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Abstract:
This document contains text and maps of the Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A. The plan amends the 1993 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A, and 85B. It also amends the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan. This plan was developed with citizen input during numerous community planning workshops in 2007–2008. Planning policies in the 2002 General Plan are refined as land use concepts for the Brandywine Community Center and for the Rural Tier. Consistent with policies in the 2002 General Plan, future development is primarily directed toward areas with existing or planned infrastructure and away from areas that are designated to retain rural character. Specific commercial areas in Clinton and Brandywine are designated for future mixed-use, transit- and pedestrian-oriented development suitable for a wide array of public, commercial, employment, and residential land uses. The land use concept for the Brandywine Community Center refines the boundaries of this center identified in the 2002 General Plan, and encourages development centered on a future transit hub. The key planning concept in Accokeek preserves the rural Livingston Road corridor as the focus of the community and recommends low-intensity future development. In the Rural Tier, the future development pattern is planned to minimize impacts to the environment and infrastructure. The plan addresses the subregion’s environmental infrastructure, transportation, schools, fire, police, library, parks, recreation, economic development, historic preservation, and scenic roads. The sectional map amendment approved zoning changes to allow implementation of the land use concepts in the master plan.
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FOREWORD

The Prince George’s County Planning Board is pleased to make available the Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A. This planning document sets forth land use concepts and policies for the communities of Accokeek, Brandywine, Clinton, and Tippett. It addresses policy changes that have occurred since the previous master plan and sectional map amendment (SMA) was approved in 1993, most notably the policy changes in the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan.

Land use policies established in the 2002 General Plan are the foundation of planning concepts in this master plan. Development patterns are guided by the location and character of development sought for the Developing and Rural Tiers in Subregion 5. This plan addresses transit, either light rail or bus-rapid transit, along the MD 5 corridor, from the Branch Avenue Metro Station to Charles County. While providing for the lowest density residential development in the Rural Tier, the plan encourages high-density, transit- and pedestrian-oriented development in the Brandywine Community Center and surrounding several future transit nodes along MD 5. The plan contains additional recommendations for land use, transportation, environment, public facilities, parks and recreation, historic preservation, and other important community priorities. The SMA updated zoning to implement the plan’s vision and land use concepts.

Stakeholders in the Subregion 5 planning areas participated in numerous listening sessions, meetings, and workshops throughout the plan preparation process to assist staff in identifying issues and developing alternative planning solutions. The preliminary master plan and proposed SMA that was the subject of joint public hearings held on March 31, 2009 and April 11, 2013 represents the culmination of this effort. Implementing the Subregion 5 master plan represents an opportunity to create livable, pedestrian-friendly, and vibrant communities in southern Prince George’s County.

Sincerely,

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
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This Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment establishes policies and strategies to carry out a land use, preservation, and development vision for the Subregion 5 planning areas in Prince George’s County within the framework of the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan. This Subregion 5 master plan replaces the prior 1993 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B and supersedes all other plans prepared by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A, except for the policies and recommendations in the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Revitalization Sector Plan, and the following functional master plans: the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, the 2010 Water Resources Functional Master Plan, 2010 Approved Historic Sites and Districts Plan, and the 2012 Approved Priority Preservation Area Functional Master Plan.

Subregion 5 covers approximately 74 square miles in south and southwest Prince George’s County, representing approximately 15 percent of the County’s total land area. Close to three-quarters of the subregion forms part of the Developing Tier, with the remainder in the Rural Tier. Both of these land use policy tiers were designated by the 2002 General Plan. In 2008, the population was approximately 54,500 and it is projected to increase to approximately 82,000 by 2030.

The master plan envisions an attractive, vital, and sustainable suburban and rural region, managed in a way that protects the best existing character of rural and suburban areas and supports, through land use measures and other policies and programs, the future desired characteristics of these areas. For purposes of the plan, Subregion 5 is divided into three distinct communities: Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippet. It is intended that large areas straddling Accokeek and Brandywine should remain rural. Economic development and growth are primarily directed to the MD 5 corridor and Brandywine, where investments in infrastructure are anticipated.

ACCOKEEK

Plan policies and strategies retain Accokeek’s predominantly rural community character. Land conservation in areas designated “rural” on the subregion plan’s Future Land Use map are strengthened through zoning, water and sewer policies, and by designating close to 9,000 acres, including some areas in Brandywine, as priority preservation areas (PPAs) supportive of profitable agricultural and forestry enterprises. Much of the land around the rural areas is designated as “residential low transition” on the Future Land Use map, with a minimum of 60 percent open space retention recommended when development occurs.

It is intended that Accokeek’s traditional, linear heart along Livingston Road should retain its role and function as an attractive corridor of business, service, institutional, and residential uses. The plan establishes development design guidelines to maintain and enhance the traditional character and feel of this corridor as additional development occurs.
**BRANDYWINE**

Brandywine is the subregion’s most diverse community, including rural, residential, large scale industrial, and highway-oriented commercial uses. As in Accokeek, plan policies and strategies strengthen land conservation in areas designated “rural,” designate portions of the Rural Tier as a priority preservation area, and designate “Residential Low-Transition Areas.”

The master plan envisions the center of the Brandywine community along MD 5, south of the MD 5/US 301 intersection. This center implements the 2002 General Plan policy to direct growth into designated areas, creating in Brandywine a core within an approximately 120-acre transit-oriented, mixed-use area on the east side of MD 5/US 301. It would be focused on a transit station, with high-density, mixed residential, commercial, and employment uses abutting existing and planned major commercial land uses to the south, and mixed residential uses to the north.

The historic village of Brandywine in Subregion 5 extends from the CSX tracks west to Timothy Branch north and south of MD 381 (Brandywine Road). The plan protects the low density character of the village by designating most of it as residential low on the Future Land Use map. The plan also recommends a village preservation and revitalization study to consider ways to improve the long range livability and viability of this community.

**CLINTON AND TIPPETT**

Clinton is a mature, suburban community, experiencing moderate growth. The portions of Clinton along MD 5 and along MD 223 west to Temple Hills Road are largely developed, though there are some infill opportunities on previously undeveloped land or on land that was partially developed at low densities and could be redeveloped. The plan contains basic strategies to manage infill development and maintain community character in the light of regional traffic needs, especially along MD 223. This road is the Clinton community’s major artery and also contains the subregion’s largest concentration of commercial land, east and west of MD 5. A future sector plan recommended for Clinton setting forth specific recommendations for improving land use, circulation (including transit), and economic development was approved on April 2, 2013. It is called the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan. Portions of Clinton are in the noise and accident potential zones of Joint Base Andrews. To balance community interests with the military mission, the Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility Washington Joint Land Use Study was completed in December, 2009.

The 400-acre Hyde Field site (Washington Executive Airport) is the largest undeveloped tract in Tippett and is recommended for low density residential development.

**ENVIRONMENT**

- Protect the subregion’s green infrastructure, with special focus on primary corridors: Mattawoman Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Tinkers Creek.
- Provide additional protection for the subregion’s special conservation areas through policies and programs, including the PPA in Accokeek and Brandywine.
- Integrate the plan’s strategies with the 2010 Approved Countywide Water Resources Functional Master Plan.
TRANSPORTATION

- Preserve the MD 5 corridor for future bus rapid transit or light rail transit, connecting Brandywine with the Washington Metrorail system.
- Upgrade MD 5 and US 301 to freeway status.
- Support US 301 realignment alternatives that preserve the Rural Tier areas.
- Improve links between development approval and road system adequacy.

PUBLIC FACILITIES

- Improve pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, especially in the denser area of Clinton, parts of which lack sidewalks.
- Plan for two new elementary schools and one middle school to meet projected needs through 2030.
- Improve police coverage through new/consolidated stations in adjoining Subregions 6 and 7.
- Relocate the Brandywine Fire/EMS station (Company 40) to the vicinity of Brandywine Road and Dyson Road.
- Expand stream valley parks along Mattawoman, Piscataway, and Tinkers creeks.
- Construct a community center in Brandywine Community Park and other new community parks.
- Continue monitoring wastewater flows to the Piscataway and Mattawoman wastewater treatment plants.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

- Provide for multiple, smaller locations for businesses to locate, rather than relying on large industrial tracts or campus-like business parks. Designate locations in all three plan communities.
- Maintain the viability of agriculture through access to high quality agricultural soils, strong markets for farm output, and access to service and supply industries.
- Maintain and allow for large contiguous blocks of timberland by protecting prime forestry sub-soil types.
- Provide commercially viable access to sand and gravel resources.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION

- Protect and preserve historic resources that are significant for their historical, architectural, or archeological value.
- Promote public awareness and appreciation of historic sites and resources.
- Promote economic development through heritage tourism and recreation.

SECTIONAL MAP AMENDMENT

Update zoning to enable implementation of the land use plan.
II: BACKGROUND

This chapter provides background information that was used as a basis for formulating the Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. Section A, Planning Context and Process, describes the location of the study area, the purposes of this master plan, prior plans and initiatives, and the public process used to prepare this master plan. Section C, Existing Conditions, contains profiles of Subregion 5 including the area’s history, demographic, economic, environmental, transportation and land use information. Section D, Key Planning Issues, summarizes the key planning issues that are addressed in this master plan.

A. PLANNING CONTEXT AND PROCESS

Master Plan Study Area Boundaries
The master plan study area includes land in south and southwest Prince George’s County generally bounded by the Potomac River, Tinkers Creek, Joint Base Andrews, Piscataway Creek, the CSX (Popes Creek) railroad line, Mattawoman Creek, and the Charles County line. The subregion is approximately 74 square miles of land, equivalent to 15 percent of the total land area of Prince George’s County (Map II-1: Planning Areas and Communities). Within these boundaries are established and new residential neighborhoods, medical services, schools, commercial and industrial businesses, large retail centers, a regional park, two general aviation airports, a national park, environmental education centers, sand and gravel mining operations, a golf course, agriculture, and large forested areas. (See discussion of communities in section B. 6. and in Chapter IV, Land Use and Development Pattern.)

For this master plan, Subregion 5 encompasses the following three communities (Map II-1: Planning Areas and Communities) in Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Planning Areas</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>83 and 84</td>
<td>East and west sides of MD 210, north of Charles County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>East and west of MD 5/US 301, north of Charles County, west of the CSX Railway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton/Tippett</td>
<td>81A and 81B</td>
<td>South of Joint Base Andrews and Tinkers Creek, between Friendly High School on Allentown Road and the historic site, His Lordship’s Kindness, on Woodyard Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Planning Areas are established in the Prince George’s County Code, Sec. 27-649 through 685.
Plan Purpose

The Subregion 5 master plan establishes development policies, objectives and strategies that are consistent with the recommendations of the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*. The Subregion 5 master plan supersedes all earlier plans prepared by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for the planning areas (PA 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A), and updates the 2002 General Plan and countywide functional master plans.

The objectives of this plan are to:

- Update the 2002 General Plan.
- Analyze existing development and current zoning patterns for consistency with the 2002 General Plan.
- Amend the zoning map through a sectional map amendment to allow for the implementation of the plan’s land use recommendations.
- Set policies and recommendations that will guide future development.

Prior Plans and Initiatives

The Subregion 5 master plan is the third major comprehensive land use plan developed specifically for southwestern Prince George’s County. The first *Master Plan for Subregion V*, adopted in 1974, implemented and amended the 1964 *Prince George’s County Plan*. This was followed by sectional (zoning) map amendments in 1978 and 1979.

In 1982, the *Prince George’s County General Plan* was approved. This General Plan established a framework of four policy areas (Categories I–IV) that generally corresponded to developed, developing, possible future development and permanent rural areas of the County. Subregion V did not include any Category I lands (designated for Metrorail service), but did include the other categories: Category II (developing areas served by public water and sewer beyond the direct Metrorail service area); Category III (staged future development, large-lot areas and/or agricultural areas with water and sewer service); and Category IV the portions of the Subregion that were to remain rural in perpetuity.

In 1993, the second *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B* was approved, implementing and amending the 1982 *General Plan*. It envisioned a concept of three suburban communities and villages along MD 210 (Accokeek) and MD 5 (Brandywine and Clinton/Tippett), separated by one interior suburban village (Tippett) and three rural living areas (West Accokeek/Moyaone, Piscataway/Danville, and Cedarville).

The 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* sets forth goals, objectives, policies, and strategies for the County. This General Plan divided the County into three policy areas: the Developed Tier, Developing Tier, and Rural Tier (*Map II-2: 2002 General Plan and Subregion 5 Regional Context*). These policy areas correspond to areas of significant economic development, residential development, and preservation. This master plan includes land within the Developing and Rural tiers.

Based on the boundaries established in the 2002 General Plan, 54 square miles (73 percent) of Subregion 5 are designated as part of the County’s Developing Tier and 20 square miles (27 percent) of Subregion 5 are designated as part of the County’s Rural Tier (*Table II-1: Proportion of Land Use Policy Tiers in Subregion 5*).
Map II-2: 2002 General Plan and Subregion 5 Regional Context
Under the 2002 General Plan, the Developing Tier is envisioned as an area of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and transit-serviceable employment areas. Growth policies in the Developing Tier encourage compact residential neighborhood design and limit commercial uses to designated centers.

The Rural Tier portion of the subregion is located in two areas: west of Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and the area between Accokeek and Brandywine, mostly south of Floral Park Road. The Developing Tier comprises the remaining land area.

The vision for the Rural Tier is protection of large amounts of land for woodland, wildlife habitat, recreation and agricultural pursuits, the preservation of rural character and the conservation of significant scenic vistas. Land use, environmental, transportation, and public facilities policies recommended for the Rural Tier are intended to balance pressure for residential development and landowners’ equity with the desire to maintain rural character and sustainable natural environments.

