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

September 9, 2026

RECEIVED
September 9, 2026
CLERK OF THE COUNCIL
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MD

Silver Hill 9, LLC; Silver Hill 4, LLC
Silver Hill Land Owner, LLC
212 E Main Street
Salisbury, MD 21801

Re: Notification of Planning Board Action on
Detailed Site Plan DET-2024-017
Metro Grove

Dear Applicant:

This is to advise you that, on **September 3, 2026,** the above-referenced Detailed Site Plan was acted upon by the Prince George's County Planning Board in accordance with the attached Resolution.

Pursuant to the Prince George's County Planning Board's Rules of Procedure, the Planning Board's decision will become effective 30 calendar days after the date of this notice **(September 9, 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, 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. **2026-054**

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

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Board | Office of the Chairman

1616 McCormick Drive, Largo, MD 20774
301-952-3560
pgcpb@ppd.mncppc.org
www.pgplanningboard.org

PGCPB No. 2026-054 File No. DET-2024-017

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Silver Hill 9, LLC; Silver Hill 4, LLC; and Silver Hill Land Owner, LLC ("applicant") submitted an application for approval of a detailed site plan for development of 250 multifamily residential dwelling units in 3 buildings, with associated infrastructure and amenities, commonly known as "Metro Grove" ("development");

WHEREAS, the project is located on approximately 7.21 acres in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) and Suitland Parkway ("subject property"); and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at an evidentiary hearing on July 23, 2026, regarding Detailed Site Plan DET-2024-017 for Metro Grove, the Planning Board finds:

I. EVALUATION CRITERIA

The subject property is within the Residential, Multifamily-48 (RMF-48) Zone. This application is being reviewed under the requirements of Section 27-3605(e) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. The Planning Board has considered the following in reviewing this detailed site plan:

A. The Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance;

B. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031;

C. Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2024-063

D. The 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*;

E. The Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance;

F. The Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance;

G. Referral comments; and

H. Written and oral testimony.

II. BACKGROUND

A. **Request**: The detailed site plan application ("site plan") is for development of 250 multifamily residential dwelling units in 3 buildings, with associated infrastructure and amenities. The development consists of two phases; Phase 1 will include two buildings (Buildings 1 and 2) totaling 200 units, and Phase 2 will consist of one building (Building 3) with 50 dwelling units.

As part of the application, the applicant requested alternative compliance from the requirements of Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets, of the 2018 *Prince*

George's County Landscape Manual. In addition, the applicant requested a reduction in minimum off-street parking requirements, pursuant to Section 27-6308(a)(1) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

The applicant entities are Silver Hill 9, LLC; Silver Hill 4, LLC; and Silver Hill Land Owner, LLC, and their address is 212 E Main Street, Salisbury, Maryland 21801. The information on the coversheet of the site plan is incorrect, which is conditioned herein to be revised.

B. Development Data Summary:

	EXISTING	**EVALUATED**
Zone(s)	RMF-48	RMF-48
Use	Single-family detached dwellings	Multifamily Dwellings
Total Gross Acreage	7.21	7.21
Floodplain Acreage	0	0
Total Net Acreage	7.21	7.21
Parcels	2	1
Dwelling Units	2	250*
Phase 1		200
One-Bedroom Units	-	90
Two-Bedroom Units	-	66
Two-Bedroom Units		44
Phase 2		50*

Note: *The Unit Mix Table on the coversheet of the site plan shows approximately (+/-50 units for Phase 2 and, therefore, approximately 250 units for the overall development. However, the site plan must include a definite number of units. A condition is included herein to revise the Unit Mix Table to reflect 250 units for the overall development, and 50 units for Phase 2, which may be revised through subsequent amendments to this site plan.

C. Location: The subject property is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) and Suitland Parkway.

D. Proposed Uses: The site plan proposes multifamily dwelling use on the property. This use is permitted in the Residential, Multifamily-48 (RMF-48) Zone, subject to the use-specific standards found in Sections 27-4202(i) and 27-5102(c)(1)(E) of the Zoning Ordinance.

E. Surrounding Uses: The subject property is bounded to the north by the public right-of-way of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road); to the east by the public right-of-way of Suitland Parkway, under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service, and commercial

and residential uses in the Residential, Multifamily-20 (RMF-20) and Legacy Mixed-Use Town Center (LMUTC) Zones beyond; to the west by single-family, two-family, and multifamily residential dwellings in the RMF-48 Zone, and an unnamed stub extension from the public right-of-way of Maywood Lane; and to the south by single-family residential dwellings in the Residential, Multifamily-12 (RMF-12) Zone. The subject property also has frontage along West Summer Road to the south, a 16-foot-wide public right-of-way providing driveway access from Suitland Parkway to single-family dwellings to the south of the subject property.

F. **Previous Approvals**: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031 was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on February 5, 2026 (PGCPB Resolution No. 2026-007), for one parcel to support development of 250 multifamily dwelling units, subject to 7 conditions.

Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2024-063 was approved by the Planning Director on January 14, 2026, for development of 250 multifamily dwelling units, subject to 7 conditions. The ADQ is valid for 12 years from the date of its approval, subject to additional expiration provisions of Section 24-4503(c) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.

G. **Design Features**: The 7.21-acre subject property is long and narrow in shape, fronting Suitland Parkway to the east and MD 458 to the north. The subject property is currently improved with two single-family detached residential units which will be razed for the new development. The development will be accessed via a single vehicular access point from a 35-foot-wide stub extension of Maywood Lane, which connects to MD 458. An internal driveway within the subject property will extend from the stub and provide access to the multifamily buildings. The vehicular access is consistent with prior agency approvals and access limitations as approved by the PPS. The 22-foot-wide internal drive aisles provide clear circulation, emergency vehicle access, and convenient access to parking areas. The three multifamily buildings will be located on the eastern part of the property, fronting Suitland Parkway and MD 458, while the surface parking lots will be located on the western portion of the property. The provision of crosswalks and continuous 6-foot-wide sidewalks in front and around each building form the pedestrian circulation for the subject property.

The Phase 1 development will include Buildings 1 and 2 and their associated parking lots, and the surface parking lot in front of Building 3. Phase 2 development will include Building 3, which also includes a parking structure on the ground floor of the building.

Architecture

The submitted site plan set includes the floor plans, elevations, and renderings for Buildings 1 and 2 for Phase 1. Building 3 will be designed in Phase 2; only renderings are provided for Building 3 for illustration purposes, with no floor plans or elevations. A subsequent amendment to this site plan will be required, for the purpose of including all floor plans and elevations, prior to approval of building permits for Building 3. Building 1 will be L-shaped and Building 2 will be U-shaped. Both buildings will be five stories,

with an approximate maximum height of 61 feet. Building 1 will consist of 65 residential units, including 20 one-bedroom, 26 two-bedroom, and 19 three-bedroom units. Building 2 will consist of 135 residential units, including 70 one-bedroom, 40 two-bedroom, and 25 three-bedroom units. Building 3 will consist of 50 units, with a maximum height of 65 feet. The applicant has requested a minor departure from design standards (DPT) to allow an increase in the maximum length of Building 2, from 250 linear feet to 288 linear feet, in the RMF-48 Zone. The DPT was considered and approved by the Planning Director, pursuant to Section 27-3614(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, prior to the Planning Board hearing of this application. Each building includes an outdoor plaza adjacent to the building entrance. Buildings 1 and 2 also include an outdoor recreational area. Each building's primary building entrance faces west towards outdoor recreational facilities and parking lots.

The architectural design of Buildings 1 and 2 share a similar style which exemplifies a contemporary mid-rise multifamily residential building, with a clear horizontal base, middle, and top composition. Each building features a flat roof with varying heights of cornices and incorporates a mix of materials and colors, including darker brick veneer at the base and cementitious panels and horizontal siding with various lighter colors for the middle and upper portion. Vertical and horizontal articulation in the form of recessed Juliet balconies, varied window groupings, and massing shifts break down the building's scale. The cornice is expressed as a clean, contemporary projecting cap that creates a strong horizontal termination at the roofline. Canopies are incorporated at building entrances and windows at ground level to define pedestrian scale.

Parking
The site plan includes a parking reduction request per Section 27-6308(a)(1), for up to a 50 percent reduction of the minimum number of off-street parking spaces required by Table 27-6305(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, for uses located within a one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) radius of a high-service transit stop, which is Suitland Metro Station. A detailed analysis of the parking reduction request is discussed below in Finding III.

Based on the reduced minimum parking requirements, the site plan meets the parking requirements (201 required and 227 spaces provided). Parking is provided within multiple surface parking lots that are connected within the subject property, and within the parking facilities within Building 3. The development also meets the bicycle parking requirement (49 required and 74 spaces provided). The development includes a total of 18 short-term bicycle parking spaces, and a total of 56 long-term bicycle parking spaces. The parking and bike parking charts on the coversheet of the site plan also indicate that the provided spaces meet applicable requirements for each phase.

Signage
The site plan includes two signs, one gateway sign and one building-mounted sign on Building 1, which meet the location, number, and area requirements of Section 27-61506(a), Permanent Real Estate Identification Sign, of the Zoning Ordinance. The development includes 250 units and, therefore, it is allowed to have a maximum of two signs. The gateway sign is located on the south side of the 35-foot-wide

driveway. The sign consists of a central wood-look sign panel with laser cut, powder-coated aluminum letters, anchored by two rectangular piers with varying heights and dark brick finish. The sign panel measures 9 feet in length and 3 feet in height, and 27 square feet in area. The building-mounted sign is attached to Building 1, at the corner of Suitland Parkway and MD 458. The sign measures 18 feet in height, 2.5 feet in width, and 45 square feet in area, and is designed with a powder-coated aluminum panel with laser cut letters. Details of the signage are included on Sheet SK-1 of the architecture elevation set.

Lighting

The site plan includes pole-mounted lighting fixtures in the parking area and outdoor recreational area, and bollard lighting fixtures at building entrances and along the pedestrian path. All lighting fixtures will be full cut-off, and light will be directed downward. The submitted photometric plan demonstrates that the internal driveway and walkways of the subject property are adequately lit. The photometric plan and lighting fixture details are included on Sheets 17–18 of the detailed site plan set.

Recreation Facilities

PPS-2024-031 determined that, to meet public facility adequacy, recreational facilities for the development shall be provided, in accordance with Section 24-4507 of the Subdivision Regulations, as required through conditions in the approved ADQ-2024-063. Based on projected population, the minimum value of recreational facilities determined for the development, at the time of PPS approval, was $969,371.56. The recreational facilities chart on Sheet 01A shows the provided value is $973,128, which meets the minimum requirement. The site plan provides a variety of indoor and outdoor recreation facilities with estimated cost and construction timing on Sheet 01A. Bicycle racks and the lobby should not be included as recreational facilities, as bike racks are part of parking requirements, and a lobby is a function of building entrances. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to remove the bicycle racks and lobby from the recreational chart calculation. Building 1 includes a community room, a fitness room within the building, and a forecourt and school-age playground as outdoor facilities. Building 2 includes a community room within the building, and a forecourt, lawn game, a dog waste station, and pre-school age playground as outdoor facilities. All outdoor facilities are connected by an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant path connecting the buildings and spaces. The location, layout, and details of those facilities are shown on Sheet 06B (open space set-aside exhibit) and Sheets 19–25 of the detailed site plan set.

Loading and Trash Facilities

This site plan includes three loading spaces and three trash areas which are consolidated in between Buildings 1 and 2, and to the south of Building 3. Designated loading and trash areas are located to provide convenient access while minimizing conflicts with primary circulation routes. The service areas are not visible from Suitland Parkway and MD 458, as they are screened by the landscaping along both streets.

III. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE ZONING ORDINANCE

A. Detailed Site Plan Decision Standards (Section 27-3605(e))

(1) The proposed development represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the applicable standards of this Subtitle, without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use;

The applicable standards of this Subtitle consist of the RMF-48 Zone, Intensity and Dimensional Standards (Section 27-4202(i)(2)), Section 27-5102(c)(1)(E) requirements for multifamily uses, and applicable development standards contained in Part 27-6 of the Zoning Ordinance. Detailed findings of conformance to the applicable provisions of the Zoning Ordinance are addressed in Findings III.B and V.

Based on the analysis herein, and subject to the conditions of approval, in addition to the evidence filed in conjunction with this application, the Planning Board finds that DET-2024-017 represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the applicable standards of this Subtitle, without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the development for the intended uses.

(2) All conditions of approval in any development approvals and permits previously approved for the property have been considered and imposed as necessary to satisfy the applicable standards of this Subtitle;

As further discussed in Finding IV below, the development complies with applicable conditions of PPS-2024-031 and ADQ-2024-063.

(3) The proposed development demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirements of Section 24-4303(D)(5) of Subtitle 24: Subdivision Regulations;

The on-site regulated environmental features (REF) include one isolated wetland and wetland buffer located in the southern portion of the subject property. The development includes off-site impacts to REF in the form of a stream buffer. Two impacts to REF were reviewed and approved with PPS-2024-031. There are no new impacts to REF with this application. The Planning Board finds that the development demonstrates preservation and/or restoration of the REF in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible.

(4) Proposed development located within a Planned Development (PD) zone shall be in conformance with the PD Basic Plan and PD Conditions of Approval that apply to that development;

The development is not located in a Planned Development Zone; therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

(5) The proposed development conforms to an approved Tree Conservation Plan, if applicable;

The site plan has a companion Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-2026-0038, which is approved. The development conforms with the TCP2.

(6) The development proposed in a detailed site plan for infrastructure complies with applicable regulations of PART 27-6: Development Standards, prevents offsite property damage, and prevents environmental degradation to safeguard the public's health, safety, welfare, and economic well-being for grading, reforestation, woodland conservation, drainage, erosion, and pollution discharge;

The application is not a site plan for infrastructure. Therefore, this provision does not apply.

(7) Places of worship located on a lot between one (1) and two (2) acres in size shall also meet the following standards:

(A) The minimum setback for all buildings shall be twenty-five (25) feet from each lot line;

(B) When possible, there should be no parking or loading spaces located in the front yard; and

(C) The maximum allowable lot coverage for the zone in which the use is proposed shall not be.

The development does not include a place of worship. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

(8) Notwithstanding any other provision in this Section to the contrary, in determining whether to approve an alteration, extension, or enlargement of a legal conforming building, structure, or use filed in conformance with Section 27-1707(c), the Planning Board shall find that the proposed alteration, extension, or enlargement will benefit the development and will not substantially impair implementation of any applicable area master plan or sector plan.

The site plan does not alter, expand, or enlarge legal conforming building structures or uses, and has not been filed in conformance with Section 27-1707(c) of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

B. Standards applicable in the RMF-48 Zone - Intensity and Dimensional Standards (Section 27-4202(i))

The site plan is in conformance with the applicable RMF-48 Zone Intensity and Dimensional Standards for multifamily dwellings, as shown below:

STANDARD	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
Density, max.(du/ac of net lot area)	48	35
Net lot area, min. (sq. ft.)	7,500	314,178
Lot width, min. (ft.)	75	244*
Lot frontage at front street line, min. (ft)	60	231*
Lot Coverage, max. (% of development lot as a whole)	60	43
Front yard depth, min. (ft)	15	50.35
Side yard depth, min. (ft)	8**	22
Side yard depth, min. along street (ft)	30**	43.86
Rear yard depth, min. (ft)	20	24.02
Principal structure height, max. (ft)	110	
Building 1		61 max.***
Building 2		61 max.***
Building 3		65 max.***
Accessory structure height, max.(ft)	15	12

Notes: *Proposed Parcel 1 is a corner lot. Pursuant to Section 27-2500 of the Zoning Ordinance, "Lot, corner" is defined as "A "lot" abutting two (2) or more "streets" at their intersection, where the interior angle of intersection does not exceed one hundred thirty-five degrees (135°)" while "Lot, through" is defined as "Either an "interior lot" fronting on two (2) or more "streets," or a "corner lot" fronting on three (3) or more "streets." The 16-foot-wide West Summer Road does not meet the definition of "street," in accordance with Section 27-2500; therefore, the subject property is a corner lot. The lot frontage is along MD 458 (Silver Road).

**On a corner lot, the minimum side yard depth along a side street is 30 feet. All other side yards may be 8 feet.

***The height is listed as maximum height, to allow flexibility for construction documents.

C. Standards for multifamily dwellings in the RMF-48 Zone (Section 27-5102(c)(1)(E))

The site plan is in conformance with the applicable use specific standards for multifamily dwelling use in the RMF-48 Zone, pursuant to Section 27-5102(c)(1)(E), as follows:

(E) Dwelling, Multifamily RMF-48 Zone

Multifamily dwellings shall not be constructed in the RMF-48 Zone where the land is situated on less than six acres of land and adjacent on three sides to property with a future land use designation of Residential, Medium Density Land Uses within an applicable area master plan or sector plan approved prior to 2007.

The site plan is located on 7.21 acres of land, and the two adjacent sides of the property are subject to the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan* (sector plan), which does not meet the above criteria. Therefore, multifamily dwelling units are allowed to be constructed in the RMF-48 Zone on the subject property.

D. Part 27-6. Development Standards

The site plan is consistent with the applicable standards in Part 27-6. The following analysis is offered:

1. Section 27-6200—Roadway Access, Mobility, and Circulation

The site plan is in conformance with the applicable standards in Section 27-6200 of the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

Section 27-6202. Consistency with Plans
The design and construction of access and circulation systems associated with this site plan is consistent with the transportation goals, objectives, and actions in the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035), the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), and the sector plan as follows:

General Plan Consistency:
Plan 2035 includes the following goals and policies related to multimodal transportation:

Policy 2: Expand and improve transit service, particularly on routes connecting Downtowns, the Innovation Corridor, and Regional Transit Districts in order to maximize the economic development potential and synergies between these areas.

TM 2.1: Invest in existing bus services and in new bus and light rail transit service to connect Downtowns, Innovation Corridor, and Regional Transit Districts. Coordinate transit planning initiatives with local municipalities, County, the Washington Metropolitan Transit Authority (WMATA), and the State of Maryland.

A new ADA-compliant bus pad and shelter is included at the existing bus stop at the intersection of Maywood Lane and MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) to support transit use. The sharrow roadway markings for the bicycle facility and pedestrian improvements, such as sidewalks, connect the subject property to existing Suitland Metro Station, which support the use of transit service.

Policy 4: Use complete and green street practices to design, operate, maintain, and retrofit the transportation network in order to improve travel conditions for pedestrians, bicyclists, transit riders, and vulnerable population consistent with the surrounding area's character.

> **TM 4.4: Designs new transportation. Continuous sidewalks on both sides of the road and on-road (bike lanes) bicycle facilities should be included, to the extent feasible and practical, and based on the type and location of the facility proposed.**

MD 458 currently has shared road pavement markings along the property frontage. The Planning Board requires the provision of shared roadway signs along the facility, which is conditioned herein.

Policy 7: Improve overall safety levels within the County's transportation network.

> **TM 7.1: Develop a countywide strategy that promotes the use of alternative fuel vehicles. This includes facilities for plug-in electric vehicles on streets and in parking facilities. Amend codes and standards to implement policies and strategies.**

The development includes 23 electric vehicle ready parking spaces, 10 electric vehicle supply equipment (EVSE) parking spaces and 3 EVSE accessible parking spaces to support the policy.

Policy 8: Ensure that minimum and maximum parking requirements for transit accessible areas are appropriate to advance the overall goals of Plan 2035.

> **TM 8.2: Support parking reduction strategies such as shared parking, transportation demand management strategies and programs, car and bike share programs, and new sidewalk and trail connections between transit facilities and residential and employment areas in the Regional Transit Districts, and Innovation Corridor, and Local Centers.**

The development requested a 50 percent parking reduction, based on the one-quarter mile proximity to transit. The Planning Board concurs with the reduction request to support the policy. Detailed analysis is included in Finding III.D.2 below.

Master Plan Consistency
The subject property has frontage along MD 458 and Suitland Parkway (F-7). Both are master-planned roadways. The subject property is consistent with the MPOT and the sector plan.

Right-of-Way

- **Silver Hill Road (MD 458) (A-40):** 120-foot right-of-way

Both the MPOT and area master plan recommend a minimum 120-foot right-of-way. The plan sheets identify 60 feet from the centerline and include 0.01 acre of dedication to meet the requirements.

- **Suitland Parkway (F-7):** Variable width right-of-way; 4 to 6 lanes

Suitland Parkway is designated as a parkway in the MPOT, which is owned and maintained by the National Park Service (NPS). The sector plan does not contain a right-of-way recommendation for this roadway. The plan sheets identify the boundary of the right-of-way, as shown on MSHA right-of-way Plat 16844, and the Planning Board finds that acceptable.

The subject property has frontage along Summer Road to the east as shown on the plan, a service roadway parallel and within the bounds of the right-of-way of Suitland Parkway. As stated in a letter provided in the applicant's statement of justification, from the standpoint of the NPS, Summer Road is not considered a separate roadway within the NPS system. The site plan is not impacting Suitland Parkway. The Planning Board finds that the proposal meets the intent of the master plan, and no additional right-of-way is required.

Pedestrian and Bike Facilities
The MPOT recommends the following facilities along the subject property's frontage:

- **Silver Hill Road (MD 458):** Planned bicycle lane

The MPOT recommends a bicycle lane along the property frontage of Silver Hill Road. The sector plan carried forward this recommendation in 2014; however, as stated in Table 25 on page 127 of the sector plan, unless the roadway is subject to lane reductions, it may not be possible to provide space for bicycle lanes. Silver Hill Road currently has shared road pavement markings along the property frontage, which meet the intent of the master-planned facility. The challenge with

implementing a bicycle lane at this location is the proximity to the ramps along Silver Hill Road and Suitland Parkway, as well as the number of existing travel lanes. Currently, there is no proposal to reduce the number of travel lanes to provide the MPOT and sector plan recommendation for a bicycle lane; the Planning Board finds that the shared pavement markings meet the intent of an on-road bicycle facility.

Recommendations, Policies and Goals
MPOT Complete Streets Policies:

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.

The site plan includes existing sidewalk and shared road pavement markings along the property frontage of Silver Hill Road and a connection to the on-site sidewalk facilities, which is acceptable. Both facilities also serve the nearby Suitland Metro Station, providing a connection to the regional transit system. The Planning Board requires ADA-compliant curb ramps at vehicular crossings to meet the intent of the policy.

The sector plan includes the following goals and policies related to multimodal transportation:

> **Provide a safe, convenient, and accessible transportation system that meets the basic need for travel via motorized and non-motorized modes.**

Silver Hill Road currently has sharrow markings for a shared bike lane along the property frontage, which meets the intent of the sector plan recommended bicycle facility. However, the legend for the section of Phase 1 bicycle path along MD 458 should clearly indicate it is a shared bike lane on Sheet 06A, which is conditioned herein. Plan sheets identify four crosswalks at vehicular crossings in surface parking lots to serve the on-site pedestrian circulation, and long-term and short-term bicycle parking to support non-motorized transportation modes. Both bicycle and pedestrian facilities also connect the bus shelter and the nearby Suitland Metro Station, providing a connection to the regional transit system. The Planning Board requires ADA-compliant curb ramps at vehicular crossings. Although not part of the site plan approval, some of the required off-site improvements, including crosswalks and bus shelters, are shown on the site plan for context.