**Table II-1: Proportion of Land Use Policy Tiers in Subregion 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Tier</th>
<th>County Square Miles</th>
<th>County % in Tiers</th>
<th>Sub. 5 Square Miles</th>
<th>Sub. 5 % in Tiers</th>
<th>Sub. 5 % of County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developed Tier</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Tier</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Tier</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Community Planning Division, 2008

**State Planning Initiatives**


This legislation was enacted to encourage economic growth, limit sprawl, protect valuable natural resources, support existing neighborhoods and communities, and save taxpayers unnecessary costs for building infrastructure to support sprawl. It establishes consistent land use policies to be locally implemented throughout Maryland. These policies are stated in the form of eight visions:

1. Development is concentrated in suitable areas.
2. Sensitive areas are protected.
3. In rural areas, growth is directed to existing population centers and resource areas are protected.
4. Stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay and the land is a universal ethic.
5. Conservation of resources, including a reduction in resource consumption, is practiced.
6. To assure achievement of one through five above, economic growth is encouraged and regulatory mechanisms are streamlined.
7. Adequate public facilities and infrastructure under the control of the County or municipal corporation are available or planned in areas where growth is to occur.
8. Funding mechanisms are addressed to achieve these visions.
These eight visions are a set of guiding principles that describe how and where growth and development should occur. The act acknowledges that the comprehensive master plans prepared by counties and municipalities form the best mechanism to establish priorities for growth and resource conservation. Once priorities are established, it is the state’s responsibility to support them.

**1997 Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Initiative**

This act builds on the foundation of the eight visions adopted in the 1992 act, as amended. The act is nationally recognized as an effective means of evaluating and implementing statewide programs to guide growth and development.

In 1997 the Maryland General Assembly enacted a package of legislation collectively referred to as the Neighborhood Conservation and Smart Growth initiative. The Maryland Smart Growth program has three basic goals: to save valuable remaining natural resources, to support existing communities and neighborhoods, and to maximize the use of existing infrastructure so as to save taxpayers millions of dollars in unnecessary costs for building new infrastructure to support sprawl. A significant aspect of the initiative is the Smart Growth Areas legislation that requires that state funding for projects in Maryland municipalities, other existing communities, industrial and planned growth areas designated by counties will receive priority funding over other projects. These Smart Growth Areas are called Priority Funding Areas (PFA). Portions of Subregion 5 in Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett are PFAs (approximately 40 percent of the total Subregion).

**Plan Making Methodology and Process**

The Subregion 5 master plan was developed between spring 2007 and winter 2009. Early in the planning process, community meetings called Listening Sessions were held. Based on General Plan mandates and what was heard from the community, the master plan’s goals, concepts, guidelines and the public participation program for the Preliminary Subregion 5 Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment was drafted and endorsed by the District Council on November 20, 2007. This officially launched the plan formulation process.

Project staff either facilitated planning workshops or presented information about the plan at major community workshops (seven), homeowners and civic association meetings (seven), and a community forum held by the Council Member representing the area. Additional opportunities were created to obtain citizen input throughout the planning process via newsletters distributed electronically to stakeholders, participants in meetings, advertising, information distributed to homeowner and business association memberships, elected officials, and other interested persons.

While planners met with the community, others on the project planning team prepared information to inform the planning process. The project team made population and dwelling unit projections as input to public facility (schools, libraries, fire, police, parks, recreation, and trails) needs analyses and reviewed existing land use patterns. Transportation modeling was conducted to evaluate current deficiencies and project future needs. Environmental analyses were prepared, including a study of the Mattawoman watershed to identify possible protection strategies.
On October 26, 2012, the Circuit Court for Prince George’s County reversed and voided Prince George’s County Council resolution CR-61-2009, which had previously approved the 2009 Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (SMA). Consequently, the County Council remanded this master plan and SMA to the Prince George’s County Planning Board for the purposes of meeting the affidavit requirements pursuant to Md. Annotated Code, State Government Article §15-831 and re-releasing the 2009 Preliminary Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA for public review and comment pursuant to a duly advertised Joint Public Hearing held on April 11, 2013. Meanwhile, on April 2, 2013, the Prince George’s County Council approved the Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan, of which a portion lies within the boundaries of the Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA. After a work session on the April 11, 2014 public hearing testimony, the Planning Board adopted and endorsed the Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA on June 27, 2013 via PGCPB Resolution No. 13-75 (Appendix 4) and transmitted it to the Prince George’s County Council. After the County Council’s work session on the public hearing testimony and the adopted plan and SMA, the Prince George’s County Council, sitting as the District Council, approved the Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA on July 24, 2013, Prince George’s County Council Resolutions CR-80-2013 and CR-81-2013 (Appendices 5 and 6). This plan has been updated to incorporate revisions in these resolutions of approval, as well as references to the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan, (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).

B. HISTORY OF THE AREA

Prior to European settlement, the area that is now Prince George’s County was home to the Piscataway Indians, who lived in villages from the Anacostia River south to the Port Tobacco River from around 900 A.D. They established farming villages in the fertile floodplains along major rivers and streams. One of these villages, the Accokeek Archeological Creek site along the shore of the Potomac River in southwestern Prince George’s County, is a National Historic Landmark. The Potomac River is an American Heritage River.

After twenty-five years of trading with the Native Americans, in 1634 the Europeans began to settle in Maryland. Although the Piscataway Nation is neither a federally-nor a state-recognized tribe, its descendants still reside in Prince George’s County and retain their cultural traditions. The Piscataway Nation owns a burial/sacred ground in Accokeek on federal land.

By the mid 1600s, farms and plantations lined the Patuxent and Potomac rivers within the original boundaries of Calvert and Charles counties. By 1695, the area population was between 1,600 and 1,700 people of European descent, a sufficient number for self-governance, and Prince George’s County was established the following year. Agricultural and farming pursuits continued to dominate the area through the mid–twentieth century and plantation houses and farms dotted the landscape. The Poplar Hill Mansion on His Lordship’s Kindness, at 7606 Woodyard Road, is a substantial example of the plantation houses built in the area during the late 1700s. It now operates as a museum.
From the earliest days of settlement, transportation routes shaped development patterns. Waterways served as the earliest avenues of commerce. The Historic Village of Piscataway was established in 1707 as a trading center, at the confluence of the Piscataway Creek and Tinkers Creek, and thrived as a small port town and the site of an important international tobacco inspection warehouse. As the population and numbers of settlements grew, overland travel became increasingly important. T.B., Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett formed at the crossroads of major overland transportation routes.

The village of T.B.\(^2\) developed in the early nineteenth century at the intersection of the road connecting Accokeek with Upper Marlboro and the road connecting the Village of Piscataway with the southeast corner of the County, as well as the plantations along the Patuxent River. It originally comprised a general store and a post office. In the late 1880s T.B.’s population was approximately 150 and the village had two schoolhouses, two churches and two physicians’ offices. In the 1920s, Crain Highway, precursor to US 301, was built and served as the major north-south link between Baltimore and Southern Maryland. Crain Highway brought automobile traffic through T.B. and the village began to serve as a stop for travelers. Over the years, US 301 continued to function as a business and commercial corridor, serving local communities and becoming a thoroughfare for long distance travel. The general store was renovated in 2003 to operate as an ice-cream shop and café and is a designated historic site. Now, the New York Deli, these buildings, which once served as a casket shop and a meeting place for a local temperance society, are the last remnants of the 19th century village of T.B.

Approximately 1.5 miles east of T.B., Brandywine was established in 1846 by members of the Early family. Construction of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad began in 1868 through Prince George’s County, creating new towns. The first trains ran in 1873, opening up the Brandywine area for development. A second railroad line was constructed through Brandywine in the 1880s. A hotel and post office were built around 1895. In the 1880s, Brandywine’s population was approximately 250, but it remained a quiet crossroads village until after World War II, when most of the current housing stock was built. By the late 1990s, the original Brandywine commercial village, located where Brandywine Road crosses the railroad tracks had a population of approximately 500, an elementary school, a fire station and a bank. Today, growth and development in Brandywine have shifted to areas closer to T.B. with better access to US 301 and MD 5.

Clinton, another crossroads community, began to develop in the mid-nineteenth century about six miles northeast of Piscataway. It was first called Surrattsville after John Surratt, who in 1852 opened a tavern in the community that also served as a residence, polling place and post office. The Surratt House became a landmark when it figured in the trial of the Lincoln assassination. Mary Surratt was implicated by her acquaintance with John Wilkes Booth, who stopped at the tavern upon fleeing Washington, D.C., The Mary Surratt House on Brandywine Road is now a museum. Surrattsville was renamed Clinton at the end of the nineteenth century.\(^3\)

\(^2\) The origin of this somewhat unusual name, sometimes written as Tee Bee, is unknown. One suggestion is that the name “T.B.” was taken from an early boundary marker placed at the division line between the lands of the William Townshend family on the west and the Brooke family on the east. Other sources suggest that the initials stand for Major Thomas Brooke of the British militia, who received a patent for a 2,530 acre tract in the area known as Brookefield in 1663.

\(^3\) The origin of the name Clinton is not known with certainty. One suggestion by staff of the Surratt House is that the United States Postmaster General at the time was a descendant of the New York politician DeWitt Clinton and the Postmaster named the post office after his ancestor.

\[\text{Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness}\]
As growth in and around Washington, D.C. extended south along the MD 5 corridor and around Joint Base Andrews, Clinton emerged as a location for residential development and, until the 1990s, contained most of the residential and retail development in what is now Subregion 5.

Accokeek formed as a settlement for the English farmers and planters in the late seventeenth century. Initially, Accokeek’s location, isolated from major transportation routes, limited development. However, as Charles County continued to develop and as Indian Head Highway became a commuter route to employment areas, Accokeek became increasingly attractive for residential development. By 2008, Accokeek contained approximately 3,427 dwellings. An especially desirable area in west Accokeek is a wooded, scenic area called the “Moyaone Reserve” located within the established boundary of Piscataway National Park. Residential lots in the Moyaone Reserve are a minimum of five acres in size and are subject to scenic easements acquired for the protection of the Mount Vernon viewshed.

In 1922, land at the Piscataway Creek and the Potomac River confluence was purchased by Alice and Henry Ferguson as a vacation retreat. They named the property the “Hard Bargain Farm.” A short distance west is the National Colonial Farm, a re-creation of a mid-eighteenth century tobacco plantation operated jointly by the Accokeek Foundation and the National Park Service. Both farms serve as educational facilities and are visited by families and school groups year round.

C. EXISTING CONDITIONS

Regional Context

Prince George’s County is one of Maryland’s largest and most diverse counties. Located in the southwestern portion of the County, Subregion 5 is primarily an extension of the ring of suburbs and small communities within commuting distance of Washington, D.C. Subregion 5, along with Subregion 6, is a transition zone between the more developed parts of Prince George’s County and the rural landscapes of southern-central Maryland. Reflecting this transitional identity, Subregion 5 contains Developing and Rural Tiers (Map II-2: 2002 General Plan and Subregion 5 Regional Context).

Developing Tier

Close to three quarters of the 74 square miles in Subregion 5 are in the 2002 General Plan’s Developing Tier policy area. The Developing Tier in Subregion 5 contains over 20,000 acres of developable land, available for the absorption of regional growth outside existing, emerging, or planned regional activity centers in Prince George’s County, such as Largo, Bowie, and Westphalia. Approximately 8,000 acres of the undeveloped portion of the Developing Tier has been platted for residential development, but is not yet developed.

The Developing Tier portions of Subregion 5 are characterized by an evolving mix of established developed land, primarily in the core areas of Clinton, Accokeek, Brandywine, and suburban residential subdivisions, interspersed with wooded areas, farms, and institutional uses. Forest areas and farms cover more than half of the Developing Tier, but are interspersed with developed areas.
Residential portions of the Developing Tier are generally developed at low to medium densities (one to four dwelling units per acre) and are suburban in character. Clinton has the most diverse residential development, with some areas of multifamily units and townhouses, at densities upwards of seven units per acre. Brandywine also has a somewhat diverse mix of housing types, whereas Accokeek has exclusively single-family detached housing.

Non-residential development, including commercial, industrial, and institutional uses, accounts for approximately six percent of land in the Developing Tier portion of the subregion. These uses are scattered along the MD 5, US 301, and MD 210 corridors with concentrations in Clinton along and north of MD 223. The Southern Maryland Hospital Center, located at Surratts Road and MD 5, is an important employment center. Other large institutional uses include Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant in Accokeek and the federal Law Enforcement Training Center in Clinton. Louise F. Cosca Regional Park occupies a large tract of land in Clinton, almost in the center of Subregion 5.

Rural Tier

The Rural Tier area between Accokeek and Brandywine covers approximately 8,000 acres. It helps protect the headwaters and tributaries of Piscataway Creek and Mattawoman Creek. This southernmost Rural Tier area also includes many of the area’s sand and gravel extraction sites.

In combination with the rural portions of Subregion 6, these areas form a significant part of the large block of forest, agriculture, and open space that surrounds the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area to the east and south. The Rural Tier in the Accokeek area, west of MD 210, covers approximately 4,800 acres, and contains Piscataway National Park. Low density development and large forested areas in the Rural Tier help protect tributaries of Piscataway Creek and the Potomac River, and are part of a mostly continuous chain of publicly owned land (much of it under the jurisdiction of the National Park Service) stretching along the Potomac River from Indian Head (in Charles County) to the District of Columbia. In 1998 the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency designated the Potomac River as one of the first 14 American Heritage Rivers in a program designed to streamline federal participation in local efforts to protect and enhance the natural, cultural, and economic resources inherent in the nation’s waterways.

The Rural Tier portions of the subregion are characterized by a mix of forest land interspersed with scattered farmland, low density residential development, and open land including two golf courses and sand and gravel mining sites. The Rural Tier west of MD 210, in the Moyaone Reserve, includes generally large-lot subdivisions (with densities of at least one unit per five acres). The Rural Tier east of MD 210 also includes rural and low-density subdivisions and a few active and former sand and gravel extraction sites on the south side of Accokeek Road and along McKendree Road. While land along the Potomac River and Piscataway Creek is part of Piscataway National Park, relatively little land along Mattawoman Creek is currently in public ownership.

Regional Facilities and Infrastructure

Subregion 5 is crossed by several major regional roads. Branch Avenue (MD 5); the primary north-south travel route between Washington, D.C., Charles County, and St. Mary’s County in southern Maryland; passes through Clinton/Tippett and
Brandywine. US 301 (Robert Crain Highway) links Baltimore (via MD 3 and I-97) with Richmond, Virginia (via Charles County). These two major thoroughfares converge into a single road (US 301/MD 5) in Brandywine, diverging again just after crossing into Charles County. Indian Head Highway (MD 210) links western Charles County with Washington, D.C., via Accokeek in Subregion 5. MD 210 is also an important access road to National Harbor located in the Subregion VII planning area.