Section 27-6203. Multimodal Transportation System
Multimodal access and circulation are included via sidewalk and shared road pavement markings along Silver Hill Road. Long-term and short-term bicycle parking has been provided to support multimodal use.

Section 27-6204. Circulation Plan or Site Plan Required
The submitted plans demonstrate pedestrian and vehicular circulation through the subject property and meet the requirements of this section. One vehicular access point is included along Maywood Lane. Sidewalks and striped crosswalks are also included crossing vehicular drive aisles and through the subject property to accommodate both pedestrian and bicycle circulation.

Section 27-6206. Vehicular Access and Circulation
27-6206(a): All public streets are classified appropriately along the site access via Maywood Lane.

27-6206(b): All accessways are classified appropriately and there are no alleys with this development.

27-6206(c): The site plan includes one vehicular access point along Maywood Lane and an internal road to serve the multifamily buildings. Drive aisles are a minimum of 22 feet wide. The Planning Board finds access and circulation to be sufficient.

27-6206(d):
(1): One vehicular access point is included along Maywood Lane, which is not identified as a collector or arterial roadway. The criteria have been met.

The Maryland State Highway Administration has not approved direct access onto Silver Hill Road, and the NPS denied a request for access on Summer Road, which spans the length of the property along its eastern border.

(2): The multi-family units will have access via a public roadway and meet the permitting agency standards. The criteria have been met.

27-6206(e): There are no adjoining parcels containing a nonresidential or mixed-use development or adjoining vacant land. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

27-6206(f): The development is for multifamily use; therefore, this provision is not applicable.

27-6206(g): The applicant has included a sidewalk connection to the on-site sidewalk facilities.

27-6206(h): The subject property is not adjoined by vacant land, and no future connections are provided.

27-6206(i): There are no new streets included.

27-6206(j): There are no private streets included.

Section 27-6207. Pedestrian Access and Circulation
27-6207(a): The development includes a comprehensive internal pedestrian network. Five-foot-wide sidewalks are included along buildings, the internal road, and along MD 458 (Silver Hill Road). Internal pedestrian circulation, including sidewalks and crosswalks, is designed to permit convenient, efficient, and orderly movement of pedestrians among the destination points within the development.

27-6207(b): Pedestrian connectivity is currently included via a 5-foot-wide sidewalk along MD 458 and existing sidewalk along Maywood Lane.

Section 27-6208. Bicycle Access and Circulation
27-6208(a): The development includes shared lane pavement markings along the frontage of MD 458 to accommodate cyclist connections with circulation through the development. Bicycle parking is included for each building, including 6 uncovered bicycle racks (12 spaces) serving Building 1, 6 covered bicycle racks (12 spaces) serving Building 2, and 3 uncovered bicycle racks (6 spaces) serving Building 3, located near the entrance of the buildings. Consolidated long-term bicycle parking is provided by a 44-space bike storage facility located between Buildings 1 and 2. This criterion has been satisfied.

27-6208(b): There are no adjoining parcels containing a multifamily, townhouse, nonresidential, or mixed-use development, or to the boundary of adjoining vacant land. Therefore, this criterion is not applicable.

2. Section 27-6300—Off-Street Parking and Loading

The site plan is in conformance with the applicable standards in Section 27-6300 of the Zoning Ordinance, including vehicular and bicycle parking, and loading requirements.

Section 27-6304. General Standards for Off-Street Parking and Loading Areas
Off-street parking spaces are provided on surface parking lots for each building and in a parking structure for Building 3. Parking areas are arranged for convenient access, with no conflicts with public streets and sidewalks. The required surfacing, marking, wheel stops, and lighting are shown on the site plan, per Section 27-6304(d)–(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.

In accordance with Section 27-6304(g) of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the standards in the Federal ADA Accessibility Guidelines, a minimum of six parking spaces should be accessible spaces, and a minimum of one space should be van-accessible, for a total number of parking spaces between 201–300. The site plan provides 23 accessible parking spaces, including 8 van-accessible spaces. This requirement is met.

Section 27-6305. Off-Street Parking Standards

The applicant has submitted a reduction request with justification to the minimum off-street parking requirements in Section 27-6305(a), in accordance with the provisions in Section 27-6308(a)(1), Reduced Parking Standards for Parking Demand Reduction Strategies, of the Zoning Ordinance. A transportation statement dated June 11, 2026 with trip generation and parking demand analysis for the project is submitted with the application. Section 27-6308(a) notes the Planning Director may authorize up to 50 percent reduction for uses located within a one-quarter mile (1,320 feet) radius of a high-service transit stop.

The Planning Board measured the radius from the northeastern corner of the subject property to the center of platform at the Suitland Metro Station, and determined it is approximately 728 feet. In addition, the project will further strengthen this multimodal access by connecting directly to the sidewalk along MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) and by incorporating pedestrian improvements along the walking route to the Metro, including new crosswalks and ADA-compliant curb ramps with truncated domes. Thirdly, the applicant proffers to install a new ADA-compliant bus pad and shelter at the existing bus stop at the intersection of Maywood Lane and MD 458, located approximately 220 feet from the property. Fourth, policy support for parking reduction for developments near Metro stations can be found in Plan 2035 and the sector plan. Fifth, based on the submitted parking demand analysis and the applicant's experience on operating affordable housing near transit, the project is an affordable housing development, which typically have lower parking needs than market-rate housing.

The Planning Board finds that the request for and up to the entitled 50 percent reduction results in the development reducing the parking from 375 required parking spaces to 201 parking spaces. The Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Parking Generation Manual* suggests 227 parking spaces for multifamily dwelling units close to rail transit stations. The 50 percent reduction of the County parking minimum and the ITE *Parking Generation Manuel* closely align to support the reduction request. Given the property's immediate proximity to a high-capacity transit station, the planned pedestrian and transit facility enhancements, the submitted parking demand analysis, and Plan 2035 and sector plan policies to support parking reduction near transit stations, the Planning Board approves the requested 50 percent parking reduction pursuant to Section 27-6308(a)(1), for the minimum off-street parking requirements in Section 27-6305(a).

Both Phases 1 and 2 will meet the parking minimum per parking reduction independently. The minimum requirement for Phase 1 is 160 spaces and 208 spaces are provided; the minimum requirement for Phases 1 and 2 is 201 spaces, and 227 spaces are provided. As shown on the site plan by phase on Sheets 4 and 5, Phase 2 adds 27 spaces in structured parking, but also removes eight temporary compact spaces adjacent to north of Building 3. As a result, the total number of parking spaces in Phases 1 and 2 is 227 spaces. Off-street parking, including visitor parking and electric vehicle charging spaces, will be located on the surface parking areas for Phase 1 and in a parking structure in Building 3 for Phase 2.

Parking Tabulations – Phase 1			
Parking Required (min.) per Section 27-6305 (a) with 50% reduction per Sec. 27-6308 (a)(1) (does not apply to visitor parking)			**Provided**
200 dwelling units (1.5 spaces per DU) x 50%		150	-
Visitor parking (1.0 space per 20 DU)		10	-
	Total Parking	**160**	**208**
Standard Spaces (9 feet x 18 feet)	-	-	**81**
Compact Spaces (8 feet x 16 feet)*	-	-	**104***
ADA Parking (8 feet x 18 feet)	7 spaces for projects with parking spaces between 201 and 300 and 2 of them must be van-sized	7	**23****
Minimum EV-Ready Parking Spaces	10% of total required parking for multifamily dwellings	16	(23)***
Minimum EVSE Installed Parking Spaces	5% of total required parking for multifamily dwellings	8	(7)***
	At least one parking space equipped with an accessible charging station	1	(3)***

Parking Tabulations – Phase 1+Phase 2			
Parking Required (min.) per Section 27-6305 (a) with 50% reduction per Sec. 27-6308 (a)(1) (does not apply to visitor parking)			**Provided**
250 dwelling units (1.5 spaces per DU) x 50%		188	-
Visitor parking (1.0 space per 20 DU)		13	-
	Total Parking	**201**	**227**
Standard Spaces (9 feet x 18 feet)	-	-	**81**
Standard Spaces in Structure Parking (9 feet x 18 feet)			**27**
Compact Spaces (8 feet x 16 feet)*	-	-	**96***
ADA Parking (8 feet x 18 feet)	7 spaces for projects with parking	7	**23****

Parking Tabulations – Phase 1+Phase 2			
	spaces between 201 and 300 and 2 of them must be van-sized		
Minimum EV-Ready Parking Spaces	10% of total required parking for multifamily dwellings	20	(23)**
Minimum EVSE Installed Parking Spaces	5% of total required parking for multifamily dwellings	10	(10)***
	At least one parking space equipped with an accessible charging station	1	(3)***

Notes: *Pursuant to Section 27-6306(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, up to one-half (1/2) of the required number of parking spaces in any parking lot may be compact car spaces. Any parking spaces provided in any lot, in excess of the number required, may also be compact car spaces.

**Based on the parking spaces shown on the plan, among the 23 handicap-access spaces provided, 8 van-sized handicap-access spaces are included for Phase 1 alone and for Phases 1 and 2. The off-street vehicle parking table shows only 6 handicap-access spaces are provided for Phase 1, which is conditioned herein to be corrected.

***Although this requirement will take effect on or after January 1, 2027, the site plan provided electric vehicle parking spaces to comply with the requirement in Section 27-6305(e) of the Zoning Ordinance. To avoid double counting, the bracket symbol indicates that the electric vehicle parking spaces are included in the total number of parking spaces provided, and do not change the total parking spaces value.

Section 27-6306. Dimensional Standards for Parking Spaces and Aisles
As shown on the site plan and the parking chart on cover sheet, the included parking spaces and drive aisles meet the minimum dimensional standards as outlined in Table 27-6306(a). The typical width of driveways and parking space dimensions are labeled on site plan. Out of the total required parking spaces, up to half of the parking spaces may be designated as compact. Any parking spaces provided in any lot, in excess of the number required, may also be compact car spaces. In Phase 1, out of 208 total parking spaces provided, 104 are designated as compact; in Phases 1 and 2, out of 227 total parking spaces provided, 96 are designated as compact. Both phases meet the requirements.

Section 27-6309 Bicycle Parking Standards
Section 27-6309(a): The development also meets the bicycle parking requirement. The development requires 49 bicycle parking spaces for both Phase 1 alone and Phases 1 and 2, and the applicant is proposing 68 bicycle parking spaces in Phase 1 alone and 74 parking spaces for Phases 1 and 2. The

development provides nine inverted U-style bicycle racks, accommodating 18 short-term bicycle parking spaces near Buildings 1 and 3. In addition, 56 long-term bicycle parking spaces are included, with 12 spaces provided by six covered inverted U-style racks near Building 2, and the remaining 44 spaces provided within a dedicated bicycle storage facility. The bike rack and bike storage facility details are shown on Sheets 23 and 24 of the site plan set.

Section 27-6309(b): The nine short-term racks are on paved surfaces, at least 3 feet away from the principal buildings, and are more than 30 inches apart from each other. The long-term covered racks and the storage facility locations comply with the requirements of Section 27-6309(b)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Bicycle Parking Tabulation					
Required (min. spaces) per Section 27-6309(a)(1)(A)			**Provided** (spaces)		
			Short term	**Long term**	**TOTAL**
Phase 1 (200 DU)	1 space per 4 DU, no fewer than 2 and no more than 49	49	12	56	68
Phase 1+ 2 (250 DU)		49	18	56	74

Section 27-6310 Loading Area Standards
Three loading spaces are included in this site plan and are 12 feet by 33 feet in size. The loading areas are located away from public street view and adjacent to building loading doors, to the maximum extent practicable. The loading areas are accessible and designed so vehicles can maneuver safely, as demonstrated by the submitted truck turn exhibit. All loading areas are located a minimum of 50 feet from any existing residential use surrounding the subject property.