Accokeek Road (MD 373) and Floral Park Road provide east-west connectivity through the southern Rural Tier portion of Subregion 5. Woodyard Road (MD 223) links Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4) in Subregion 6 to the central portion of Subregion 5 at Branch Avenue (MD 5); southwest of Branch Avenue, MD 223 becomes Piscataway Road. MD 5, MD 223, and MD 210 are important commuter routes from southern Prince George’s County, points south to employment areas in Washington, D.C., and along the Capital Beltway (Map II-1: Planning Areas and Communities).

The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission’s (WSSC) Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant, located on the south side of Piscataway Creek near MD 210, serves a large portion of south-central Prince George’s County. The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) and the County’s Fire Training Academy are located in the easternmost part of the subregion. The Southern Maryland Hospital Center, at the intersection of MD 5 and Surratts Road in Clinton/Tippett, serves the subregion and surrounding areas. Washington Executive Airport and Potomac Airfield are privately owned general aviation airports located on the western side of Subregion 5, between Piscataway Road and Allentown Road. Subregion 5 has six elementary schools, three middle schools, and three high schools, some of which also serve areas outside the subregion.

The National Park Service administers Piscataway National Park, which was established in 1962 primarily to protect the scenic viewshed of Mount Vernon, located on the Virginia side of the Potomac River. The boundaries of Piscataway National Park encompass over 5,000 acres of federally owned property and privately-held land which is subject to the scenic easements held by the National Park Service.

Louise F. Cosca Regional Park, with 779 acres, is the largest M-NCPPC regional park in Subregion 5. Three partially developed stream valley parks also play an important regional role: Piscataway Stream Valley Park, Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park, and Mattawoman Stream Valley Park (Chapter VII: Public Facilities).

**Environmental Profile**

Subregion 5 lies almost entirely (99 percent) within the Potomac River basin. A very small portion of the region is in the Mataponi Creek watershed which drains toward the Patuxent River (Map II-3: Existing Land Cover (2008)). The subregion’s three major streams, Tinkers Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Mattawoman Creek flow generally east to west towards the Potomac River. Subregion 5 includes some of the headwaters and tributaries of Piscataway Creek and Mattawoman Creek. Mattawoman Creek supports an important bass fishery in Charles County.

Subregion 5 has an undulating topography, varying in elevation from 0 feet mean sea level (msl) to approximately 270 feet msl. The lowest elevations are found along the Potomac River. Higher elevations are primarily confined to the northeastern quadrant of the subregion in Clinton/Tippett. Steep slopes are inherently unstable landforms that become susceptible to soil erosion when disturbed. The adverse effects of steep
slope disturbance are more pronounced when the slope is adjacent to a stream or other water body, where erosion can lead to decreased water quality and negative impacts on riparian plant and animal species. Steep slopes are not extensive in Subregion 5; however, areas of steep slopes are found along portions of Mattawoman Creek and the banks of the smaller streams that feed Piscataway Creek and Tinkers Creek.

The 2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan reported on water quality in all of the County’s watersheds. All seven watersheds in the subregion were ranked “very poor” to “fair” for either or both aquatic habitat and the Benthic Index of Biological Integrity (IBI). None of the watersheds were ranked “fair” under both measures. Piscataway Creek, Lower Potomac River, Pomomkey Creek, and Mattawoman Creek were ranked fair under one measure. Tinkers Creek ranked very poor for aquatic habitat. Portions of Mattawoman Creek and Piscataway Creek are listed as Tier II waters by the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE, 2007).

Floodplains, usually naturally formed, are relatively low, flat areas adjoining rivers, streams, and other bodies of water. They are subject to partial or complete flooding on a periodic basis. Floodplains store and moderate the speed and impact of stormwater run-off, and in conjunction with wetlands (many of which are found in floodplains), also help to maintain water quality and recharge groundwater. Approximately 3,650 acres of floodplains occur along the Potomac River, Tinkers Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Mattawoman Creek systems.

Subregion 5 supports some large tracts of woodlands, as well as tidal and nontidal wetlands. Woodlands cover approximately 26,000 acres, a little over half the subregion, and are particularly extensive in the Piscataway and Mattawoman Creek watersheds. Woodlands reduce runoff and erosion, provide for aquifer recharge, reduce the effects of air pollution, provide shelter and sustenance for a variety of wildlife, and act as visual and environmental screens and buffers in developed areas. They also reduce heat islands, global warming, and energy consumption. Piscataway National Park encompasses 5,000 acres of open fields, forest tree canopy, and wetlands along the Potomac River protecting a significant cultural landscape directly opposite Mount Vernon, in Virginia. The park supports diverse plant and animal populations including bald eagles, beavers, and osprey.

Wetlands are valuable natural resources that provide habitat for plants, fish, and wildlife; maintain water quality (by slowing and collecting sediment and pollutants), act as ground water recharge areas, and control flooding and erosion. Piscataway Creek, Mattawoman Creek, and their tributaries support the majority of tidal and non-tidal wetlands within the subregion, including those occurring in Piscataway National Park. The tidal wetlands at the mouth of Piscataway Creek are important to the overall ecology of the Lower Potomac River Basin and the natural productivity of the area supports resident and migratory fish, waterfowl, and marsh birds. Other wetland complexes occur along Tinkers Creek and its tributaries. Small, isolated wetland pockets are also found throughout the subregion.

---

4 The ranking was a four point scale; good, fair, poor, very poor.
5 Tier II waterways exceed the minimum water quality thresholds and are subject to Maryland’s Antidegradation Review Policy, which regulates new amendments to water/sewer plans or discharge permits to ensure maintenance of the water quality within these waterbodies.
The diverse habitat conditions across the subregion support varied wildlife, including game/commercial species such as waterfowl, deer, rabbit, striped bass, shad, herring, perch, and many rare, threatened, or endangered species, such as bald eagles, protected under federal, state, and County law.

Stream buffers, the land at the edges of rivers and streams, help to control flooding and reduce the volume and speed with which pollution, nutrients and sediments enter rivers and streams. This, in turn helps to protect water quality in Subregion 5 and beyond. All land within 1,000 feet of the lower approximately 4.5 miles of Piscataway Creek and the portion of the Potomac shoreline that is within the subregion are part of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (CBCA), and subject to Prince George’s County’s Chesapeake Bay Critical Area regulations.

The Patuxent River has received considerable policy and planning attention both at the county and state levels. The Patuxent River Policy Plan, approved in 2000 and overseen by the Patuxent River Commission, is a multi-county, multi-agency effort to protect the river through land management and pollution control practices. Prince George’s County promotes recreation and educational opportunities along the river. The Patuxent River Policy Plan applies to all of the Patuxent River watershed, only a portion of which is within the Subregion 5 plan area.

Prince George’s County adopted the Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan in 2005. Approximately 17 percent of the countywide network is in Subregion 5. The Green Infrastructure Plan identified three special conservation areas (SCAs) within the subregion as targeted preservation areas in need of special attention. The largest SCA is the Mattawoman Creek Stream Valley Corridor, which extends along the entire southern side of the subregion. The other SCAs are Piscataway National Park and the Potomac River/Chesapeake Bay Critical Area shoreline.

Demographic and Economic Profiles
In 2008, the total population for Subregion 5 was approximately 54,500, six percent of the total population of Prince George’s County (Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment). Approximately 71 percent of this population (38,699) lived in Clinton/Tippett, 18 percent (10,062) in Accokeek, and 11 percent (5,750) in Brandywine.

<p>| Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment |
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| Population |
| Prince George’s County | 808,060 | 100% | 852,884 | 105% | 992,868 | 118% |
| Subregion 5 | 43,839 | 5% | 54,511 | 6% | 82,086 | 12% |
| Accokeek | 7,845 | 0.9% | 10,062 | 1.2% | 17,508 | 74% |
| Brandywine | 2,744 | 0.3% | 5,750 | 0.7% | 16,119 | 180% |
| Clinton/Tippett | 33,250 | 4% | 38,699 | 4.5% | 48,459 | 32% |
| Dwelling Units |
| Prince George’s County | 306,190 | 100% | 328,928 | 107% | 392,490 | 124% |
| Subregion 5 | 15,028 | 5% | 18,670 | 12% | 30,000 | 101% |
| Accokeek | 2,734 | 1% | 3,427 | 2% | 6,300 | 137% |
| Brandywine | 938 | 0.3% | 2,157 | 0.7% | 6,400 | 688% |
| Clinton/Tippett | 11,356 | 4% | 13,086 | 4% | 17,300 | 47% |
| Employment |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prince George's County</th>
<th>338,296</th>
<th>347,886</th>
<th>423,983</th>
<th>518,386</th>
<th>170,500</th>
<th>49%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subregion 5</td>
<td>16,246</td>
<td>17,669</td>
<td>22,606</td>
<td>28,601</td>
<td>10,932</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>1,943</td>
<td>2,294</td>
<td>3,136</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>2,852</td>
<td>3,433</td>
<td>6,792</td>
<td>7,518</td>
<td>4,085</td>
<td>119%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton/Tippett</td>
<td>11,502</td>
<td>12,293</td>
<td>13,520</td>
<td>17,947</td>
<td>5,654</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Population and Dwelling Units are for 2008, Employment data are for 2005.
Sources: 2000 from Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments Round 7.0; 2008 and 2030 from M-NCPPC Community Planning Division.

Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment shows that pipeline development, development that has been proposed or approved and will likely be built by 2030, is approximately 9,650 dwelling units (28,319 minus 18,670). Of these, the largest share (3,688 units or 38 percent) is in Brandywine.

Between 2000 and 2008 the subregion’s population grew by 10,672 or 24 percent. This increase represented 24 percent of all the population growth of Prince George’s County during this period. Approximately half of the increase was in Clinton/Tippett, with the other half divided fairly evenly between Accokeek and Brandywine.

This plan projects that by 2030 the Subregion 5 population will increase to approximately 82,100, or eight percent of the total population of Prince George’s County. Of this number, 59 percent (48,459) would be in Clinton/Tippett, 21 percent (17,508) in Accokeek, and 20 percent (16,119) in Brandywine.

Thus, over the life of the plan, while all three communities are projected to grow in population and dwelling units, the rate of growth in Accokeek and Brandywine is projected to be greater than in Clinton/Tippett.

In 2005 there were approximately 17,700 jobs in Subregion 5, about five percent of total employment in Prince George’s County. Of these, approximately 70 percent (12,293 jobs) were in Clinton/Tippett, especially along the MD 223 corridor east of Temple Hills Road and north of the corridor close to Joint Base Andrews. Subregion 5 has a relatively poor jobs to population ratio of 0.32 compared to 0.4 for the County as a whole.

Pipeline employment is approximately 4,900 jobs, of which over 3,330 are in Brandywine, primarily associated with some large retail centers planned or under construction as of 2008.

The master plan projects that by 2030 the subregion’s employment will increase to approximately 28,600, or six percent of total employment in Prince George’s County. Of this number, approximately 63 percent (17,947) would be in Clinton/Tippett and 26 percent (7,518) in Brandywine. Accokeek is projected to continue to have a relatively small number of jobs (3,136), primarily along MD 210.

Although the census data are from 2000, they provide a snapshot in time of the socioeconomic characteristics. Below are selected characteristics for the subregion, as of 2000:

- **Age**: The percentage of seniors (age 60 and above) in the subregion (13 percent) was slightly higher than the County (11 percent).
- **Employment**: The unemployment rate (4 percent) was slightly lower than that of the County (6 percent). The majority (51 percent) of employed persons living
in the subregion worked in the private sector; 25 percent worked for the federal
government and 13 percent for local or state government.

- **Occupation:** Occupational categories accounting for the highest percentage of
  employed persons were public administration (22 percent), education, health and
  social services (17 percent), and professional services (11 percent). Agricultural-
  related occupations accounted for the smallest percentage of all occupations (0.4
  percent).

- **Income:** The median household income for the subregion was $72,244, higher
  than that of the County ($55,256) and the Washington DC metropolitan area
  ($62,216).

- **Education:** Educational attainment was similar to the County as a whole: 89
  percent of the population age 25 and above were high school graduates and 25
  percent held bachelor’s degrees or higher.

Subregion 5 is economically diverse, with a broad range of employment that
includes retail, industrial government, health, agricultural and mining. Employment
in Subregion 5 has remained relatively steady in recent years. In 2005 there were
approximately 17,700 jobs in the subregion, an increase of approximately 1,432 jobs
since 2000 (*Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment*). Most of the
increase was in Brandywine and Clinton/Tippett, and is attributable to additional
commercial development.

The largest single employment center in Subregion 5, with approximately 1,200 jobs,
is the Southern Maryland Hospital Center and associated medical offices located on
Surratts Road at MD 5. The hospital is the largest full-service acute care facility in
Southern Maryland and the region’s leading center for vascular, cardiac, and emergency
medicine.

Industrial employment in the Subregion is scattered; in Clinton, in Accokeek along
MD 210, and in Brandywine around MD5/US 301. In Clinton there are concentrations
in Kirby Industrial Park and Clinton Industrial Center, both on Kirby Road, and
along, and east of, Old Alexandria Ferry Road, adjacent to Joint Base Andrews.
Industrial uses in Brandywine include: Panda Brandywine power plant, a large
distribution facility; Brandywine Auto Parts; and Soil Safe, a soil remediation and
clean-up business. Accokeek is home to a gun manufacturing facility, as well as
industrial-service businesses.

Approximately 13 percent of employment in the subregion is in retail. Subregion 5
has eight shopping centers, six in Clinton and two in Accokeek, as well as scattered
free-standing, largely highway-oriented businesses, especially along MD 210 and US
301 in Brandywine. Retail centers in Clinton are Clinton Park Center on Woodyard
Road, Clinton Crossing at Branch Avenue and Woodyard Road, Coventry Plaza at
Coventry Way and Old Branch Avenue, Clinton Square on Old Alexandria Ferry
Road, Clinton Village on Woodyard Road, and Clinton Station at Aaron Lane and
Old Branch Avenue. Centers in Accokeek are Accokeek Village on Livingston Road
and Manokeek Village on Berry Road. Between 2008 and 2013, the Brandywine
Crossing Shopping Center opened with approximately a million square feet of retail,
restaurants, and a movie theater.
Table II-3: Land Use/Land Cover

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use/Land Cover</th>
<th>Developing Tier</th>
<th>Rural Tier</th>
<th>Subregion 5 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource Lands</td>
<td>23,555</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>10,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>1,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest</td>
<td>17,557</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>8,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extractive/Barren</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Lands</td>
<td>11,086</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>9,167</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>1,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Residential</td>
<td>1,919</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Land Area</td>
<td>34,641</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>12,758</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Maryland Department of Planning, 2002 Land Use/Land Cover database.

Land Use/Land Cover

Almost three quarters of the land in Subregion 5 is resource-based, comprising a mix of forest, agriculture, extractive, and wetlands (Table II-3: Land Use/Land Cover). Approximately 27 percent of the subregion is developed land, of which almost 85 percent is devoted to residential land use, predominantly suburban low density residential development.

Map II-3 shows a graphical representation of land use in 2008 prepared by the M-NCPPC planning team. The land use categories on the map are different from those in Table II-3 as the map shows greater specificity while the land use/land cover data in Table II-3 is older (2002) and is generalized to facilitate comparisons across the state.

Mineral extraction is an historically important industry in Subregion 5, based on the presence of large sand and gravel deposits affiliated with the Brandywine geological formation. Regionally, this industry is undergoing significant change as small mine operations are transitioning out of the industry and being replaced with larger, more consolidated operations. There are seven active mining operations within the subregion, including a washing and processing plant on Accokeek Road in Brandywine. The mining industry also supports other independent businesses in the region, predominately in the trucking industry, generating spin-offs to the local economy.

Agricultural land accounted for approximately 15 percent of land cover in Subregion 5 in 2002. As of 2008, approximately 140 parcels greater than 10 acres in size had agricultural tax assessments. These parcels totaled approximately 7,600 acres. Although the number of farms in Subregion 5 has fallen in recent years, a large number of agricultural enterprises still exist. These include the home base of Parker Farms on Livingston Road, a multi-state, mid-Atlantic vegetable-farming enterprise; Deakins Pond, a wholesale nursery; and Miller Farms, a direct farm market in Clinton/Tippett. Prince George’s County’s first preservation easement under the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF) program was awarded to Denison Landscaping and Nursery on Accokeek Road.
Community Profiles

Communities are places that have a distinct combination of land use, density, and overall character. They are envisioned as having their own open spaces, internal circulation, schools, activity centers, and community facilities though some communities may not have all these assets. The Subregion 5 master plan comprises three communities: Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett (Map II-2: Planning Areas and Communities). This community structure provides an organizational framework for the master plan.

Accokeek covers the south and southwest portion of Subregion 5. Accokeek has a mostly rural landscape characterized by woodlands, open areas, farm fields, and nurseries. The community is framed by rivers and streams such as the Potomac River, Piscataway Creek, and Mattawoman Creek. Most development in Accokeek occurs along MD 210, though a number of large residential subdivisions are to be developed along Berry Road and Floral Park Road. The traditional heart of the Accokeek community is a linear mix of business, service, institutional, and residential uses along approximately two miles of Livingston Road between the US Post Office west of MD 210, and Kellers Market (near Bealle Hill Road) east of MD 210. The commercial center of Accokeek is anchored by the Accokeek Village shopping center, a library, a gas station, independent businesses, a church east of MD 210, B and J Carry-out, several offices, and a church are located west of MD 210.

Brandywine comprises the southeast portion of Subregion 5. Of the subregion’s communities, Brandywine has the smallest population, but in some ways is the most diverse in terms of land use, with rural areas, the historic village of Brandywine, residential subdivisions, sand and gravel mines, industrial areas that include a power plant (Panda), an auto salvage yard, highway oriented retail uses, and a new commercial shopping center. Brandywine has been slated for substantial growth since the 1970s based on its large tracts of available land and its strategic location at the convergence of MD 5 and US 301.

Clinton covers the northern part of the subregion, and is the center of long standing residential development and commercial activity. Clinton is home to several region-serving facilities including Louise F. Cosca Regional Park, the Southern Maryland Hospital Center, Surrattsville High School, and several shopping centers. Joint Base Andrews borders Clinton to the north. The traditional center of Clinton is the intersection of MD 223, Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road. Near this intersection are several churches, Surrattsville High School, the Clinton Fire Company, post office, and the B.K. Miller liquor store.

Transportation Summary

The transportation network in Subregion 5 is based around several major roadways that provide regional access to the local roadway network. Table II-4: Average Annual Daily Traffic, 2007 shows the Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on the major roadways in Subregion 5.

The two major highways in Subregion 5 are MD 5 and MD 210. Both are heavily traveled, carrying both local and regional traffic. MD 5 is a 4- to 6-lane, partially access-controlled highway connecting the Washington, D.C. metro area to Southern Maryland. MD 210 is a 4- to 6-lane partially access-controlled highway connecting Southern Prince George’s County and Charles County to Washington, D.C.. Both MD 5 and MD 210 experience traffic congestion during peak periods, particularly at their signalized intersections.
Other major roads in Subregion 5 include:

- MD 223 (Piscataway Road/Woodyard Road) crosses the study area from northeast to the southwest and connects MD 4 to Livingston Road.
- US 301 (Crain Highway) is on the eastern side of Subregion 5. It continues north through Subregion 6 and connects to US 50 in Bowie; to the south US 301 continues through Charles County and into Virginia.
- MD 373 (Accokeek Road) travels east to west in the southern portion of the Subregion and connects MD 210 with MD 5.

There is no rail transit service in Subregion 5, but the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station on the green line of WMATA’s Metrorail system is just inside the Capital Beltway, west of Joint Base Andrews. Northern and northwestern parts of the subregion are served by the WMATA’s Metrobus. CSX operates a freight rail line that generally parallels US 301 in Prince Georges County from Bowie, via Brandywine, to southern Charles County.

Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation’s “TheBus” system operates two routes in the northern portion of the study area that connects to the Metrorail Green Line. The Maryland Transit Administration operates a commuter bus service along MD 5 between Washington, D.C. and Southern Maryland, though these buses do not stop in Subregion 5. Subregion 5 has two commuter park and ride lots, in Clinton and Accokeek.

Sidewalk and pedestrian/bicycle trails are present along some roadways and neighborhood streets, although a subregion–wide network is not yet developed. The existing trails in Subregion 5 are predominantly located in parks and are primarily recreational in function and design, serving hikers, bikers, and equestrians. There are two privately owned general aviation airports in Subregion 5, both in the Tippett area. Potomac Airfield is a general aviation airport located between Allentown Road and Tinkers Creek. Washington Executive Airport (also known as Hyde Field) is a general aviation facility located at MD 223 and Steed Road.6

Several transportation planning studies are being conducted by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA). These studies are discussed in Chapter VI, Transportation. The Maryland SHA is conducting the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project evaluating transportation options from the US 301/MD 5 interchange at T.B. to the US 301/Turkey Hill Road interchange in Charles County. The MTA’s Southern Maryland Transit Corridor Preservation Study is a major study, completed in 2010, that analyzes alternative alignments for either light rail or bus rapid transit (BRT) service between the Branch Avenue Metro Station and Charles County.

6 General aviation includes all air traffic except for commercial passenger, cargo, and military traffic.

Table II-4: Average Annual Daily Traffic, 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Route Description</th>
<th>Traffic (Vehicles)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MD 5 (0.1 miles south of Surratts Rd)</td>
<td>67,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 5 (0.40 miles south of MD 223)</td>
<td>75,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 210 Indian Head Highway (0.2 miles south of MD 373)</td>
<td>46,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 210 Indian Head Highway (0.2 miles north of MD 373)</td>
<td>48,301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223 Piscataway Road (0.2 miles north of Livingston Rd)</td>
<td>1,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223 Piscataway Road (0.2 miles north of Temple Hill Rd)</td>
<td>17,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 301 Crain Highway (0.20 miles north of MD 381)</td>
<td>32,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 5/US 301 south of Cedarville Rd</td>
<td>84,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 373 Accokeek Road (0.1 miles east of MD 210)</td>
<td>7,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 373 Accokeek Road (0.1 miles west of MD 5)</td>
<td>3,902</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. KEY PLANNING ISSUES

During preparation of the plan, at numerous listening sessions, public workshops, and community meetings, participants raised a large number and broad range of issues and concerns related to the future of the subregion. While all the issues and concerns that were raised are considered during the preparation of the plan, the key issues are the following:

- **Modifications to the Rural Tier/Developing Tier boundaries:** During the plan preparation process some property owners requested their land be removed from the Rural Tier and placed in the Developing Tier. Additionally, at several meetings there were requests for the Rural Tier to be expanded in support of the General Plan’s vision to protect large amounts of land for woodland, wildlife habitat, recreation, agricultural pursuits, and preservation of rural character. These issues, along with direction from the General Plan to examine land use on the edges of Developing and Rural Tier boundaries, are addressed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Patterns.

- **Adequacy of public facilities:** A number of questions were raised at public meetings about the adequacy of public facilities in Subregion 5, especially roads. A number of participants expressed the concern that developments are being approved prior to the provision of public facilities needed to support the developments. This issue is addressed in Chapter VI: Transportation.

- **Long term planning versus immediate concerns:** Somewhat related to the above public facility issue is the expectation that the master plan address immediate concerns, such as problem roadway links, intersections and lack of sidewalks, in addition to planning issues that might not be realized for 20 years or more. This issue is addressed throughout the plan.

- **Accokeek:** The area along Livingston Road east of MD 210 has served as a commercial and service center for Accokeek for decades. There are different expectations for the future of this area, but the way in which remaining undeveloped land in that area is used will be vital to the character of the Livingston Road corridor and the Accokeek community as a whole. This issue is discussed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Patterns.

- **Brandywine:** The 1993 Subregion V Master Plan conceived of Brandywine as an employment-based community center. Since then, industrial land has been slow to develop, while residential and commercial uses have been attracted to the potential mixed-use center. With these changes, and the challenges and opportunities presented by highway improvements and the introduction of transit, future land use in Brandywine has been reconsidered. This issue is discussed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Patterns.
• **Hyde Field (Washington Executive Airport):** An approximately 400-acre area at the intersection of MD 223 and Steed Road had been designated for large scale employment use since at least 1993, but is not suited for large scale employment use due to its distance from major highways. This area includes Hyde Field, which has served as a general aviation airport since World War II, and land that has been mined for sand and gravel. How to develop the largest remaining uncommitted tract in Clinton/Tippett in the future is discussed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Patterns.

• **MD 223:** MD 223 is a key artery for Subregion 5 that carries both local and regional traffic. Plan participants have expressed concerns about traffic volumes and operations along segments of MD 223, especially at peak hours. Although the road has been designated for comprehensive improvements for many years, few have actually been made. This is discussed in Chapter VI: Transportation Systems.

• **Mattawoman Creek:** The Mattawoman Creek watershed is designated for special attention in the 2002 General Plan, and as a special conservation area in the 2005 Green Infrastructure Plan. Water resources and land planning issues for Mattawoman Creek are discussed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Patterns and Chapter V: Environment.

• **Future US 301 Alignment:** The State Highway Administration conducted the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project to evaluate alternatives for alleviating traffic congestion along the US 301 corridor. One alternative referred to as the Western (Waldorf) By-Pass would traverse the Mattawoman Creek watershed in the county’s Rural Tier. In 2002, the Prince George’s County Council approved a resolution stating that this particular alternative should be removed from consideration in the master plan. Finding a suitable solution to the traffic congestion in this corridor remains an important consideration for this plan, but it is more appropriately addressed by the State Highway Administration in conjunction with Prince George’s County and Charles County.
Subregion 5 is a diverse and important part of the County with a variety of living choices and employment opportunities for residents in the Developing and Rural tiers. The Developing Tier portion has a network of distinct communities in Clinton/Tippett, Brandywine, and Accokeek. The Branch Avenue and Indian Head Highway corridors will continue to provide employment, shopping, and expanded home ownership opportunities. Mass transit will support new developments in the designated Brandywine Community Center area and innovative design techniques will be used to minimize environmental impacts. Communities will have a system of sidewalks and multiuse trails connecting to parks, open space, recreation centers, and other destinations.

In the Piscataway, Mattawoman, and Potomac watersheds, land along the periphery of the County, is preserved to protect the landscape, rivers, creeks, forests, farms, and rich history that defines and unites the subregion. Historic sites and new businesses complement each other to promote tourism, which will encourage visitors to experience agricultural and rural lifestyles first hand. The rural character of the region is preserved through measures that minimize sprawl and protect cultural, natural, and agricultural resources. Existing agricultural and mineral resources serve as catalysts for economic activities conducted in an environmentally sensitive manner.

The three vibrant communities of Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett build upon and protect their distinct characters as described by the following vision statements:

- **Accokeek** retains a predominantly rural community character with community-oriented commercial development. Large forested areas are interspersed with residential development, scattered small farms, and agricultural enterprises (nurseries, produce stands). New residential developments blend seamlessly into the Accokeek community fabric with woodlands retained between newer and older developments. Livingston Road, which is the linear, traditional heart of the Accokeek community, functions as the hub of community activity with the library, churches, small local businesses, the Fire House, the post office, and other gathering places situated along a two-mile stretch. Attractive village scale commercial shopping areas are thriving in Accokeek, including a small, locally serving commercial and office development on the south side of Livingston Road. Children and adults from Accokeek and throughout the region regard Accokeek as their destination for environmental education programs at the Hard Bargain and National Colonial farms.
• **Brandywine** develops into the center envisioned in the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. It is a large, mixed-use community within the MD 5/US 301 corridor with transit-oriented neighborhoods designed so residents and employees can walk to nearby bus or light rail commuter stations. A variety of housing choices are available to residents, from apartments to single-family dwellings, and there are many opportunities to shop, dine, and be entertained. A well-planned road network allows local traffic to circulate throughout the community without relying on the regional highway network. A key feature in Brandywine is the network of pedestrian trails and bike paths that connect living areas to schools, shops, and parks. East of Brandywine is the original village of Brandywine, is a vital part of the larger community and includes one-of-a-kind restaurants and small shops along a traditional main street, MD 381. West of Brandywine, the land uses transition to rural, low density residential development.