Loading Space Tabulation			
Required (min.) per Section 27-6310(a)			**Provided**
Phase 1 (200 DU)	1 space per 100 up to 300 DU	1	2
Phase 1+ 2 (250 DU)		1	3

3. Section 27-6400—Open Space Set-Asides

Development subject to the standards of Section 27-6400 of the Zoning Ordinance shall provide the minimum amount of open space set-asides (as percentage of development site area) identified in Table 27-6403: Required Open Space Set-Asides, of the Zoning Ordinance, based on the use classification.

Section 27-6403. Amount of Open Space Set-Asides
The applicant provided an open space set aside exhibit on Sheet 06B showing open space set aside location, type, and calculations. Residential use in the RMF-48 Zone is required to provide 20 percent of the development site area for

open space set-aside, which is approximately 1.44 acres (or 62,835 square feet). Section 27-6404(a) of the Zoning Ordinance also requires at least 15 percent of the total required minimum open space set-aside area to be active recreational areas, which is approximately 0.22 acre (or 9,425 square feet). The submitted open space set-aside exhibit shows the provision of 2.09 acres (or 91,127 square feet) for open space set-aside, which includes 0.25 acre (or 10,871 square feet) of active recreational area.

Section 27-6404. Areas Counted as Open Space Set-Asides
As shown on open space set aside exhibit, the site plan provides various open space types, including natural feature and/or landscaped areas, squares, forecourts and plazas, and active recreational areas, which are all eligible to be counted towards the open space set-aside pursuant to Table 27-6404(a). Active recreational area is defined as land occupied by areas and facilities used for active recreational purposes. The active recreational areas include both indoor and outdoor facilities, which are both qualified spaces. Indoor facilities include community rooms and fitness rooms that meet the definition of "clubhouse," and outdoor facilities that include two playgrounds and a cornhole court. Each building will include a plaza in front of the building entrance, with more than 600 square feet in area. The plazas have direct access to sidewalks and will accommodate people sitting and gathering with benches and tables.

Section 27-6405. Areas Not Counted as Open Space Set-Asides
In accordance with Section 27-6405 of the Zoning Ordinance, the open space set-aside areas are not included among those areas that are prohibited from being counted toward the required open space set-aside.

Section 27-6406. Design Standards for Open Space Set-Asides
As required by this section, the open spaces are readily accessible and useable by residents and visitors and serve as focal points within the development. The open space set-aside areas are contiguous or interconnected, to the maximum extent practicable, by sidewalks. Primary entrances of the buildings are facing the required open space set-aside areas.

Section 27-6407. Development in Open Space Set-Asides
Development within the open space set-aside consists only of improvements appropriate to each open space set-aside, as listed in the recreational facilities calculation chart on the coversheet.

27-6408. Ownership, Management, and Maintenance of Open Space Set-Asides
Prior to approval of a building permit, an easement or covenant shall be established for the open space to ensure continued use for open space purposes, in perpetuity, and provide for the continued and effective management, operation, and maintenance of the land facilities, which is conditioned herein.

4. Section 27-6500—Landscaping

The site plan complies with the applicable standards of the 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual), including Section 4.1, Residential requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirement; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffer Incompatible Uses; Section 4.8, Building Frontage Landscape Requirements; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, as shown on the landscape plans with this application. The applicant requests alternative compliance from Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets, for Perimeter 1 fronting MD 458 (Silver Hill Road). Conformance to those standards is further discussed below in Finding V below.

5. Section 27-6600—Fences and Walls

The site plan includes two types of fences, which are located outside of public right-of-way and utility easements, with no unfinished side. No perimeter fences and walls, which are defined as located within 15 feet of a street right-of-way, are included. A 6-foot-high privacy fence is located along the western perimeter of the property, east of the woodland preservation area, and other 6-foot-high privacy fences are set 15 feet from and run parallel to the street-facing property line. A 3.5-foot-high decorative safety fence with gates is provided around playgrounds. The materials for the 6-foot-high fence is wooden with concrete footings, and the material for 3.5-foot-high fence and gate is aluminum, as shown on Detail Sheet 31 of the site plan set.

In addition, the site plan includes a 3-foot-high masonry wall between Building 1 and MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), which is as part of the alternative compliance request. The wall details are included on Sheet 31 of the site plan set. The site plan is in conformance with the applicable standards in Section 27-6600 of the Zoning Ordinance, including fence and wall heights, locations and appearance. Furthermore, the site plan contains six retaining walls, with varying heights between one and less than 6 feet, at the western and southern portion of the property and around Buildings 1 and 2. Retaining walls are exempt from all listed standards, except those in Section 27-6609 of the Zoning Ordinance, which the provided retaining walls conform with.

6. Section 27-6700—Exterior Lighting

A photometric plan is included on Sheet 17 of the detailed site plan set, demonstrating conformance to the applicable standards in this section, which is discussed above in Finding II. Details are provided for the pole-mounted lights and bollard lights on Sheet 18.

Section 27-6704. Prohibited Lighting
No prohibited lighting types are included.

Section 27-6704. Private Street Lighting
No private street lighting is included.

Section 27-6706. General Standards for Exterior Lighting
As shown on the photometric plan, all lighting will be full cut-off fixtures that are directed downward. Maximum illumination measured in foot-candles, at ground-level, at the lot lines will not exceed the maximums listed in Section 27-6706(c)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance. The 16-foot-tall pole-mounted lighting fixtures are within the maximum height limit of 16 feet for the residential base zone.

Section 27-6707. Lighting Design Standards for Specific Uses and Site Features
Bollard lights are provided along the building perimeter and sidewalks. Pedestrian bollard lamps shall be mounted no higher than 4 feet above grade and shall not exceed 900 lumens for any single lamp. The bollard light has been designed to comply with Section 27-6707 of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. Section 27-6800—Environmental Protection and Noise Controls

Section 27-6802. Natural Resources Inventory (NRI)
An approved natural resources inventory (NRI) plan is required with site plan applications. NRI-057-2024 was approved on July 5, 2024, and provided with the application. The NRI shows streams and 100-year floodplain do not occur on-site; however, regulated environmental features (REF) in the form of an isolated wetland and wetland buffer are located in the southern portion of the subject property. The subject property contains 13 specimen trees.

Section 27-6803. Trees and Vegetations
This site plan complies with the requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 1, General; Subtitle 25, Division 2, Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance; and Subtitle 25, Division 3, Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, of the Prince George's County Code. Detailed discussion is included in Findings VI and VII below.

Section 27-6804. Floodplain Management
According to NRI-057-2024, the subject property does not contain 100-year floodplain. The site plan is in accordance with Subtitle 32, Division 4, Floodplain Ordinance, of the County Code.

Section 27-6805. Erosion and Sedimentation Control
Section 27-6805 of the Zoning Ordinance requires an approved Grading, Erosion, and Sediment Control Plan as described in the applicability sections of Subtitle 32. Development shall comply with the requirements for sedimentation and erosion control in accordance with Subtitle 32, Division 2, Grading,

Drainage and Erosion and Sedimentation Control, of the County Code. Approved Erosion and Sediment Control Plan CSC-122-25 was submitted with the application; however, the sediment and erosion control concept is not consistent with the site plan and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2). The TCP2 must reflect the ultimate limits of disturbance, not only for installation of permanent site infrastructure, but also for the installation of all temporary infrastructure, including erosion and sediment control measures. The final sediment and erosion control plans shall match the site plan and the TCP2 prior to issuance of permits.

Section 27-6806. Stormwater Management
Section 27-3605(c)(F)(x) of the Zoning Ordinance requires a stormwater management (SWM) concept approval prior to acceptance of a site plan application. At the Subdivision and Development Review Committee meeting on May 22, 2026, the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) confirmed that a revision to the SWM concept plan was required due to changes in size, location, and numbering of stormwater facilities. A revised approved SWM Concept Plan (SIT-00051-2025-R01) was submitted with the revised material, which shows the use of 19 micro-bioretention facilities and three underground detention facilities to meet the stormwater requirements for the development. The revision to the SWM concept plan was approved on June 11, 2026. Impacts to the on-site and off-site REF shown on the plan were previously approved with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031. The site plan is in conformance with the revised SWM concept plan in compliance with Section 27-6806 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 27-6807. Chesapeake Bay Critical Area
The property is not within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area. Therefore, Section 27-6807 of the Zoning Ordinance is inapplicable.

Section 27-6808. Regulated Environmental Features
This subject property contains REF that are required to be preserved and/or restored, to the fullest extent possible, under Section 27-6808 the Zoning Ordinance.

Section 27-6808 refers to Section 24-4300(d)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations, which states: "Where land is located outside the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Overlay (CBCAO) zones, the preliminary plan of subdivision (minor or major) and all plans associated with the application shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, consistent with the Environmental Technical Manual established in accordance with Subtitle 25: Trees and Vegetation, of the County Code. Any lot with an impact shall demonstrate sufficient net lot area where a net lot area is required in accordance with Subtitle 27: Zoning Ordinance, of the County Code, for the reasonable development of the lot outside the regulated feature."

The on-site REF includes one isolated wetland and wetland buffer. The development includes off-site impacts to REF in the form of the stream buffer. Two impacts to REF were reviewed and approved with PPS-2024-031. There are no new impacts to REF with this application.

Section 27-6809. Unsafe Lands

In accordance with Section 27-6809, Unsafe Lands, of the Zoning Ordinance, this application was reviewed for unsafe land restrictions. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, the predominant soils found to occur on-site are the Beltsville-Urban land complex, Croom-Marr complex, and the Grosstown gravelly silt loam complex. According to available mapping information, unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay or Christiana clay do not occur on this property.

Section 27-6810. Noise Control

In accordance with the results of the Phase I study submitted with PPS-2024-031, a Phase II noise study dated May 21, 2026, is submitted with this application. The study has evaluated the future noise impact (2036) to the development generated by Suitland Parkway and MD 458, which are classified as a freeway and an arterial roadway, respectively, as well as the Green Line Metro railway. Noise contours in dBA Leq units for day and nighttime, and for lower and upper levels are depicted on Sheet 06B of the site plan set, and included in the noise study. The noise study analyzed exterior noise to ensure that all outdoor activity areas for all three buildings will be mitigated to 65 dBA Leq during daytime hours (between 7 AM and 10 PM) and 55 dBA Leq during nighttime hours (between 10 PM and 7 AM) in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance. In addition, a building shell analysis has been conducted for Phase 1 (Buildings 1 and 2) of the development in order to determine the minimum building construction requirements necessary to maintain noise levels not exceeding 45 dBA Leq within interior living spaces. Building 3 is considered Phase 2 of the subject property, and will not be exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA Leq; therefore, further analysis is not required.

Results of the analysis have found that the multifamily Buildings 1 and 2 will be exposed to future transportation noise levels exceeding 65 dBA Leq, with a maximum impact of 71 dBA Leq (daytime) upon the north elevation of Building 1 along MD 458. The two outdoor activity areas will not be exposed to future transportation noise levels exceeding 65 dBA Leq (daytime) or 55 dBA Leq (nighttime). The study recommends upgrading window and patio door Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings, including windows and patio doors rated between 26 to 30 STC, to maintain the interior noise levels at or below 45 dBA Leq. The recommended noise mitigation measures are depicted on the submitted architectural elevations on Sheets 32-35 of the site plan set.

8. Section 27-6903—Multifamily, Townhouse, and Three-Family Form and Design Standards

The three buildings are multifamily buildings including more than 20 dwelling units and are subject to the requirements in this section. Elevations and renderings are included in this application for Buildings 1 and 2, and only rendering were provided for Building 3 for illustrative purposes. Compliance to this section for Building 3 will be evaluated with a future site plan amendment.