• **Clinton/Tippett**, a thriving, established community, is the most populated area in Subregion 5. New development increases opportunities for employment, shopping, and recreation. New development uses environmentally sensitive design techniques to minimize environmental impacts. Joint Base Andrews stimulates economic development within the community and promotes the establishment of new businesses and services. Commercial shopping centers located at key interchanges along the MD 5 (Branch Avenue) corridor are redeveloped into vital mixed-use areas served by transit. Within Clinton/Tippett, residents and business owners have a variety of choices when it comes to transportation: they can drive, walk, bike, ride transit, or fly from a general aviation airport. Transportation facilities are built to meet the needs of Clinton/Tippett residents. Shuttle buses circulate throughout the area and augment the rapid bus transit or light rail services along MD 5 that link to the Branch Avenue Metro Station. Pedestrian sidewalks and bike paths connect the residential neighborhoods to commercial and recreational areas.
The development pattern established in the Subregion 5 master plan defines the location and quantity of land that should be developed for different uses: residential, employment, commercial, mixed-use, and institutional. It also identifies the location and acreage of land that should be conserved for agriculture and other natural resource uses, or preserved for environmental, scenic, and recreation purposes. Furthermore, the development pattern drives the need for other facilities such as schools, transportation, fire, police, water, and sewer.

This chapter begins with definitions of the land use categories on the Future Land Use map (Map IV-1: Future Land Use) and describes where they are recommended for future development. The land use categories applied to the portion of Subregion 5 that is within the boundaries of the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (CBA) are also defined and identified on the Future Land Use map in this chapter, as useful reference. Summaries of the CBA sector plan recommendations for pedestrian and transit-oriented development in the Coventry Way, Downtown Clinton, and Southern Maryland Hospital Center focus areas are included.

The 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan land use policy areas that form the basis of the goals, policies, and strategies in this master plan are the Developing Tier, Rural Tier, and Centers and Corridors. This chapter provides specific planning recommendations for the communities of Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett in the context of the General Plan policy areas. Transition areas are provided to encourage the retention of open, natural areas in strategic locations where land in the Developing Tier is contiguous to land in the Rural Tier. Aviation also influences land use recommendations within Subregion 5. This chapter addresses ongoing planning work to ensure compatibility of future land uses surrounding Joint Base Andrews and two general aviation airports. Policies and strategies provided throughout this chapter are intended to be used by the community, developers, and planners to enhance the character, convenience, and overall livability of each of these communities, especially during the review of development proposals. Lastly, amendments to the General Plan development pattern policy areas are addressed.
A. FUTURE LAND USE CATEGORIES

The Subregion 5 Future Land Use map (Map IV-1: Future Land Use) designates land in the Developing Tier as residential low, residential medium, institutional, and public and private open space. Commercial and industrial areas are distributed among the subregion’s communities with concentrations in Brandywine and Clinton. Future land use in the Rural Tier is designated “rural,” reflecting the County’s goal to preserve rural resources, character, and open space. Public parks and open space in the Rural Tier these areas are primarily in Piscataway National Park and in the Mattawoman Creek watershed. For land within the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (CBA), Map IV-1: Future Land Use shows four mixed-use categories, four commercial land use categories, and one industrial land use category.

The Subregion 5 Future Land Use map has several purposes:

• It is a policy map that provides the basis for classification of land into zoning districts that regulate the use of land (that is, what uses can occur where and under what conditions), as well as the subdivision and development of land.

• It serves as a guide to the County’s desires and interests for future land development, preservation, and conservation. Where land is not currently zoned in accordance with the Future Land Use map, the map shows where applications for floating zones or comprehensive design zones would be supported, provided the proposal was in accordance with the subregion master plan’s goals, policies, or strategies.

• It includes the Rural/Developing Tier boundary line, dividing the Rural Tier, with its set of goals and objectives, from the Developing Tier, which has a different set. This policy line affects eligibility for public water and sewer service and the application of transportation and fire standards under the County’s public facility requirements.

• The map serves as a guide to decision makers regarding water and sewer allocations.
### Table IV-1: Future Land Use Map Designations, Descriptions, and Applicable Zones (Subregion 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Intent/Types of Land Uses, Densities</th>
<th>Applicable Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>Retail and business areas, including employment such as office and service uses.</td>
<td>C-O, C-A, C-S-C, C-M, C-R-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Manufacturing and industrial parks, warehouses and distribution. May include other employment such as office and service uses.</td>
<td>I-1, I-2, I-3, I-4, E-I-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed use</td>
<td>Areas of various residential, commercial, employment, and institutional uses. Different mixed use areas may vary with respect to their dominant land uses; i.e. commercial uses may dominate overall land use in one mixed use area, whereas residential uses may dominate in another.</td>
<td>M-X-T, M-X-C, M-U-T-C, M-U-I, M-A-C, L-A-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional</td>
<td>Uses such as military installations, sewerage treatment plants, schools.</td>
<td>Any zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential high</td>
<td>Residential areas over 20 dwelling units per acre. Mix of dwelling unit types, including apartments.</td>
<td>R-H, R-10, R-10A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential medium-high</td>
<td>Residential areas between eight and 20 dwelling units per acre. Mix of dwelling unit types, including apartments.</td>
<td>R-30, R-T, R-18, R-18C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential medium</td>
<td>Residential areas between 3.5 and eight dwelling units per acre. Primarily single-family dwellings (detached and attached).</td>
<td>R-55, R-M, R-T, R-20, R-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential low</td>
<td>Residential areas up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Primarily single-family detached dwellings.</td>
<td>R-E, R-R, R-L, V-L, V-M, R-S, R-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential low—transition area</td>
<td>Residential areas up to two dwelling units per acre. Primarily single-family detached dwellings. Minimum 60 percent open space through required conservation subdivisions.</td>
<td>R-R, R-E, R-A, R-L, V-L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Agricultural land (cropland, pasture, farm fields), forest, very low density residential. The county’s intent is for these areas to remain rural and to conserve these areas' natural resources, primarily forest and forest resources, for future generations. New residential development is permitted at densities that generally range from .5 to .2 dwelling unit per acre.</td>
<td>R-O-S, O-S, R-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public parks and open space</td>
<td>Parks and recreation areas, publicly owned natural areas.</td>
<td>R-O-S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Description and Location of Recommended Land Uses

**Commercial** areas are designated primarily along MD 223 and US 301/MG 5. Each of the communities of Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton have commercial areas. Accokeek has two commercial areas: Accokeek Village on Livingston Road east of MD 210 and Manokeek Village on MD 228, also east of MD 210. Brandywine is a growing commercial center with the development of Brandywine Crossing, a nearly one million square foot shopping center. The largest concentration of existing commercial land use is in Clinton: east and west of the MD 5/MG 223 intersection, composed of two shopping centers, plus a neighborhood-oriented crossroads at the MD 223/Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road intersection (see Chapter III for details). Another commercial concentration in Clinton is to the north at MD 5/Coventry Way and Old Alexandria Ferry Road. Small commercial areas are scattered in diverse locations, mostly reflecting crossroad sites established years ago when the entire area was more rural.

This plan limits the expansion of commercial land uses along major roadways that are not in designated growth areas, consistent with goals and policies to discourage strip commercial development and to support redevelopment and infill development in existing and planned development areas over “green field” development. Note, however, that Mixed Use areas may contain commercial uses.
Map IV-1: Future Land Use
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Industrial areas are designated in the following locations: in Brandywine east of MD 5/US 301, in Clinton on Kirby Road, and along Old Alexandria Ferry Road adjacent to Joint Base Andrews. A few other industrial areas are in scattered locations, such as the manufacturing plant in Accokeek.

Areas that are designated institutional reflect large, existing institutional land uses. In Clinton, these uses include: the Southern Maryland Hospital Center, the federal Law Enforcement Training Center and the County’s Fire Training Academy, Resurrection Cemetery south of Woodyard Road near Rosaryville Road, and the PEPCO transmission facility south of the Southern Maryland Hospital Center. In Accokeek, institutional uses include the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission’s Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant.

Mixed use areas contain residential, commercial, employment, and institutional uses. Mixed use areas are designated in Brandywine and Clinton. See below under Section C, Centers and Corridors.

Residential medium high and residential high areas can be developed as single-family or townhouse development and are limited to several small areas in Clinton east of Clinton Park Shopping Center, and west of MD 5 near the Southern Maryland Hospital Center. Other residential medium high and residential high areas are designated in or near the future Brandywine Community Center.

Residential medium areas are designated in a variety of locations in Clinton/Tippett and in a development in Accokeek, south of Floral Park Road. The largest existing residential medium development is in the Tippett area west of MD 5, between Tinkers Creek to the north and Piscataway Creek to the south.

Residential low areas are designated for single-family detached suburban development. Most of the land in Subregion 5 is in this category, which is intended for single-family detached residential development that may have up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre. Residential low areas include much of the residential land in the Accokeek community that is not in the Rural Tier and most of the land in Clinton/Tippett surrounding Cosca Regional Park. These areas are located in the MD 5 corridor north of Floral Park Road and Brandywine Road. Along MD 223, most of the area known as Hyde Field is designated “Residential Low” land use in this master plan. This departs from the long-standing designation for this property as an employment and institutional area. At this location, the Residential Low designation is consistent with the surrounding development pattern.

Residential low—transition areas respond to the direction in the approved goals, concepts and guidelines (November 20, 2007) for this master plan to examine the appropriateness of the land use designations along the boundary between the Developing Tier and the Rural Tier. Residential low—transition areas support the 2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan and its designation of a portion of the Mattawoman watershed as a Special Conservation Area by encouraging residential subdivision designs that incorporate large, natural, undeveloped areas.

In a transition area the conservation subdivision technique is strongly recommended. Conservation subdivisions are required to be clustered, to be built in less environmentally sensitive areas, and to have a minimum conservation requirement of 60 percent in the O-S Zone, 50 percent in the R-A Zone, and 40 percent in the R-E and R-R zones. Residential low-transition areas adjacent to the Rural Tier provide for more environmentally-sensitive residential subdivision design, which is particularly important in the Mattawoman Creek watershed where the protection of water quality is paramount (Chapter V: Environment).
In transition areas, future low-density single-family detached residential development is intended, with large amounts of open space serving as the transition area in the Developing Tier, along and adjacent to the Rural Tier. Residential low-transition areas are eligible for public water and sewer service. In addition, residential low-transition areas should meet the following criteria:

- Contiguous to Rural Tier boundaries.
- In large blocks rather than small individual parcels.
- In subdivided areas with minimum five-acre lots. Lots as small as approximately two acres can be included if part of a larger parcel of land.

**Rural** areas are located in the designated Rural Tier, generally north of Mattawoman Creek (the County line), east of the Potomac River, and south of Floral Park Road, excluding land along MD 210 and the US 301/MD 5 corridor. Consistent with 2002 General Plan policy, the Rural Tier is envisioned to protect large amounts of land for woodland, wildlife habitat, recreation and agriculture pursuits, and to preserve the rural character and vistas that now exist.

**Public and private open space** areas include Louise F. Cosca Regional Park, Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park (comprising several large tracts along this creek), Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park, and Piscataway National Park (managed by the National Park Service).

The **Brandywine Community Center**, (Map IV-1: Future Land Use), is intended to be developed with mixed residential and non-residential uses at moderate densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development proximate to a future transit node. The boundaries of this 550-acre community center are defined on the Future Land Use map (Map IV-4: Brandywine Community Center and Surrounding Area and Map IV-5: Brandywine Community Center Core and Edges). It is centered on a future bus rapid transit (BRT) or light rail transit (LRT) station, located generally east of a new interchange at MD 5 and A-55 (Accokeek/Brandywine Road realigned). Development concepts for the community center are discussed in Section C, Center and Corridor.

**Unique Land Use Categories in the CBA Sector Plan in Subregion 5**

In the portion of Subregion 5 that is addressed in the 2013 *Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan* (CBA), the recommended future land uses within the boundaries of CBA are incorporated into the future land uses in Subregion 5 (Map IV-1: Future Land Use). The commercial and mixed-use land use categories in the CBA sector plan vary from those in the Subregion 5 master plan in the breakdown of the uses within the Commercial and Mixed Use categories. These use categories are defined in the CBA sector plan as follows:
Commercial
This is typically a broad category that includes a wide array of commercial uses including retail, services, repair, and office uses. It includes large shopping centers, small strip centers, and miscellaneous establishments such as auto services and sales. This plan proposes to break this category into several subcategories, further defining the specific type of commercial use being recommended. The subcategories include the following:

- Commercial-Neighborhood
- Commercial-Office
- Commercial-Production, Distribution, and Repair
- Commercial-Shopping Center

Mixed Use
Includes multiple uses, for example, residential, commercial, and institutional, on one property or within one zoning classification. Areas with mixed-use may vary with respect to their dominant land use: i.e., commercial uses dominate land uses in a commercial mixed-use classification while residential uses dominate in a residential mixed-use classification. The Mixed Use category is higher density without a required dominant use. Mixed Use subcategories include the following:

- Residential Mixed Use
- Commercial Mixed Use
- Institutional Mixed Use
- Mixed Use

B. COMMUNITIES
As described in Chapter III, Subregion 5 is divided into three communities: Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton/Tippett. This section describes the plan’s broad vision and recommendations for the future character and development of these communities.

Goals
- In developing areas, achieve high-quality, suburban development organized around a network of park, open space, and community facilities.
- Provide for compatible new development in older, established communities of Accokeek, Brandywine, and Clinton.
- In rural areas, preserve agricultural and forested working landscapes and protect significant cultural landscapes, scenic vistas, and landmark and historical sites. Ensure that new development respects and fits into the existing vernacular landscape rather than visually dominating it.

Accokeek
Accokeek is the most rural portion of Subregion 5. Development is largely concentrated along MD 210, Indian Head Highway; east and west of this highway are areas dominated by woodlands, farm fields, nurseries, and open areas. The area west of MD 210 includes Piscataway National Park, operated by the National Park Service, and the Moyaone Reserve, a low density area (standard lot size of five acres), also within the Mount Vernon viewshed protection easement. The rural area east of MD 210 extends to Gardner Road, west of Brandywine.
The linear mix of business, service, institutional, and residential uses along approximately two miles of Livingston Road between the U.S. Post Office, west of MD 210 (Indian Head Highway), and Kellers Market (near Bealle Hill Road), form the rural ‘main street’ of Accokeek. In addition to this stretch of Livingston Road, a community shopping center anchored by a grocery store, several restaurants, various businesses, and a church, located east of MD 210, along with B & J’s BBQ establishment and various commercial businesses located west of MD 210 are recognized as the heart of Accokeek. A mile south of the intersection of MD 210 and Livingston Road is a second commercial area in Accokeek. The Manokeek Village Shopping Center is located in the southeast quadrant of MD 210 and MD 228. It consists of a large grocery store, a bank, fast food restaurants, and retail uses. Senior housing is being developed opposite this shopping center in the northeast quadrant of MD 210 and MD 228. Along MD 228, at its intersection with Manning Road East, development of a mixed-use project is anticipated.

During the master plan preparation process, approximately 70 acres of undeveloped land between the two existing Accokeek shopping centers was the subject of discussion and conflicting opinions about its future development. This site is strategically located at an anticipated interchange at MD 210 and MD 373. How this land is developed will greatly influence the character of the Accokeek community. Several planning concepts for this tract of land were considered during the Subregion 5 master plan preparation process.

These included:
• a mix of residential, employment, and institutional uses
• “big box” commercial development that could provide types of retail not currently available in Accokeek
• residential
• a new high school

Ultimately, the decision was to designate the area for future Residential Low development.

**Livingston Road**

With care and attention, the traditional character of Livingston Road, between the US Post Office west of MD 210 and Kellers Market, to the east, can be maintained and enhanced as additional development occurs. Today, the overall “feel” of the roadway is one of quiet, slow-paced rural life. Views are generally closed because of extensive tree cover behind buildings. The roadway can be divided into three segments: rural, residential, and commercial, based on adjoining land uses, views from the roadway, building location and settings, and landscaping and vegetation (Map IV-2: Livingston Road Corridor). To maintain and enhance the character of the Livingston Road corridor, the following guidelines should be applied.
when reviewing development applications, with due consideration given to site specific conditions and situations:

**Overall guidelines, apply to all segments**

- Limit the number of new access points onto Livingston Road.
- Use quality building materials, vernacular if possible.
- Use compatible materials on the roadway that blend in or look rustic, such as wooden or corten guard rails instead of galvanized steel.
- Use random massing of new plant material to complement and reinforce existing vegetation.
- Use open fencing, such as post-and-rail.
- Create pedestrian linkages or provide footpaths between commercial and residential areas; specifically, provide pedestrian access between the residential and commercial segments.
- Soften overhead utilities, with landscaping especially in the commercial segment where there are fewer trees.

**Commercial Segment**

- Site buildings to orient the fronts or sides toward Livingston Road.
- Achieve consistent setbacks for public and private improvements.
- Locate parking to the side or rear of buildings. Screen parking along street edges. Encourage shared parking where possible.
- Limit height of freestanding signs to keep them visually below the tree line.
- Use muted lighting.
- Plant shade trees.

**Residential Segment**

- Respect existing, predominantly deep, setbacks with large front yards by providing similar setbacks in new development.
- Give consideration to similarity in density, style, bulk, materials, and site layout to adjoining lots. Locate new structures to maintain existing rhythms of building width and spacing.

**Rural Segment**

- Contain views by framing parcels with trees to create clusters of interconnected development set in natural areas.
- Where possible, preserve areas of natural, unmanaged, wooded lots.

**Gateways**

- Highlight gateways into Accokeek from MD 210, such as enhancing the MD 210/Livingston Road intersection with additional landscape features and identifying signage.
- Retain the transportation concept recommended in the 1993 Subregion V master plan for an interchange at Livingston Road and MD 210, with Livingston Road to remain at grade and MD 210 going underneath, to retain character and community connectivity between the east and west sides of MD 210.
**Rural Character and Cultural Landscapes**

Retaining rural character is important to many Accokeek residents, who expressed this view frequently at meetings during the plan preparation process. Some people expressed a strong desire to expand the Rural Tier, mentioned earlier, by connecting the Rural Tier areas on the east and west sides of MD 210. Making major changes to the Rural and Developing tier boundaries is considered undesirable because of the relationship between the tier boundaries and the water and sewer service category designations in the County Water and Sewer Plan. It was concluded that connecting the Rural Tier areas on the east and west sides of MD 210 could not be achieved in a meaningful, rational way, given the existing and approved development in this area. However, the plan contains a response to the desire to protect the rural character with the Residential Low-Transition Area land use designation that applies to many areas in the Developing Tier that are adjacent to the Rural Tier in Accokeek ([Map IV-1: Future Land Use](#)). This designation encourages land owners to use the Conservation Subdivision technique when subdividing their land, as it is the County’s most environmentally sensitive manner of subdividing land for residential development.

The cultural landscapes of the rural communities of Accokeek and Piscataway are part of a nationally significant historic landscape within the scenic viewshed of Mount Vernon, located across the Potomac River. This area, as well as the view across the Potomac River to and from Mount Vernon, should be protected using the controls and processes recommended in the 2007 and 2013 viewshed studies. Land use policies that retain, conserve, and enhance rural character should be utilized during the development process to protect areas of critical vegetation and help ensure protection of the area’s rural character and its historic significance. Appropriate controls should be used during development to ensure that the height, siting, mass, material, and setbacks within the Area of Primary Concern are consistent with the area’s rural character.

**Brandywine**

Brandywine is perhaps the most diverse of the three communities in Subregion 5 with rural, residential, large scale industrial, and highway-oriented commercial uses. Development in Brandywine is currently concentrated in a few nodes, such as the area near T.B., the large commercial and industrial uses between MD 5/US 301 and the CSX railroad, the original Brandywine neighborhood where Brandywine Road crosses the CSX railroad tracks, and residential subdivisions such as Clinton Acres, Chaddsford, and McKendree Village. The western portion of Brandywine is in the Rural Tier. As described in Section C, Center and Corridor, considerable development is envisioned for the Brandywine Community Center and the immediate surrounding community.
Map IV-3: Mt. Vernon Viewshed Area of Primary Concern
Village of Brandywine

The historic village of Brandywine was platted circa 1870 as “Brandywine City” along the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad (see Chapter III: A Vision for Subregion 5). The community now extends from the railroad tracks (now CSX) west to Timothy Branch north and south of MD 381 (Brandywine Road). A portion of the community is east of the railroad in the Subregion 6 planning area. Public and quasi-public uses in this small village include an elementary school, post office, and the Brandywine Volunteer Fire Department (Company 40), as well as churches, a bank and a few stores. Residential development consists of mostly homes built between the 1930s and 1990s, and two homes that are designated National Register Historic Sites. The village includes several additional historic properties.

While this Subregion 5 master plan pays a lot of attention to the recommended Brandywine Community Center, preservation and enhancement of existing neighborhoods is also an important consideration. During the plan preparation process, some residents raised concerns regarding the future viability of the village, the large amount of truck traffic on MD 381 (gravel and timber), and a desire for commercial revitalization. Residents noted appreciation of the quiet, off-the-beaten-track elements of the village, and its convenient location with respect to employment centers and transportation.

As a result of the planning process, a special study of the revitalization strategies and opportunities was prepared in collaboration with the community. The focus of the Brandywine Revitalization and Preservation Study, February 2012, is a stretch of the Brandywine Road between the CSX railroad tracks and Timothy Branch. It includes several historic sites, two churches, Brandywine Elementary School, a post office, retail commercial, office, and industrial land uses. The study provides recommendations and implementation actions pertaining to transportation improvements along Brandywine Road and rural village community design concepts with historic preservation as a guiding principle. Community members and staff may use the recommendations and implementation strategies in the study to advocate for development that can revitalize the community.
Other Brandywine Development

The remaining portions of the Brandywine community are envisioned as being primarily low density residential. Much of the future residential development would be in large master-planned subdivisions, particularly in the northern and western portions of the community, such as Saddle Creek and the Estates at Pleasant Valley.

The Future Land Use map shows a small area on the west side of MD 5 at Moores Road for residential use since access to MD 5 will be terminated when MD 5 becomes a freeway making the area unsuitable for commercial use.

Rural and Environmental Concerns

As in Accokeek, rural character is an important consideration in the portions of Brandywine nearest the Rural Tier. The response, in the master plan, to these concerns is to designate western portions of the Developing Tier in Brandywine as Residential Low-Transition Area (Map IV-1: Future Land Use).

The protection of Mattawoman Creek is another important concern in Brandywine. In addition to protecting rural character, the Residential Low-Transition Area designation also helps to protect water quality in Mattawoman Creek, reducing impervious surface and stormwater flows to the creek and its tributaries by encouraging the use of conservation subdivision techniques.

Clinton/Tippett

Clinton and Tippett communities contain both well-established and new suburban developments. The portion of Clinton along MD 5 and MD 223, west to Temple Hills Road, is largely developed, though there are infill opportunities on previously undeveloped land, or on land that was partially developed at low densities and can be redeveloped. This area is the oldest part of Clinton and has the highest densities.

Undeveloped residential land in Clinton is located east of MD 5, north of Surratts Road, and north of Piscataway Creek west of MD 5.

West of Louise F. Cosca Regional Park is the area referred to as Tippett. The landscape is still mostly wooded and rural, but much of this area has also been platted for future development in large subdivisions such as Bevard North and Wolfe Farm. Although the slowdown in the housing market that began in 2007 has slowed the pace of development in this area, the general pattern of future development is largely set. The primary development issue in Clinton and Tippett is ensuring that the area functions well in the future, especially with respect to transportation and public facilities.

MD 223 (Piscataway Road)

MD 223 is the major road artery for the community and the primary route to access MD 5 and the shopping centers along MD 223. With very few alternative routes available that do not go through residential neighborhoods, MD 223 carries local and regional traffic, and several intersections are failing. Options to manage development until intersection improvements and alternative routes are built are discussed in Chapter VI: Transportation.

As a condition of subdivision approval for the Bevard North development in Tippett, the MD 223/Brandywine Road/Old Branch Avenue intersection in Clinton will be reconstructed, adding two through lanes, an exclusive right-turn lane, and an exclusive left-turn lane on both the eastbound and westbound approaches. This project, while necessary for area traffic, has the potential to negatively affect the character of Clinton’s core, unless it is designed with attention to the needs of pedestrians, as well as drivers.

1 Access to MD 5 will be via A-65 or A-63, see Chapter VI: Transportation.
designing the MD 223 road improvements, the following design elements should be considered to ensure creation of an attractive corridor (area comprising the roadway and the land adjacent to the roadway):

- Roadway character
- Street furniture
- Historic elements
- Parking
- Plant materials and screening
- Overhead utilities
- Lighting
- Signage
- Sidewalks

**Infill, redevelopment, and retrofit**

Clinton faces a couple of issues common to maturing suburbs on major traffic routes: managing infill development and maintaining community character in light of regional traffic needs.

Infill is the development of land in existing areas that was left vacant during the development of the suburb. The older parts of Clinton have a number of infill sites. Some of these sites are on Old Branch Avenue within one half mile of the traditional center of Clinton, the MD 223/Brandywine Road/Old Branch Avenue intersection.

Infill provides opportunities and challenges. The opportunity is to add new uses and/or housing types not currently available in the community, adding variety and diversity to the community and more customers for local businesses. The challenge is to ensure that new development fits seamlessly into the existing fabric of the community. Prince George’s County has experienced successful infill development in its older communities. Guidelines for successful infill include:

- **Compatibility**: Ensure buildings are appropriately scaled for their site and recognize adjacent land use and development. Give consideration to similarity in density, setback, style, bulk, materials, and site layout to surrounding residential areas. Locate new structures to maintain existing rhythms of building width and spacing, with setbacks that respect predominant setbacks in the neighborhood.

- **Heights**: New dwellings should generally be within 10–15 percent of the height of adjacent dwellings. The proportion (relationship of height to width) of new structures should be as similar as possible and compatible with the proportion of existing adjacent structures.

- **Variety**: Use quality materials and architectural detailing and, where possible, provide a range of housing forms to add variety and provide diversity and choice.

- **Open space**: Incorporate public and private open spaces, such as pocket parks and tot lots, to enhance the appearance and environmental character of the community.

- **Trees**: Mature trees are an important part of neighborhood character. Maintain mature trees wherever possible.

- **Fences**: Use open fences or low hedges rather than high walls.

- **Circulation and connectivity**: Connect on-site and off-site roads, sidewalks, trails, streetscapes, and open space networks. Lay out new streets in a size and scale to maintain continuity of the existing community’s circulation system. Avoid closed street systems, and generally restrict culs-de-sac to a short keyhole design.
Retrofitting is the adding of connections or facilities to improve the functionality of an area after development has taken place. In Clinton, for example, the Woodyard Crossing shopping center does not allow for easy access from homes on adjoining streets to the west, such as Woodley Road. These residents are required to go onto MD 223 or MD 5 to access the shopping center, adding unnecessary trips to the road network. “Pedestrian access only” might be provided if vehicle access cannot be provided, or if vehicle access is undesirable and might attract cut-through traffic from other neighborhoods.

Pedestrian and bicycle connectivity is particularly important in the denser areas of Clinton, parts of which lack sidewalks. Here, local retail and public facilities such as the Clinton-Surratts library, Surrattsville High School, several churches, and the northern part of Cosca Regional Park are within a half- to three-quarter-mile radius of the key MD 223/Brandywine Road/Old Branch Avenue intersection. Chapter VI: Transportation, discusses options and ideas to retrofit this area with a pedestrian-bicycle network. The CBA sector plan recommends a multi-use boulevard in this portion of MD 223.

For summaries of each of the focus areas in Clinton, see the Corridor discussion later in this chapter. For more in depth information see the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan.

In Tippett, Hyde Field and abutting land to the southwest is the largest undeveloped area. This area was designated for large-scale employment use since 1993 and is currently used for sand and gravel mining, as a general aviation airport, and for vehicle storage on a property south of the airport. During the master plan preparation process the community discussed the future land use designation of this approximately 500 acre area. Market assessments suggest it is not suited for large scale employment use due to its location far from major highways. Residential low density land use is recommended for the area so as to be compatible with surrounding existing and planned communities.

Note: The Prince “George’s County Circuit Court for Case Number CAL13-24972, issued a Court Order dated December 18, 2015, that changed the zoning of Hyde Field from the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone and the R-E (Residential Estate) Zone to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone and R-S (Residential- Suburban) Zone, subject to CR-61-2009, and an Agreement attached to the Court Order. The L-A-C Zone is consistent with a “mixed-use” land use recommendation, which was not recommended for this property in the 2013 approved master plan. The R-S Zone is consistent with the “residential low” land use recommended for this property in the 2013 approved master plan.

**Strategies**

**Short Term**

- Prepare a Brandywine village preservation and revitalization study. The study should address infill development, redevelopment, transportation, and circulation patterns including truck traffic, design considerations, and community aspects such as historic and archeological considerations. The Brandywine Revitalization and Preservation Study was completed and published in February 2012.