(a) Site Access
The site plan includes one vehicular access point from a stub extension from Maywood Lane and an internal driveway to serve the multifamily buildings. A secondary point of vehicular access was denied by NPS and the Maryland State Highway Administration either on Suitland Parkway or MD 458. The single access and denial of other access points were evaluated during the review and approval of PPS-2024-031.

(b) Location of Off-Street Parking
As shown on the submitted site plans, all parking, including guest parking, is to be located on the side or rear of the multifamily buildings. No off-street parking occupies the parcel's street frontage.

(c) Building Orientation and Configuration
The building's primary entrances are oriented towards internal driveways and open spaces, which are located between the buildings and the surface parking lots. Even though buildings have elevations facing external streets, due to topographical and lot dimensional limitations, the buildings are oriented toward off-street parking lots internal to the subject property. Providing primary entrances adjacent to resident parking areas is the most practical solution for providing direct access to buildings for the majority of building occupants.

(d) Maximum Building Length
The project is located within the RMF-48 Zone, thus the maximum building length is 250 feet. Building 1 has an approximate total length of 165 feet, Building 2 has an approximate total length of 288 feet, and Building 3 has an approximate total length of 196 feet. The applicant has requested a minor departure from design standards (DPT) to allow an increase the maximum length of for Building 2 from 250 linear feet to 288 linear feet (approximately 15 percent increase in building length) in the RMF-48 Zone. The DPT is being considered by the Planning Director pursuant to Section 27-3614(b)(1) of Zoning Ordinance, and a decision is to be made prior to the Prince George's County Planning Board hearing on this application. The length for Building 2 is labeled as 284 feet versus 288 feet. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise plans to match the actual building length with the departure request.

(e) Building Facades
As shown in the submitted architectural elevations and renderings for Buildings 1 and 2, the facades of the two buildings are designed with wall offsets in the form of projections or recesses, with a minimum depth of 2 feet and spaced ranged between 10–43 feet apart. Pursuant to Section 27-6903(e)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, the street-facing facades of the multifamily buildings are designed with a minimum of three design features, including eaves projecting at least 6 inches from the façade plane, multiple windows with a minimum 4-inch-wide trim, and roof form and line changes consistent with wall offsets.

(f) Roofs
Buildings 1 and 2 are designed with a flat roof that is concealed by parapets extended at least 3 feet above the roof level. All roof-based mechanical equipment will be screened from the street.

(g) Building Façade Fenestration/Transparency
The submitted architectural elevations show that at least 15 percent of the street-facing façade area of the ground-level floors of Buildings 1 and 2 will be occupied by windows and/or doorways, as shown on Sheets Building 1 - A4.2 and Building 2 - A4.2.

(h) Materials
As shown on the architectural elevations, the primary façade materials extend along any side façade that is visible from a street, for a minimum of 20 feet; and material changes occur along a horizontal line, where two forms meet, or where materials occur as accents.

(i) Garage Standards
These regulations are not applicable to Buildings 1 and 2 because there is no parking garage included.

(j) Outdoor Activity Areas
As shown on Sheet 16 of the landscape plan, the three multifamily buildings are screened from adjacent single-family dwellings. Sufficient perimeter landscape buffer is provided in accordance with Section 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual.

9. Section 27-61200—Neighborhood Compatibility Standards

This section applies because the application includes multifamily development which is located on land adjacent to existing single-family detached dwellings and two-family dwellings. The applicant has submitted a letter dated June 24, 2026, with justification that the Maryland Housing Expansion and Affordability Act (HEAA) preempts certain neighborhood compatibility standards. In particular, the standards that are preempted are

Section 27-61203(a)(2) and (3), Building Height and Setbacks, of the Zoning Ordinance, for all three buildings.

Justification of HEAA preempting Section 27-61203(a)(2), Building Height and Setbacks

1) Background
The applicant first notes that the density for Metro Grove is appropriate with the zone the property is located in, which is the RMF-48 Zone. Even though the adjacent properties are developed with existing single-family and two-family dwellings, those properties could be redeveloped at substantially higher densities than what exists today, due to their zoning designation in theRMF-48 and Residential, Multifamily-12 (RMF-12) zones, and pursuant to the recommendations in Plan 2035 and the sector plan.

In addition, the applicant notes the building layout cannot be reconfigured to accommodate the density of 250 units. A site constraints exhibit provided by the applicant demonstrates the property is subject to multiple overlapping constraints that materially restrict building placement, including the subject property's oblong shape and topographic conditions, requirements for internal circulation, parking, open space, SWM, woodland conservation, and noise mitigation. These regulatory and environmental limitations significantly narrow the developable area, and preclude any alternative configuration that would preserve the 250-unit count without compromising applicable design and regulatory requirements.

Thirdly, even though part of Building 2 is not restricted by the height and setback requirement, adding more floors to Building 2 would conflict numerous laws and policies that protect Suitland Parkway's viewshed, for safety and preservation of the scenic and historic roadway.

2) Qualified Project Under HEAA
The applicant provides that Metro Grove is a "Qualified project" under the Housing Expansion and Affordability Act (HEAA), because the project meets all requirements for classification as a "qualified project" within 0.75 miles of a rail station under LU § 7-503. To qualify, a project must meet three criteria, and Metro Grove satisfied each one as follows:

> **LU § 7-503(a)(2)(i) consists of new construction or substantial renovation;**
>
> Metro Grove is a new construction consisting of three multifamily residential buildings totaling 200 units in Phase 1, and 50 units in Phase 2, situated on a previously undeveloped 7.21-acre parcel. This criterion is satisfied.

LU § 7-503(a)(2)(ii) is on property that is located within three-quarters of a mile of a rail station located in the State;

Metro Grove is located at 4315 and 4319 Silver Hill Road in Prince George's County, Maryland. The distance from the center of the Metro Grove site to the Suitland Metro Station platform is 0.20 miles (1,056 feet). The Suitland Metro Station is an active Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Green Line station expressly included among the rail systems covered by the HEAA. This criterion is satisfied.

LU § 7-503(a)(1)(iii)1. contains at least 15% of units that are affordable dwelling units; and 2. is deed–restricted to include 15% of units that are affordable dwelling units for a period of at least 40 years. (An affordable dwelling unit has housing costs that do not exceed 30% of a household's income for households earning less than 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI)).

LU § 7-503(a)(2)(iv) requires a higher percentage of affordable units in a county or municipality that, on or before December 31, 2024, has requirements equal to or exceeding 15 percent. Prince George's County does not have a pre-existing inclusionary program equaling or exceeding the HEAA's threshold, so the 15 percent standard applies. Based on the chart provided on page 7 of the justification letter, Metro Grove includes 192 units that are at or below 60 percent AMI, which is 76.8 percent of the total 250 units, exceeding the minimum requirement. The affordability restrictions will be documented in a low income housing tax credit (LIHTC) regulatory agreement and deed restriction recorded against the property for a minimum of 40 years, consistent with HEAA's requirements and the standard terms of the Maryland Community Development Administration LIHTC program.

Based on the above analysis, the Planning Board finds that Metro Grove satisfies all three criteria for designation as a "qualified project" under the HEAA's rail station proximity category and, therefore, is entitled to all statutory benefits under the Act, including the density bonus and unreasonable limitation protections.

3) Unreasonable Limitation or Requirement

The applicant argues that the HEAA applies to any local regulation that imposes an "unreasonable limitation or requirement" on a "qualified project." According to LU § 7-501(m), "unreasonable limitation or requirement" includes any limitation or requirement that amounts to a de facto denial by having a substantial adverse impact on: 1) the viability of an affordable housing development in a qualified project; 2) the degree of affordability of affordable dwelling units in a qualified project; or 3) the allowable density or number of units of the qualified project. As stated in LU § 7-505, a local jurisdiction is

prohibited from imposing any unreasonable limitation or requirements on a "qualified project," including limitations on or requirements concerning height, setback, bulk, parking, loading, dimensional, or area, and similar requirement. The applicant asserts that the applicability of Section 27-61203(a)(2) and (3) would amount to a de facto denial by having an adverse impact on all three factors as follows:

1) The viability of an affordable housing development in a qualified project;

If the height and setback requirements were applied, the project would lose 80 units, as shown in Figure 8 of their justification letter. Metro Grove's 250-unit program is not discretionary but is required to support a tightly structured financing framework that cannot withstand any reduction in unit count without complete project failure. The development relies on a precisely calibrated combination of nine percent and four percent low income housing tax credit (LIHTC) financing, each sized to maximize available resources and already awarded or underwritten based on specific unit totals. A reduction of 80 units would lower annual revenue while fixed operating costs remain largely unchanged, reducing net operating income by about 76 percent and creating an unbridgeable financing gap of roughly $18 million with no identified source of funds. Beyond the arithmetic, the reduction would trigger a cascade of commitment failures that would effectively terminate the project. As a result, the imposition of the neighborhood compatibility standards would have a substantial adverse impact on Metro Grove's viability that would amount to a de facto denial.

2) The degree of affordability of affordable dwelling units in a qualified project

Metro Grove Phase 1 is an affordable project serving households at 30, 40, 50, 60, and 70 percent area median income, supported by a complex financing structure that includes both 9 percent and 4 percent low income housing tax credits (LIHTC) and County soft loans from Prince George's County Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). This structure is highly sensitive to increases in development costs, meaning that redesign of the project could jeopardize the project's financial feasibility, such as by reducing total number of units or forcing a restructuring that eliminates the deepest affordability tiers. DHCD's funding commitment is tied to specific affordability outcomes, including set-asides for vulnerable populations such as youth aging out of foster care and households at risk of

homelessness. A reduction of 80 units would create a revenue gap that cannot be offset operationally, requiring the loss of these targeted affordability commitments.

3) The allowable density or number of units of the qualified project

Compliance with the height and setback components of the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards would require the elimination of 80 affordable units across three buildings due to building redesign and losing number of floors, which represents a 32 percent reduction of the total 250 units of the development. The project is entitled to a 30 percent density increase under the HEAA, the maximum density allowed would be increased by 103 units to 449 units. The 250 units are 56 percent of the maximum density allowed on the property. The reduction of 80 units eliminates affordable homes that both county and state have specifically sought to produce through transit-oriented development policy and the LIHTC program.

Based on above analysis, the Planning Board finds that Metro Grove qualifies as a "Qualified Project" under the HEAA pursuant to the rail station proximity category. As a result of this designation, Metro Grove is entitled to a 30 percent density bonus and "unreasonable limitation or requirement" protection. The analysis above concluded that the imposition of the Neighborhood Compatibility Standards on this project constitutes an unreasonable limitation within the meaning of the HEAA. Therefore, the Planning Board finds that Section 27-61203(a)(2) and (3), are not applicable to the application for all three buildings.

(a) Building Height and Setbacks

The three buildings will not be on a block face with other buildings. However, the three buildings have a consistent plane or edge along public road frontage of Suitland Parkway. The requirement of Section 27-61203(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance is met. As discussed above, the requirements of Section 27-61203(a)(2) and (3) do not apply.

(b) Building Orientation

The properties currently have addresses of 4315 and 4319 Silver Hill Road. The two existing structures on the subject property will be demolished. However, these parcels were approved for consolidation as part of the PPS and will function as a single development site. No addresses have been assigned to the new buildings at this time.

The site plan orients the buildings to respond to the subject property's internal circulation system and its surrounding context. The property is bounded by

MD 458 to the north, Suitland Parkway to the east, and West Summer Road to the south, with access from Maywood Lane to the west. As discussed in Finding III.D.8 above, even though buildings have elevations facing external streets, due to topographical and lot dimensional limitations, providing primary entrances towards resident parking areas is the most practical solution for providing direct access to buildings. As shown on the architectural elevation package, the elevations facing MD 458 and Suitland Parkway have similar level of articulation as those elevations that are facing inwards towards the open space and parking lots.