- Accelerate road improvements in Clinton/Tippett along MD 223 and the construction of alternative routes through identification of new funding sources.

- Develop a staging plan to manage development in a way that minimizes the worsening roadway level of service along MD 223.
C. CENTER AND CORRIDOR

The 2002 General Plan directs growth in Prince George’s County to designated Centers and Corridors. The vision for centers is to promote development of mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities in context with surrounding neighborhoods and with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented design. “The Centers in the Developing Tier should be developed at densities that are high enough to generate ridership that justifies the cost of extending rail transit. They should be developed at sufficient intensities with integrated mixed land uses, sustain existing bus service, and create additional opportunities for more walk-, bike-, or drive-to-transit commuting.”

Within Subregion 5, the 2002 General Plan targets growth in a “possible future community center” in Brandywine, and along the MD 5 (Branch Avenue) Corridor. This master plan sets forth goals, policies and strategies to promote growth in these designated areas. The definition of the Brandywine Community Center is refined in terms of its boundaries, future land use and circulation patterns. The planned residential land uses in the MD 5 Corridor provide the keystone for future transit-oriented development at strategically located corridor nodes identified on Map IV-1: Future Land Use.

Goals

- Establish a mixed-use, transit-oriented Brandywine Community Center along MD 5 between the area near the MD 5/US 301 interchange and north of the intersection of MD 5 McKendree/Cedarville roads.
- Expand existing concentrations of population and employment along the MD 5 Corridor, particularly in Clinton, at corridor nodes, and within the Brandywine Community Center.

In addition, the 2002 General Plan states the following goals for Centers and Corridors:

- Capitalize on public investment in the existing transportation system.
- Promote compact, mixed-use development at moderate to high densities.
- Ensure transit-supportive and transit-serviceable development.
- Require pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented design.
- Ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.
Brandywine Community Center

The area targeted for growth in Brandywine, roughly centered on the future interchange at MD 5/US 301 and planned A-55, and distinct from the historic village of Brandywine (Section B: Communities), has been the subject of considerable planning interest for many years. The 1993 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B identified this location as the Brandywine Special Study Area and envisioned a new community west of US 301/MD 5 where a mixture of residential and commercial development would be concentrated. The area east of US 301/MD 5 was designated for employment development (office, distribution, manufacturing) in the 1993 master plan.

The 2002 General Plan reinforced, in part, the 1993 master plan’s recommendations by characterizing the Brandywine area as a “possible future Community Center.” The intent was to encourage the establishment of a focal point for residential and non-residential activity, developed at densities that are high enough to produce transit ridership sufficient to justify the cost of extending and maintaining transit service along MD 5. In addition, high transit ridership would mitigate the area’s traffic congestion, air pollution, and energy consumption.

Economic Potential

One input to determine the type and scale of land uses recommended within the Brandywine Community Center and its surrounding area is a review of the current and future (year 2030) economic potential of the area. By 2030, residential development in the Brandywine area alone will be able to support a community retail center and office space. The ability of the Brandywine Community Center to attract larger amounts of commercial and office development, particularly the concentrations necessary to support transit, depends on the way in which Brandywine distinguishes itself from the automobile-oriented commercial and business uses located in Waldorf (Charles County) (the closest major concentration of non-residential uses). Developing the Brandywine Community Center as a high-amenity, pedestrian-oriented center could create the necessary distinction from Waldorf. A strong “sense of place” achieved through design features would create an identity for Brandywine that would be unique in this region of Prince George’s County.

Community Center Core

The core of the Brandywine Community Center is an approximately 120-acre area recommended for transit-oriented, mixed-use development focused on a future transit station near the interchange of MD 5/US 301 and an arterial road (relocated A-55). The development concept for the Brandywine Community Center and surrounding areas are shown in Map IV-4: Brandywine Community Center and Surrounding Area, and Map IV-5: Brandywine Community Center Core and Edges.

The community center core is on the east side of MD 5/US 301, extending approximately one-quarter mile from the recommended transit station. The core is envisioned as a mixed-use area containing moderate to high density residential (15 to 30 dwelling units per acre), commercial, and employment uses that would generate approximately 25 employees per acre. Public uses, such as schools, parks, and the transit station, would comprise 10 percent to 20 percent of the total area. This area would abut existing and planned major retail land uses to the south, such as Costco and Target. Big box retail is inappropriate within the community center core. Other uses that would be inappropriate in the core area would be auto-oriented or land intensive uses, such as automotive repair, drive-in restaurants, or lumberyards. To the north of the core area would be the more intense elements of the anticipated mixed-use development called Villages at Timothy Branch.
Community Center Edges

The edges of the Brandywine Community Center are approximately one half to three-quarters of a mile from the planned transit station. Although some areas west of MD 5/US 301 are within one-third of a mile of the transit station (and thus, within walking distance for some riders), the MD 5/US 301 expressway poses a significant barrier to pedestrian accessibility. Such areas are therefore considered part of the community center edge, rather than the core. On the east side of MD 5/US 301, the southern community center edge includes Costco, Target, and the other existing and planned large-scale retail and wholesale commercial establishments. Additional commercial, light industrial, or other employment generating uses are encouraged.

The northeastern community center edge includes a portion of the Villages at Timothy Branch community. This community would include a mix of residential uses, predominantly single-family attached and detached housing. The development concept for the northern portion of the Villages at Timothy Branch community includes a mixed commercial and residential node near the intersection of A-63 and MD 381 (Brandywine Road). To the north of MD 381, the Brandywine Business Park property is proposed to develop as a predominately medium-density residential community called Stephen’s Crossing. It was previously envisioned as a mix of commercial, employment, and light industrial uses. While these areas are beyond the community center edge, they would be tied to the community center by road linkages and a complementary land use pattern.

Community center edges to the west of MD 5/US 301 should contain a mix of residential and commercial land uses, although these areas are not expected to develop the high-density mix envisioned for the community center core. Commercial uses may be clustered in pods, rather than mixed among residential uses, and residential densities would range from 4 to 20 dwelling units per acre.

Recreation and Trails

An area of passive open space area would be located on the west side of MD 5/US 301, in an area of wetlands and stream headwaters. This open space would be retained primarily to preserve those sensitive environmental areas, but would also serve as an amenity for future development in this portion of the community center edge. It will also serve as a connecting point for proposed off-road trails. As described in Chapter VI: Transportation, stream valley trails along Mattawoman Creek, Burch Branch, and Timothy Branch would be accessible from the Brandywine Community Center and the surrounding area. Part of the Timothy Branch trail system would follow the tributary along the west side of US 301/MD 5 to the open space near the A-55 interchange. On-road bicycle lanes or sidepaths are envisioned for major roads in the vicinity (Chapter VI: Transportation). Additional trails and small parks should be built as a part of new development. Trails and parks should be linked together, and designed to protect sensitive natural resources. South of the community center, a 50-acre community park on McKendree Road, adjacent to the Mattawoman Watershed Park, is recommended (Chapter VII: Public Facilities).

Environmental Considerations

Most of the Brandywine Community Center lies within the Mattawoman Creek Watershed, a highly sensitive watershed, particularly sensitive to changes in impervious coverage (Chapter V: Environment). Protection of Mattawoman Creek and its tributaries will require special attention during the development of the Brandywine Community Center. This includes low impact development techniques to reduce impervious surfaces and improve water quality.
Wetlands, streams, and their buffers should be protected to the greatest degree possible. Including these features as “green” or open space amenities can add value to development in and around the community center, while providing necessary open space, park, and recreation land for residents. New development should incorporate best management practices and environmental site design (ESD) consistent with the revisions to the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual\(^2\) to manage stormwater runoff. Finally, the designation of some land southwest of Accokeek Road as Residential Low–Transition Area will also help to protect tributaries of Mattawoman Creek.

**Transportation Network**

To support the land use concept, a number of transportation network improvements are recommended. While Chapter VI: Transportation contains a full discussion of road, pedestrian/bicycle, transit, and other transportation network improvements for Subregion 5, this section provides detail for the Brandywine Community Center.

The overall emphasis of the road network in and around the Brandywine Community Center is to separate regional through traffic from local vehicles accessing the center and nearby uses. Key elements of the proposed road network for the Brandywine Community Center are:

- The upgrade-in-place of MD 5/US 301 to an access-controlled freeway. This may include collector-distributor lanes between the MD 5/US 301 merge and the McKendree Road interchange. This road would primarily serve regional through traffic between southern Maryland, I-495, and US 50.

- A full interchange at the junction of MD 5/US 301 and A-55. The design of this interchange could be either a full diamond or a half-diamond on the south side of MD 373, relocated. The alignment of A-55 is moved south compared to the 1993 Master Plan, to provide spacing between this interchange and adjacent interchanges at McKendree/Cedarville Road and MD 5.

- Spine Road (A-63) on the east side of Brandywine Community Center. This arterial is the primary thoroughfare serving the core and edges on the east side of US 301/MD 5. A-63 is envisioned to cross Timothy Branch once. However, Map IV-4: Brandywine Community Center and Surrounding Area, shows two potential crossing locations:
  - A crossing near the southern end of Matapeake Business Drive (I-500) would avoid crossing the actively used Soil Safe property (the employment land use east of Timothy Branch), but might have greater environmental impacts on Timothy Branch compared to the A-63 alignment.
  - A crossing in the vicinity of the proposed transit station, to align with the A-55 interchange and the northern end of I-500 might have lesser environmental impacts than the southern crossing, but would cut through the Soil Safe property.

Through a separate process, the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) is working with Prince George’s County and Charles County on the Southern Maryland Transit Study, investigating options for transit service right-of-way preservation between White Plains in Charles County and the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station, using the MD 5/US 301 corridor. The transit mode could be bus rapid transit (BRT) or light rail transit (LRT), and would generally run along the eastern edge of MD 5/US 301 (Chapter VI: Transportation).

\(^2\) New rules were adopted in early 2009.
Map IV-4: Brandywine Community Center and Surrounding Area
Map IV-5: Brandywine Community Center Core and Edges
In addition to the transit station in the core of the Brandywine Community Center, a second station is shown near the planned MD 5/A-63 interchange. This station would be placed on or near the site of the current park-and-ride lot, and is envisioned as being park-and-ride oriented, attracting residents from broad portions of Subregions 5 and 6. Large parking facilities could be considered here.

Development within the community center core and edges would include sidewalks and other pedestrian/bicycle facilities. The core would be within walking distance of the transit station, while the edges would be within reasonable bicycling distance of the transit station, and would also be considered walkable for some pedestrians. As described in Chapter VI: Transportation, a circulator bus system (local transit shuttles or people-movers) should also be considered to serve elements of the Brandywine Community Center as demand increases.

**Design Considerations**

Urban design considerations such as architectural scale, bulk, and style, street and sidewalk widths, vegetation, and building materials are crucial details that make a place attractive, livable, and establish a community’s unique character. Guidelines regarding such elements can help to reinforce community character, while allowing appropriate design flexibility. Developing design guidelines with the community could not be achieved within the master plan’s time frame.

**MD 5 (Branch Avenue) Corridor**

The 2002 General Plan designates MD 5 as one of seven growth corridors in the County. The intent of this designation is to concentrate development and encourage redevelopment at key points along designated major transportation routes. Within the Developing Tier, the General Plan’s vision is for corridor development that is of moderate density and compatible with the surrounding community. Core centers should include the area that is between one-quarter and one-half of a mile walking distance from a transit station or stop.

The planned transit corridor along MD 5 supports the General Plan’s corridor concept, and the master plan emphasizes preservation of right of way for the transit route (Chapter VI: Transportation). As described in the previous section, a transit node is planned in Brandywine at the MD 5/A-63 interchange north of TB. This station is envisioned as being park-and-ride oriented. Land use in the area surrounding the transit station (on both sides of MD 5) would be a mix of commercial and institutional uses east and west of MD 5. Medium density residential uses are envisioned for the area between Brandywine Road and Accokeek Road on the west side of the interchange.
The upgrade of MD 5 to a freeway would change other elements of the road network in the T.B. area. Brandywine Road (MD 381) would be truncated on either side of MD 5, restricting service for adjacent commercial uses. Traffic on Brandywine Road and Accokeek Road bound for MD 5 would be redirected to A-63. The reconfigured Brandywine Road (C-613) and Accokeek Road (C-527) would likely tie into the A-63 interchange’s ramp system.

Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan

The MD 5 Corridor is envisioned as a transit way composed of either bus rapid transit (BRT) or light rail transit (LRT), including three transit stops in Clinton. Alternatives include a station in the northeast quadrant of MD 5/MD 223, near or as part of the Clinton Park Shopping Center; in the southeast quadrant of MD 5/MD 223, adjacent to a residential neighborhood; or on the west side of MD 5 in conjunction with the existing park and ride. Transit stations are also identified adjacent to the Southern Maryland Hospital Center at MD 5/Surratts Road and at MD 5 at either Coventry Way or Allentown Road. Any of these locations could allow for more dense redevelopment near the station as the area becomes more transit-oriented. The Maryland Transit Administration is studying alternative alignments for BRT or light rail along the corridor. This concept promotes the redevelopment or densification of land near these transit nodes as pedestrian and transit-oriented development.

Furthering this concept, on April 2, 2013, the Prince George’s County District Council approved the Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (PGCPB No. 13-09 and CR-24-2013).

Following are summaries of the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (CBA) recommendations for three focus areas in Clinton:

- At the Southern Maryland Hospital transit node, CBA envisions new housing, local serving retail, a plaza and ample open space conveniently located at the heart of an expanded medical campus. The sector plan designates Institutional Mixed-Use as the future land use of the medical center to allow a range of accessory uses common at medical complexes. It designates Residential Medium-High in the southwest quadrant of MD 5 and Surratts Road, opposite the hospital.

- The Downtown Clinton focus area incorporates areas adjacent to the intersections of MD 223/MD 5 and MD 223/Old Branch Avenue and Brandywine Road. This area is envisioned, in the CBA sector plan, as transformed into a vibrant, mixed-use, transit-supported destination spanning Branch Avenue, providing a range of housing types and new office development that residents and workers can safely walk or bicycle to and from. The CBA sector plan recommends a multi-use boulevard in a portion of Woodyard Road (MD 223). In this portion, MD 223 is reconstructed as an attractive boulevard that provides for, but separates local, through, and non-vehicular traffic. A new connected street grid contributes to the synergy of the area.