(c) Building Design

The buildings use a similar roof type to adjacent single-family detached, two-family, and multifamily dwellings in terms of slope and arrangement to prevent abrupt changes in roof form. Many of the adjacent dwellings along Maywood Lane are two-story mid-century brick garden style homes, exhibiting minimal traditional and colonial revival influences. The architectural emphasis is on horizontal proportions, flat rooflines, and repetitive window patterns. The building design has incorporated similar elements, such as flat roofing styles, brick bases, and repetitive window patterns, to emulate and complement the adjacent properties while allowing new design elements to blend into the adjacent neighborhood. All roofs have a minimum of a 3-foot-tall parapets where rooftop equipment is provided. Many areas include up to 6-foot-tall screening. The view of the roof-mounted equipment from the adjacent homes is minimized.

The adjacent existing structures along Maywood Lane are predominantly constructed of red brick with white/beige overhang and window frames, and black accents. The multifamily buildings have used similar color palettes, such as various shades of red and beige, and black color on canopies and accents. The design also incorporates both single and double windows arranged repetitively in groups. Canopies are provided over building entrances, with complementary sunshades—using the same canopy design—installed at first-floor windows. The canopies are oriented toward MD 458 and internally toward the subject property's courtyard areas, rather than toward Maywood Lane. The application does not include any retail components.

(d) Building Materials

Building 1 has facades facing existing single-family and two-family dwellings and is, therefore, subject to façade transparency requirements in Section 27-61203(d)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance. The submitted building façade transparency exhibit shows Building 1 does not meet the transparency requirement. A condition is included requiring the applicant to revise façade design of Building 1 to comply with requirements in Section 27-61203(d)(1). Building facade materials include horizontal siding, cementitious panel and brick veneer with two colors, which are similar to those materials used on adjacent single-family detached and two-family dwellings. No prohibited exterior materials or vinyl siding are used.

(e) Multi-Building Placement

The development does not include varying use and/or development intensities in different buildings. All three buildings have similar heights, and the longest building (Building 2) is the farthest from all existing homes.

(f) Off-Street Parking

The development is within 200 feet of single-family detached and two-family dwellings. As discussed in Finding III.D above, the applicant has submitted a request to reduce minimum off-street parking requirements in Section 27-6305(a). The total amount of off-street parking provided is 227 spaces for Phases 1 and 2, which is less than 1.5 times the required minimum specified in Table 27-6305 or 563 spaces for the development.

The placement of off-street parking configuration shown on site plan is the most practical solution due to topographical and lot dimensional limitations. Section 27-61203(f)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance provides a list of off-street parking locations in order of priority, such as within a structured parking facility, adjacent to nonresidential development, behind the building, or in front of the building. Parking for Building 3 will be provided in a structured parking facility within the building; however, due to project funding limitations, structured parking for Buildings 1 and 2 is not feasible. Parking cannot be located adjacent to the nonresidential or mixed-use development due to the surrounding residential context. In addition, parking cannot be accommodated behind the building or within the lot's corner side yard because of topographic constraints and limited space resulting from underground stormwater facilities. Therefore, surface parking lot is located in front of the multifamily buildings. Sufficient landscaping and interior planting areas are provided for the off-street surface parking area, in accordance with Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, of the Landscape Manual. No standalone parking structure is included in the development.

(g) Other Site Features

Loading and service areas are consolidated between Buildings 1 and 2 and to the south of Building 3, they are positioned away at least 50 feet from the existing residential development. Loading, service, and collection areas are included to be screened from the view of adjoining homes using materials of equal quality to the materials used for the principal buildings. Service areas have been incorporated into the overall design of the subject property so that the visual impacts of these functions are fully contained within an enclosure. The subject property will be surrounded by a 6-foot-high opaque wooden privacy fence along all property lines shared with adjoining residential properties. In addition, trash enclosures will be constructed of concrete masonry units with a brick veneer and equipped with opaque gates to screen the facility from view, as shown in the details on Sheet 29. Loading areas are located within the subject property's interior, positioned alongside the buildings and adjacent to the trash enclosures, and set

back from property lines shared with neighboring homes. Sufficient landscape buffers are provided between multifamily buildings and adjacent existing single-family and two-family dwellings, in accordance with Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual.

The development does not include drive-through service facilities. The submitted Photometric Plan and lighting fixture details on Sheets 17 and 18 have shown that the pole mounted light height is 16 feet. However, the Planning Board finds that some pole-mounted lights are located within 100 feet of a lot containing a single-family detached dwelling or two-family dwelling, which requires the maximum height to be 14 feet. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to provide an exhibit to clearly identify pole mounted lights that are located within 100 feet of a lot containing a single-family detached dwelling or two-family dwellings, and reduce the height of those lights to be 14 feet or less. Other lights that are located between 100–150 feet of such lots have a maximum height of 18 feet, which the lights meet. The applicant will comply with the operation requirement for the exterior lights.

The subject site plan includes two signs, one gateway sign to the south side of the entrance drive lane and one building mounted sign on Building 1. The gateway signage is located approximately 195 feet, and the building mounted sign is approximately 179 feet, from the nearest property line shared with a single-family detached dwelling and two-family dwelling. The building mounted sign is a projecting sign facing the intersection of MD 458 and Suitland Parkway and is approximately 176 feet from the nearest property line shared with single-family detached dwelling. This projecting sign is prohibited as it is located within 200 feet of a development with single-family detached or two-family dwelling. A condition is included herein requiring the applicant to revise the building mounted sign to be a non-projecting sign or relocate the projecting sign to be at least 200 feet away from a development with single-family detached or two-family dwelling.

As shown on Sheet 06B, open space set-asides include natural features, active recreational areas, and forecourts. Natural features are located around the perimeter of the property, and recreational areas and forecourts are located within and in front of each building, which are all located between the development and adjacent single-family detached and two-family dwellings. Outdoor recreational facilities are located at least 50 feet from lot lines shared with single-family detached and two-family dwellings.

Existing natural features are used as transition along property perimeter where possible. Steep slopes and specimen trees in the southwestern portion of the subject property will be preserved as woodland conservation areas and will be contiguous with adjacent off-site forested areas.

(h) Operational Standards
The applicant will comply with this standard.

10. Section 27-61300—Agricultural Compatibility Standards

The application is exempt per Section 27-61302 of the Zoning Ordinance because it is not adjacent to an on-going agricultural use or activity in the Reserved Open Space, Agriculture and Preservation, and Agricultural-Residential base zones.

11. Section 27-61400—Urban Agriculture Compatibility Standards

The application is exempt because it is not adjacent to on-going urban agriculture use.

12. Section 27-61500—Signage

The site plan includes two signs; one gateway sign and one building mounted sign, which meet the location, number and area requirements of Section 27-61506 (a), Permanent Real Estate Identification Sign, of the Zoning Ordinance, as discussed in Finding II.G above. Details of the signages are included on Sheet SK-1 of architecture elevation set.

13. Section 27-61600—Green Building Standards

The development meets the minimum Green Building score requirement of 4.0 points for new residential development containing 25 or more units, as noted in the following table.

Table 27-61603: Green Building Point System	**Points Earned**
HERS index greater than 40 and less than or equal to 60	0.75
Stated water heater efficiency of 0.82 or more	1.25
Air conditioner with stated efficiency greater than 14 SEER is included as standard	0.75
Use central air conditioners that are Energy Star-qualified	0.5
Construct the principal building(s) to meet or exceed LEED® Bronze certification or equivalent standards of the National Green Building Standard™/NGBS Green or the International Code Council's *International Green Construction Code*	0.75
All showerheads and handheld showers are 2.0 GPM or less	0.5
All lavatory faucets flow rate is 1.5 GPM or less at 60 PSI	0.5
All toilets are 1.28 GPF or less	0.5
Provide an electric vehicle (EV) level 2 charging station that is made available to those using the building	0.75
Provide a covered and secure bicycle parking room that protects parked bicycles from the elements and from theft	1.0
Total	7.25

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH PRIOR APPROVALS

A. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031 was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on February 5, 2026 (PGCPB Resolution No. 2026-007), for one parcel to support development of 250 multifamily dwelling units, subject to 7 conditions. The conditions relevant to the review of this site plan are listed below, in **bold** text. Analysis of the project's conformance to the conditions follows each one in plain text:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised as follows:

b. Show and label a minimum 10-foot-wide public utility easement along the entire property frontage along Suitland Parkway.

The PPS has not yet been signature approved. However, the required 10-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) is shown and labeled along Suitland Parkway on the site plan, in accordance with this condition.

3. Development of the site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan SIT-00051-2025 and any subsequent revisions, in accordance with Section 24-4303 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.

A revision to SWM Concept Plan SIT-00051-2025-R01 was submitted with the revised materials to update the SWM facilities for the development, in accordance with this condition.

4. Prior to approval, the final plat of subdivision shall include:

a. Right-of-way dedication along MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), in accordance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision and Section 24-4201(b) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations.

The plan sheets identify 0.01 acre of dedication and a 120-foot right-of-way along MD 458 on the site plan. The condition will be evaluated further at the time of final plat.

b. In accordance with Section 24-4205 and Section 24-4401 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, granting of a minimum 10-foot-wide public utility easement along public streets,

except as modified along MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), or by any future variation approval.

The 10-foot-wide PUE has been provided along the abutting public right-of-way of Suitland Parkway. However, the 10-foot-wide PUE is not shown along West Summer Road, as approved with the PPS. Furthermore, the PUE along Silver Hill Road is not correctly depicted along the northwestern portion of the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) easement, as approved with the variation request associated with the PPS. These discrepancies should be corrected to ensure conformance with the approved PPS and variation.

c. A note indicating the Prince George's County Planning Board's approval of a variation from Section 24-4205 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, in accordance with the approving resolution for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031, to modify the standard public utility easement location along the property's frontage of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road).

Compliance with this condition will be required at the time of final plat.

5. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-2025-0034), in conformance with Section 25-121 of the 2024 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

"This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-2025-0034, or most recent revision), or as modified by the Type 2 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 and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO). This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree Conservation Plans for the subject property are available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Planning Department."

The on-site woodland conservation on Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-2026-0038 is in conformance with Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-2025-0034 and is being reviewed as a minor revision pursuant to the plan review and conformance regulations contained in Section 25-119(c) of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO).

6. **Prior to issuance of permits for this subdivision, and in conformance with Section 25-119(a)(2) of the 2024 Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, a Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be approved. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:**

   "This plat is subject to the recordation of a Woodland Conservation Easement pursuant to Section 25-122(d)(1)(B) with the Liber and folio reflected on the Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, when approved."

   TCP2-2026-0038 was submitted with this application. The TCP2 is approved.

7. **In accordance with the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan*, and the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan detailing the locations and extent of the following facilities, at the time of detailed site plan:**

   a. **A standard bicycle lane or shared lane markings along the frontage of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), unless modified by the permitting 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.**

   b. **A minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the property frontage of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), unless modified by the permitting 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 with associated Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps across vehicular drive aisles. Exact location shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.**

   d. **Short- and long-term bicycle parking for the multifamily building.**

   The plan sheets include sharrow markings for a shared bicycle lane and 5-foot-wide sidewalk along the frontage of MD 458, and continental-style crosswalks across internal site vehicular drive aisles. Short- and long-term

bicycle parking is included for the multifamily buildings, including 18 short-term bicycle parking spaces near Buildings 1 and 3, and 56 long-term bicycle parking spaces by covered bike racks and a dedicated bicycle storage facility. The bike rack and bike storage facility details are shown on Sheets 23 and 24 of the site plan set. The Planning Board requires Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curb ramps across vehicular drive aisles, which are conditioned herein.

B. Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2024-063: Certificate of Adequacy ADQ-2024-063 was approved by the Planning Director on January 14, 2026, for development of 250 multifamily dwelling units, subject to 7 conditions. The ADQ is valid for 12 years from the date of its approval, subject to additional expiration provisions of Section 24-4503(c) of the Subdivision Regulations. The conditions relevant to the review of this site plan are listed below, in **bold** text. Analysis of the project's conformance to the conditions follows each one in plain text:

1. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses that would generate no more than 104 AM and 120 PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

The ADQ was evaluated for development of up to 250 affordable multifamily dwelling units. A trip generation analysis showing that the development remains within the established trip cap was submitted.

2. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a bicycle and pedestrian facilities plan that illustrates the location, limits, specifications and details of the on-site and off- site pedestrian and bicycle adequacy improvements consistent with Section 24-4506(c)(1)(G) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations prior to acceptance of the Detailed Site Plan submission.

Sheet 6A of the site plan, titled "Multimodal Circulation Plan," illustrates the pedestrian and bicycle adequacy improvements. This plan illustrates the location, limits, specifications, and details of the on-site and off-site pedestrian facilities, to include improvements at Silver Hill Road and Parkway Terrace Drive, Silver Hill Road and Maywood Lane, Maywood Lane and Terrace Drive, and a transit bus stop shelter on Silver Hill Road. The on-site pedestrian facilities include 5-foot and 6-foot-wide sidewalks with ADA-compliant curb ramps and crosswalks at vehicular crossing circulation throughout the subject property, connecting to the existing sidewalk along Silver Hill Road and Maywood Lane.

3. 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 adequate off-site pedestrian and bikeway facilities, in accordance with Section 24-4506 of the Subdivision Regulations, have (a) full financial assurances, (b) been permitted for construction through the applicable permitting agency's access permit process, and (c) an

agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate agency.

a. Silver Hill Road and Parkway Terrace Drive intersection

i. Install high-visibility crosswalks with median curb ramp/opening, corner curb ramp improvements along the southern leg

ii. Relocate the stop sign on the northbound approach

b. Silver Hill Road and Maywood Lane intersection

i. Install high-visibility crosswalks along the southern leg

c. Silver Hill Road and Terrace Drive intersection

i. Install high-visibility crosswalks along the southern leg

d. Maywood Lane and Terrace Drive intersection

i. Install high-visibility crosswalks along the east, west, and south leg

ii. Replace narrow sidewalks along all approaches

iii. Add six (6) new ADA-compliant curb ramps along the east, west, and south leg

e. Install transit shelter at bus stop (3000651) on Silver Hill Road

This condition will be evaluated at the time of permitting.

4. In accordance with Section 24-4507 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for, and provide, adequate on-site recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Prince George's County Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

On-site recreational facilities have been provided with this site plan application. Sheet 01A includes a chart with the facilities' values and timing for construction. The location, layout, and details of those facilities are shown on Sheet 06B - open space set-aside exhibit, and Sheets 19–25 of the detailed site plan set. As discussed above in Finding II.G, a variety of indoor and outdoor on-site recreational facilities are provided within the property, which are located in the

forecourts and interior rooms within each building. The provided value exceeds the minimum value required. The Planning Board finds that appropriate and developable areas are allocated, and adequate on-site recreational facilities are provided.

5. **The on-site recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Development Review Division, of the Prince George's County Planning Department, for sufficiency and proper siting, in accordance with the Prince George's County Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines, with the review of the detailed site plan. Timing for construction shall also be determined at the time of detailed site plan.**

   The Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division has reviewed the sufficiency and proper siting of the recreational facilities. The value and details are consistent with the 2024 *Parks and Recreation Facilities Design Guidelines*. As noted in the recreational facilities chart on Sheet 01A, timing for indoor facility construction is included to be concurrent with each building's construction, and timing for outdoor facility construction is included to be prior to certificate of occupancy for each building. Recreational facilities associated with each building shall be completed prior to certificate of occupancy of each building, which is conditioned herein.

V. COMPLIANCE WITH THE 2018 PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY LANDSCAPE MANUAL

The site plan complies with the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, including Section 4.1, Residential requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffer Incompatible Uses; Section 4.8, Building Frontage Landscape Requirements; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, as shown on the landscape plans with this application.

The applicant requests alternative compliance from Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets, for Perimeter 1 fronting Silver Hill Road as follows:

Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets
The applicant has requested alternative compliance from the requirements of Section 4.6 along Silver Hill Road, a master-planned arterial road. The applicant seeks relief from the requirements as follows:

REQUIRED: Section 4.6(c)(1)(B)(I), Buffering Development from Streets – Silver Hill Road, an arterial road

Total length of street frontage	232 feet
Minimum width of buffer	50 feet
Number of shade trees required (6 shade trees per 100 linear feet of property line)	14
Number of evergreen trees required (16 evergreen trees per 100 linear feet of property line)	38
Number of shrubs required (30 shade trees per 100 linear feet of property line)	70
Number of plant units (170 plant units per 100 linear feet of property line)	395

PROVIDED: Section 4.6(c)(1)(B)(I), Buffering Development from Streets – Silver Hill Road, an arterial road

Total length of street frontage	232 feet
Width of buffer	50 feet (with encroachment of sidewalk) and a 3-foot wall
Number of shade trees	7
Number of evergreen trees	24
Number of shrubs required	47
Number of plant units	237

Justification of Approval
The multifamily development requires a Section 4.6 buffer from Silver Hill Road, a master-planned arterial road. The location of the three multifamily buildings is limited due to required setbacks and buffers from Silver Hill Road along its northern property line, and Suitland Parkway along its eastern property line. The frontage on Silver Hill Road contains a variable width WSSC easement and a required 10-foot-wide PUE that cannot contain buffer plantings. Approximately 25 feet of the Section 4.6 buffer between Building 1 and the PUE is available for planting, which is not sufficient to meet the full requirement. The applicant would need to provide 158 additional planting units, which is not feasible due to limited space outside of easements.

As an alternative design, the applicant includes a 3-foot-high decorative masonry wall within the bufferyard. Per Section 4.6(c)(1)(C) of the Landscape Manual, the provision of a 6-foot-high decorative fence or wall would reduce the requirement for plant materials and buffer width by 50 percent. The objective of Section 4.6 is to reduce adverse impacts of the roadway on the multifamily development. Due to existing topography and future grading, the Alternative Compliance Committee does not find that the 3-foot wall is equally effective as a 6-foot-high wall. The Planning Board finds that the height of the decorative masonry wall be increased to

6 feet. In addition, the Board finds that the material of the wall be revised to a decorative material, rather than the standard concrete masonry unit specified for increased visual interest.

Once the 6-foot wall is provided, the requirements for plant units and buffer yard are reduced by 50 percent. As shown on the landscape plans, the applicant includes 7 shade trees, 24 evergreen trees, and 47 shrubs (total of 237 planting units) in the bufferyard, which exceeds the reduced Section 4.6 planting requirements. A 50-foot buffer is included, which exceeds the reduced 25-foot minimum buffer requirement. A sidewalk runs through a portion of the buffer across the WSSC easement. This minor encroachment is needed to provide ADA access to the right-of-way and for pedestrian circulation to the Suitland Metro Station.

Based on the above factors and the conditions of approval, the Planning Board finds that the proposal will be equally effective in fulfilling the intent and purposes of Section 4.6 of the Landscape Manual, to buffer the multifamily development from Silver Hill Road.

The Planning Board approves Alternative Compliance ACL-2026-0004 for Metro Grove, from the requirements of Sections 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets, of the Landscape Manual, along the Silver Hill Road frontage, with two conditions that are included herein.

VI. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY WOODLAND AND WILDLIFE HABITAT CONSERVATION ORDINANCE

The subject property is subject to the provisions of the WCO because the subject property has a previously approved tree conservation plan (TCP1-2025-0034). This project is also subject to the *Environmental Technical Manual*. The notification letter for this application, sent on May 22, 2026, included this companion tree conservation plan as per Section 25-119(c)(5)(A) of the WCO. The Environmental Planning Section has not received any public comment about this application as the result of the mailing.

Specimen Trees
Specimen trees are required to be protected under Section 24-4301 of the Environmental Standards of the Subdivision Regulations.

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the WCO requires that "Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree's condition and the species' ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual." The code, however, is not inflexible.

The authorizing legislation of Prince George's County's WCO is the Maryland Forest Conservation Act, which is codified under Title 5, Subtitle 16 of the Natural Resources Article of the Maryland Code. Section 5-1611 of the Natural Resources Article requires the local jurisdiction to provide procedures for granting variances to the local forest conservation program. The variance criteria in Prince George's County's WCO are set forth in Section 25-119(d) of the

WCO. Section 25-119(d)(4) clarifies that variances granted under Subtitle 25 of the County Code are not considered zoning variances.

The removal of 10 specimen trees (ST-1 through ST-7 and ST-11 through ST-13) was approved with PPS-2024-031. No additional specimen trees are requested to be removed with this application.

VII. COMPLIANCE WITH APPLICABLE PROVISIONS OF THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY TREE CANOPY COVERAGE ORDINANCE

Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of the subject property to be covered by tree canopy for any development project that includes more than 2,500 square feet of gross floor area, or disturbance, and requires a building or grading permit. The subject property is in the RMF-48 Zone, which requires a minimum of 20 percent of the net tract area to be covered by tree canopy. The subject property is 7.21 net acres and the required tree canopy coverage (TCC) is approximately 1.4 acres (or approximately 62,814 square feet). The site plan includes approximately 1.78 acres (or approximately 77,469 square feet) of TCC through a combination of woodland conservation and landscape trees, as shown on Sheet 17. The TCC requirement is met.

VIII. REFERRAL COMMENTS

The application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are incorporated herein by reference, and major findings are summarized as follows:

A. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 12, 2026 (Sams to Sun), it was noted that sector plan conformance is not required for this application. Nonetheless, the development aligns with the recommendations of the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* for the Established Communities, Employment Areas, and the general recommendations and guidance of the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan* (sector plan). The application is for construction of 250 multifamily dwelling units in three buildings. The site design and architecture with this site plan are consistent with the recommendations of the sector plan related to land use, environment, living area, and circulation and transportation.

B. **Transportation Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 18, 2026 (Wilson to Sun), it was noted that a review of conditions attached to prior approvals, a review of master plan compliance, and a review of applicable Part 27-6 development standards are provided; the findings are incorporated in this resolution. It was determined that the vehicular, pedestrian, and bicycle access and circulation for this plan is acceptable, consistent with the site design guidelines pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the County Code, and meet the findings for pedestrian and bicycle transportation purposes.

C. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 18, 2026 (Meoli to Sun), it was noted that the application in conformance with Sections 27-3605(e)(3) and (6), 27-6802, 27-6803, 27-6805, 27-6808, and 27-6809 within Section 27-6800,

Environmental Protection and Noise Controls, of the Zoning Ordinance, subject to the findings and conditions of approval.

D. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated June 18, 2026 (Vatandoost to Sun), it was noted that the property is subject to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS-2024-031, which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on February 5, 2026 (PGCPB Resolution No. 2026-007). The PPS approved one parcel for development of 250 multifamily residential dwelling units. The development with this site plan is consistent with the uses and is within the quantity evaluated with the PPS. Therefore, a new PPS is not required at this time. PPS-2024-031 is valid until February 26, 2032. Final plats of subdivision should be filed and accepted within the validity period of the PPS.

E. **Historic Preservation**—In a memorandum dated June 22, 2026 (Stabler, Smith, and Chisholm to Sun), it was noted that the sector plan contains minimal goals and policies related to historic preservation, and these are not specific to the subject property or applicable to the development. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. At the request of staff, the applicant documented the existing structures on Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties forms: Southern Friendship House (PG:76A-068) and Ganginis House (PG:76A-069). These two minimal traditional houses were constructed in the 1930s and 1940s.

The subject property is adjacent to Suitland Parkway (76A-022), a Prince George's County historic site. The multifamily buildings will be partially visible from the Suitland Parkway Historic Site; however, existing and future landscaping will partially obscure the buildings from the main traffic lanes of the Parkway. The Planning Board finds that the site plan and alternative compliance applications will have minimal impact on Suitland Parkway.

F. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In an email dated June 17, 2026 (Thompson to Sun), it was noted that on-site recreation facilities are provided in accordance with the approved PPS.

G. **Permit Review**—In a memorandum dated May 19, 2026 (Meneely to Sun), it was noted that no further comments are provided for this application.

H. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated June 8, 2026 (Abdullah to Sun), DPIE provided a list of comments which will be addressed at the time of permitting.

I. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer comments on this application.

J. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on this application.

K. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2026 (Adepoju to Sun), the Health Department provided several comments relating to availability of healthy foods, the noise impact from MD 458 and Suitland Parkway to interior space exceeding County standards, and comments addressing potential construction activity impacts (noise and dust) extending into adjacent properties during construction. The applicant has submitted mitigation methods with the site plan, including noise walls and upgrading window and patio door Sound Transmission Class (STC) ratings between 26 to 30 STC, to comply with the indoor and outdoor noise level requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. Adherence to construction standards will be required by DPIE during the permitting process.

L. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—WSSC did not offer comments on this application.

M. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—No correspondence has been received from SHA.

N. **Public Utilities**—The plan was referred to Verizon, Comcast, AT&T, the Potomac Electric Power Company, and Washington Gas, for review and comments, on May 8, 2026. Public utility companies did not offer comments on this application.

O. **Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)**—In an email dated May 26, 2026, WMATA notes that the bus stop is already included in the plans for Silver Hill Road.

IX. COMMUNITY FEEDBACK

The Planning Board received 14 items of additional backup regarding the subject site plan, prior to the noon deadline on July 21, 2026. Nine items were submitted by citizens and civic associations expressing concerns regarding traffic volume and safety, environmental concerns, light pollution, and inconsistency with adopted politics and plans, as well as the need for greater consideration of community input. Transportation issues, including road access, are discussed in Finding III.D.1 of this resolution. Transportation adequacy and access road have been approved with PPS-2024-031 and ADQ-2024-063. Environmental issues are addressed in Finding III.D.7 of this resolution. Exterior lighting issues are addressed in Finding III.D.6 of this resolution. Consistency with adopted policies and plans are addressed in Finding VIII.A of this resolution. Four items were submitted by the applicant, including proposed revised conditions, a PowerPoint presentation providing an overview of the project, the proposed decorative masonry wall with fence as part of the alternative compliance proposal, and a statement of justification to support deletion of Condition 1k. In addition, one letter of support for the project was received from the Coalition for Smarter Growth.

X. PLANNING BOARD

The Planning Board held a public hearing on this application on July 23, 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.

The public hearing began with staff giving a technical staff presentation. The presentation provided an overview of the project and addressed written comments received and also stated staff's opposition on deletion of recommended Condition 1k, related to the façade transparency requirement, as proposed by Applicant Exhibit 1. Following the staff presentation, the applicant's attorney, Peter Goldsmith, provided a presentation, which included a brief history and overview of the project, residential program details, and issues regarding site access and circulation, as well as community outreach efforts. The applicant proffered to further revise the proposed revised Condition 2a submitted in Applicant Exhibit 1. Condition 2a now requires the submitted decorative masonry wall and pillars with ornamental fence, in conformance with page 3 of Applicant Exhibit 3. Staff agree with this revision.

The applicant also provided justifications to support deletion of Condition 1k. Staff and the applicant did not agree on Condition 1k, which requires that the Building 1 façades facing single-family detached dwellings be revised to meet the minimum façade transparency percentage in the neighborhood compatibility standards of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant requested to delete the condition and argued that the HEAA prohibits applying these transparency requirements because the transparency requirement is a similar regulation like height, setback, bulk, parking, and loading that would act as an unreasonable limitation or requirement for a "qualified project." Staff did not find that the transparency requirement would result in a de facto denial of the project, based on the evidence submitted. Firstly, the justification does not provide sufficient measurable evidence that providing additional transparency would have substantial adverse impact on the viability of an affordable housing development, such that it would be a de facto denial. Secondly, staff did not agree that the transparency requirement would have an adverse impact on the degree of affordability of affordable housing. Thirdly, it is not clear that the transparency requirement is within the category of regulations that the HEAA regulates. As noted, the HEAA preempts height, setback, bulk, parking, loading, or similar requirements if found to be unreasonable requirements or limitations. Transparency is primarily a design standard and is not similar to height, setback, bulk, parking, or loading requirements, which place a spatial limitation on development. Fourthly, staff also noted that the applicant acknowledged that some façades could potentially achieve compliance with additional glazing, suggesting that the issue is not an impossibility, but rather a cost and design preference. Therefore, staff did not find the justification submitted sufficient to waive the Zoning Ordinance requirement; staff recommended keeping Condition 1k.

Following the applicant's presentation, the Planning Board raised questions regarding the provision of dog waste stations, traffic conditions and parking enforcement along Maywood Lane, the anticipated income range of future residents, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, whether other stairwells within Building 1 are subject to façade transparency requirements, the expected timeline for construction, and what "at-risk individual" represents. In response, the applicant stated that dog waste stations will be provided, and that the projected increase in traffic

volume is not sufficient to warrant a traffic signal at the intersection of Silverhill Road and Maywood Lane, as previously evaluated and approved during the PPS review. The applicant further explained that access to the development will be controlled, to discourage parking by nonresidents on the property. Regarding affordability, the applicant clarified that, to serve households earning up to 60 percent of the area median income, which ranges from approximately $74,000 to $103,000, is part of the requirement to receive Low Income Housing Tax credits for the project. The applicant also indicated that adequate pedestrian and bicycle connections will be provided throughout the subject property and along the Silverhill Road frontage. With respect to the façade transparency requirement, the applicant noted that Building 1 includes an additional stairwell; however, that stairwell is not subject to the transparency requirement because it does not face single-family or two-family dwelling units. The applicant is targeting March 2027 to start construction, depending on the permit process. The applicant clarified that the proposed units designated for at-risk individuals are intended to serve people who were formerly homeless.

Following questions, community members provided public testimony. Steven Palmer, representing DHCD, testified in support of the application, particularly regarding the requested waiver of the height and setback limitations in the neighborhood compatibility standards pursuant to the HEAA, stating that the legislation was intended to facilitate affordable housing developments such as the proposed development. Karen Toles, representing District 25 in the Maryland House of Delegates, testified in opposition to the application, expressing concerns on behalf of nearby residents regarding the potential impacts of the development on the safety, health, and welfare of the existing community. Additional community members voiced concerns related to traffic volume and safety, environmental impacts, construction-related disturbances, and the need for greater consideration of community input during the review process. Cheryl Cort, representing the Coalition for Smarter Growth, testified in support of the project, citing the project's contribution to providing much-needed affordable housing in proximity to transit within Prince George's County. The applicant's attorney responded to the concerns raised by speakers, reiterated that the application satisfies all applicable approval requirements, and stated that construction access to the subject property would not be provided from Maywood Lane.

Following the public hearing, the Planning Board unanimously voted to continue the decision of the application to July 30, 2026. On July 30, 2026, the Board voted to approve Detailed Site Plan DET-2024-017, Alternative Compliance ACL-2026-0004, and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-2026-0038, subject to the recommended conditions of approval within the staff report, as modified by Applicant Exhibit 1, except for the removal of Condition 1k regarding the façade transparency requirement, and revise proposed Condition 2a to read as follows: Increase the height of the 3-foot decorative masonry wall to a minimum of 6 feet and revise the materials to be a combination of decorative masonry wall and pillars with ornamental fence, in conformance with page 3 of Applicant Exhibit 3.

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 TCP2-2026-0038 and APPROVED Alternative Compliance ACL-2026-0004, and further

APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DET 2024-017 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall revise the detailed site plan, as follows, or provide the specific documentation:

    a. Revise the applicant's name and address on the coversheet to reflect correct information.

    b. Revise the Unit Mix Table to reflect 250 units for the overall development, and 50 units for Phase 2.

    c. Revise the Recreational Facility Chart on Sheet 01A as follows:

        (1) Remove the bicycle racks and lobby from the recreational chart calculation.

        (2) Revise the timing for completion of interior recreational facilities to be prior to certificate of occupancy of each associated building.

    d. Revise the provided number of handicap-access spaces for Phase 1, in the Off-street Vehicle Parking Table, to reflect the actual parking spaces shown on the site plan.

    e. Provide an exhibit to clearly identify pole-mounted lights that are located within 100 feet of a lot containing a single-family detached dwelling or two-family dwelling, and reduce the height of those lights to be 14 feet or less, in accordance with Section 27-61203(g)(3) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

    f. Revise the building-mounted sign to be a non-projecting sign, or relocate the projecting sign to be at least 200 feet away from a development with single-family detached or two-family dwellings, in accordance with Section 27-61203(g)(4) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

    g. Provide Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps at vehicular crossings, along ADA paths identified on Sheet 4 of the detailed site plan.

    h. Provide shared road signs along the property frontage of MD 458 (Silver Hill Road), unless modified in writing by the operating agency.

    i. Show the required public utility easement along MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) and West Summer Road, in conformance with the approved preliminary plan of subdivision or any approved variation.

    j. Revise the building length label for Building 2 to match the building length in the Departure from Design Standards DPT-2026-0007 (288 feet).

    k. Revise the façade design of Building 1 to comply with the building façade transparency requirement in Section 27-61203(d)(1) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

2. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the landscape plan, in accordance with the 2018 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, as follows:

   a. Increase the height of the 3-foot decorative masonry wall to a minimum of 6 feet and revise the materials to be a combination of decorative masonry wall and pillars, with ornamental fence, in conformance with page 3 of Applicant Exhibit 3.

3. Prior to certification of the Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2), and in conformance with Section 25-122(d) of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, documents for the required woodland conservation easements shall be prepared and submitted to the Environmental Planning Section for review by the Office of Law, and submission to the Office of Land Records for recordation. The following note shall be added to the standard TCP2 notes on the plan as follows:

   "Woodlands preserved, planted, or regenerated in fulfillment of woodland conservation requirements on-site have been placed in a woodland and wildlife habitat conservation easement recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records at Liber ____ Folio____. Revisions to this TCP2 may require a revision to the recorded easement."

4. Prior to approval of a building permit, in accordance with Section 27-6408 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, the applicant shall demonstrate that the associated easement or covenant has been established for open space set-aside areas. The easement shall be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince George's County Planning Department and be fully executed. The document shall set forth the continued use of the land for its intended open space purposes, in perpetuity, and provide for the continued and effective management, operation, and maintenance of the land and facilities, and shall include the rights of the Prince George's County Planning Board. The document shall be recorded in the Prince George's County Land Records, with a recorded copy remitted to DRD.

5. Prior to approval of a building permit for Building 3, a detailed site plan amendment shall be obtained for the purpose of including architecture and floor plans for Building 3, which may be approved by the Prince George's County Planning Director, as designee of the Prince George's County Planning Board.

6. Prior to approval of any building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a copy of the deed, restricted to include 15 percent of units that are affordable dwelling units for a period of at least 40 years (an affordable dwelling unit has housing costs that do not exceed 30 percent of a household's income for households earning less than 60 percent of the Area Median Income), for the subject property.

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 Jenkins, seconded by Commissioner Okoye, with Commissioners Jenkins, Okoye, and Lawlah voting in favor of the motion, with Commissioner Matthews absent, and with Commissioner Anderson abstaining at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 30, 2026, in Largo, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 3rd day of September 2026.

Kevin A. Anderson
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

KA:JJ:MS:ac

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY

David S. Warner
M-NCPPC Legal Department
Date: August 28, 2026