- In the Coventry Way Village focus area the CBA sector plan recommends increasing employment land uses such as production, distribution, repair, and contractor businesses serving Joint Base Andrews, and moderate-density residential development clustered around the planned transit station. Key design principles strive to ensure good connectivity along Coventry Way between Alexandria Ferry Road (and Joint Base Andrews) and Old Branch Avenue, and multimodal access to transit.

For detailed information about the planning recommendations for each of these focus areas, see the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan, Chapter IV, Strategic Plan for Redevelopment and Revitalization.
D. RURAL TIER

The 2002 General Plan designates a significant portion of land in the southern part of Subregion 5 in the Rural Tier policy area. In these areas, the County policy is to conserve large portions of land for woodland, wildlife habitat, recreation and agricultural pursuits, and to preserve rural character and significant scenic vistas.

The Rural Tier comprises almost thirty percent of Subregion 5 in two areas: west of MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) and between Accokeek and Brandywine. The Rural Tier contains farm land and extensive forest as well as other environmental, scenic, and historic resources. These are the last remaining largely undeveloped areas that are not committed to a suburban development pattern. These areas are also under development pressure due to easy access from them to major highways and their strategic location close to existing or planned metropolitan centers, including Washington, D.C., National Harbor, Branch Avenue Metro, Largo, and Westphalia (planned).

This master plan uses the term “agriculture” to cover the broadest range of working landscapes and agricultural enterprises including cropland, livestock, nurseries, equine, forestry, and other specialty enterprises such as vineyards and wineries. This chapter identifies land use policies to allow agriculture and forestry to continue and flourish in the subregion, but other policies and actions are needed in the areas of economic and business development and support, strategic planning, and marketing. These are discussed in Chapter VIII: Economic Development.

Goals

• Preserve the Rural Tier and implement the 2002 General Plan with the same density of allowed-future development as in adjacent planning areas.
• Preserve access to mineral resources where sufficient and economically viable mining potential exists.
• Conserve valuable agricultural and other natural resource lands before they are developed.

Policies

• Establish a priority preservation area (PPA) capable of supporting profitable agricultural and forestry enterprises.
• Allow future low density residential development and protect as much as possible of the remaining undeveloped land during the development process.
• Protect water quality in Mattawoman Creek and its tributaries by implementing land use policies that reduce non-source pollution and improve water quality.
**Priority Preservation Area**

All Maryland counties must have a certified priority preservation element as part of their general plans if their agricultural land preservation programs are to be eligible for certification by the state. Once certified by the state, these areas become eligible for a considerable amount of public funding for land preservation.

A priority preservation area (PPA) is one that:

- Contains productive agricultural or forest soils, or is capable of supporting profitable agricultural and forestry enterprises where productive soils are lacking.
- Is governed by local policies that stabilize the agricultural and forest land base so that development does not convert or compromise agricultural or forest resources.
- Is large enough to support the kind of agricultural operations that the County seeks to preserve.
- Is accompanied by the County’s acreage goal for land to be preserved through easements and zoning in the PPA equal to at least 80 percent of the remaining undeveloped areas of land in the area.

The PPA in Subregion 5 covers approximately 10,495 acres, or 81 percent of the Rural Tier in Subregion 5. The PPA is in two parts, one between Accokeek and Brandywine, and the other west of MD 210 (Map IV-6: Priority Preservation Area). The PPA is supported by the General Plan policy goals on preserving rural resources, character, and open space in the Rural Tier. Other master plans may recommend additional PPAs elsewhere in Prince George’s County. It is important to note that areas outside the PPA contain rural resources worthy of protection. For more information about the PPA, see the 2012 * Adopted and Approved Priority Preservation Area Functional Master Plan*.

The PPA boundaries in Subregion 5 were created using the definition of a PPA and the following criteria:

**Table IV-2: Criteria Used to Designate the Priority Preservation Area**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Criteria</th>
<th>Supporting Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas in which it is known that landowners are interested in agricultural land preservation.</td>
<td>Areas with mineral resources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas with forest resources, with special emphasis on existing or future potential hardwood resources.</td>
<td>Rational, simple boundaries, following, where possible, natural features and roads, rather than property lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas least compromised by development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 The full definition is in the Annotated Code of Maryland Agriculture Article. See also HB 2, 2006.
The land preservation goal within the portion of the PPA in Subregion 5 is approximately 6,600 acres, of which, approximately 3,800 acres are not yet protected (Table IV-3: Priority Preservation Area Acreage Goal). This number may be refined as more detailed resource mapping is undertaken during the state process of certifying the recommended priority preservation area.

Achieving the PPA acreage protection goal will require a broad range of policies and actions in the areas of zoning, easements, and other forms of land preservation.

1. **Parks and open space acquisitions:** The County expects to continue its long-term policy of acquiring land for recreation and natural resource protection in Subregion 5, especially along major stream valleys such as Mattawoman. Some of these acquisitions will be within the PPA.

2. **Purchase of development rights (PDR)—agricultural easements:** Purchase of development rights (PDR) is expected to be a major source of land preservation, building on demand that has been growing in recent years. The County’s first agricultural easements were sold in 2004 (in Subregion 5). The County adopted its own PDR program in 2006, the Historic Agricultural Resources Preservation Program (HARPP). Interest is expected to be stimulated further if the County can add an installment purchase agreement option, in which easement payments are made over time rather than in one lump sum.

3. **Protective easements:** Various types of easements can also contribute to land preservation in the PPA. These include historic preservation easements established through the Maryland Historic Trust; environmental easements held by organizations such as the Maryland Environmental Trust, which may be acquired or donated; scenic easements held by the National Park Service; and other local easements. In many parts of Maryland, local land trusts, supported by state legislation, play an important role in land preservation as easement holders or as brokers between landowners and the eventual easement holders. Promotion of the potential for local land trusts is a tool for local preservation. Organizations such as the Trust for Public Land and The Conservation Fund may also become active, as they are in other parts of the state, as local land trust partners develop.

4. **Conservation subdivisions:** Although the easement programs and resource mitigation requirements are intended and expected to direct development out of the Rural Tier or PPA, some development can be expected to take place in these places. Under the County’s conservation subdivision regulations adopted in 2006, subdivisions in the Rural Tier are required to conserve open space, and place under easement, in the O-S Zone a minimum of 60 percent of the gross tract area and in the R-A Zone a minimum of 50 percent of the gross tract area.

5. **Woodland conservation:** The County’s Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance requires mitigation for development activities that result in the clearing of woodland. The application of this ordinance, together with enhancements proposed in this section, will result in woodland conservation and tree canopy retention in the PPA from both developing sites and in off-site woodland conservation banks established to provide mitigation for development outside the PPA.

Landowners can be encouraged and assisted in establishing woodland conservation banks through retention or afforestation within the PPA, which can sell woodland conservation transfer credits to developer properties outside the PPA.
6. **Soil mitigation:** This plan’s policy is to conserve agricultural and other natural resource lands for the future. Fertile agricultural and forest soils are a nonrenewable resource which must be retained in order to sustain agricultural uses. Land development and disturbance should be directed away from class I, II, and III agricultural or forest soils in the PPA towards more suitable soils, while maintaining a sustainable land development pattern. Class I, II, and III soil types are the most fertile agricultural and forest soils and their presence may be required for certain state agricultural easement programs. Mitigation for the loss of valuable soils to development may take the form of either purchasing easements on resource lands elsewhere in the Rural Tier, within the PPA preferred, or paying a fee-in-lieu to support the County’s Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program. The precedent for such action is the County’s Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance which requires mitigation for development that affects woodland anywhere in the County. In the future the County expects there to be demand for land for other types of mitigation such as carbon offsets (planting trees or preserving woodlands to offset greenhouse gas emissions) or for nutrient trading (planting trees or preserving woodlands to compensate for nitrogen phosphorus loading that exceeds watershed load limits).

**Table IV-3: Priority Preservation Area Acreage Goal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Priority Preservation Area</td>
<td>10,495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Developed*</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Undeveloped (1 minus 2)</td>
<td>8,276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Total Protection Goal (80% x 3)</td>
<td>6,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Already Protected**</td>
<td>2,802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Remaining Protection Goal (5-4)</td>
<td>3,819</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on M-NCPPC Subregion 5 Existing Land Use.
** Includes county and state parks, state forests, and other state land. Does not include all wetlands and floodplains.

**Note on easement compatibility within a property**

To encourage participation in land conservation and stewardship opportunities available in the PPA, property owners should be made aware of the range of programs available and their applicability and interrelationship in the protection of natural land resources. Different protection mechanisms may be applicable to different portions of a site, and may co-exist without difficulty. Overlapping easements may be in conflict with County and state laws regarding the various easements. The relationship between different land protection mechanisms needs to be carefully evaluated when determining the best mechanisms for a site. Other types of easements, such as those discussed previously under “Protective Easements,” can also contribute to land preservation in the PPA. These include protective easements such as historic preservation easements established through the Maryland Historic Trust or environmental easements held by organizations such as the Maryland Environmental Trust, which may be acquired or be donated. In many parts of Maryland, local land trusts, supported by legislation, play an important role in land preservation as easement holders or as brokers between landowners and the eventual easement holders. Promotion of the potential for local land trusts is a tool for local preservation. Organizations such as the Trust for Public Land and The Conservation Fund may also become active, as they are in other parts of the state, as local land trust partners develop.
Regulation and Preservation of Agriculture

Farming on the urban fringe is changing. As discussed further in Chapter VIII: Economic Development, the structural change is towards smaller farming operations that offer a more diversified basket of goods (such as produce, livestock, equine, value added products and services, and agritourism activities) than did traditional grain and tobacco operations.

Zoning codes need to support this by allowing farming operations the flexibility to use land in ways that might not be suitable in residential areas. While few farms in the County are currently experimenting with these kinds of non-traditional agricultural activities, the trend is growing and the County should ready itself by having supportive zoning in place.

Agricultural Land Preservation Program

In 2008, Prince George’s County applied to the State Department of Planning and the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF) to certify its agricultural land preservation program. Certification enables the County to retain 75 percent of agricultural land transfer tax funds for use in land preservation, compared to 33 percent without certification. Between 2004 and 2007, the difference between these percentages averaged $1.2 million per year. Successful certification is an increasingly rigorous process and, beginning in 2009, must include establishment of a PPA, as described in this chapter. The 2012 Priority Preservation Functional Master Plan was approved on July 12, 2012. This was an important step towards the certification of the County’s Agricultural Land Preservation Program, which occurred in 2014.

Sand and Gravel Resources

Subregion 5 contains extensive mineral resources based on the presence of large sand and gravel deposits associated with the Brandywine formation (Map V-4: Sand and Gravel Resources, Southern Prince George’s County). This resource provides an economic base for jobs, value-added services, and economic benefits (Chapter VIII: Economic Development). However, mining projects can have significant impacts on nearby communities and property owners, particularly with respect to noise, dust, and truck traffic. New and expanding projects go through an extensive review and approval process at the state and County level. At the County level, a special exception is required. As part of the special exception process, the County reviews the effects of the project on the environment as well as potential impacts of noise, dust, and truck traffic on the adjacent communities.

Identifying the location of remaining sand and gravel deposits and planning for the land to transition from a temporary mining use to its ultimate land use should be part of a strategic plan for mineral resources. Regulatory tools, such as an overlay zoning district, would help preserve access to the resource and prevent the preemption of sand and gravel mining by other uses until the resource has been extracted.

Note on mining in the Priority Preservation Area

The portion of the PPA south of Accokeek Road contains some old, active, and future sand and gravel mines. Including these sites in the PPA indicates the County’s long-term policy intent to preserve these lands for productive agriculture and forestry. While in the short-term mining may remove some existing forest stands, through careful reclamation mining sites can be turned into productive land.

4 An overlay zone “lays over” the base zoning district or districts. Within the overlay, special zoning regulations apply.
Strategies

• Designate Rural Tier land in the lowest density residential zoning category that is available.
• Amend the Zoning Ordinance to allow greater flexibility for farm-based marketing, processing, and related uses such as farm stands and agritourism, as follows:
  * Remove or revise the “on the premises” provision in the definition, which limits a farm to processing, treating, etc. only what is produced on that farm.
  * Explicitly include value-added processing in the definition. One possible definition of value-added is, “the processing of an agricultural product in order to increase its market value, including such processes as canning, milling, grinding, freezing, heating, and fermenting. This term includes cheese and wine production.”
  * Explicitly include in the definition, or in the table of uses, equine activities such as boarding, veterinary medical and rehabilitation services, training, showing, and recreational riding activities.
  * Other uses to consider either in the definition or in the table of uses are pick-your-own produce operations, corn mazes, cut-your-own-Christmas-tree farms and flower operations, sales of decorative plant materials, farm tours for fees, and petting zoos.
  * In making these changes, ensure that necessary safeguards to protect the use and enjoyment of adjoining property are included.
• Continue to protect land throughout the Rural Tier through fee simple and easement acquisition and other means, including dedications and restrictions through the development process.
• Increase funding for the County’s PDR program.
• Publicize and conduct outreach among Rural Tier landowners regarding land preservation program options, including voluntary donations of easements to local land trusts.
• Review and amend as necessary the effectiveness of conservation subdivision code requirements (Section 24-152) in preserving viable agricultural lands.

Priority Preservation Area

• Gain state certification of the County’s agricultural preservation program for the PPA established within Subregion 5 and other parts of the County. (In 2014, the State certified the County’s Agricultural Land Preservation Program.)
• Implement the PPA through code revisions, amendments, and programmatic changes as outlined.
  * Develop an installment purchase agreement option.
  * Require mitigation for activities that use soil productivity classes I, II, and III agricultural or forest soils in the Rural Tier in Subregion 5.
  * Stimulate and facilitate landowner interest in donating easements to the Maryland Environmental Trust, and in selling protective easements through a variety of organizations and programs, including MALPF and HARPP, under the County’s Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
  * Consider increasing the open space easement requirement in conservation subdivisions in the PPA: in the O-S Zone from sixty to seventy percent and in the R-A Zone from fifty to sixty percent.

1Current definition: “The ‘use’ of land for farming, dairying, pasturage, apiaries, horticulture, floriculture, and animal husbandry, which may include ‘accessory uses’ for processing, treating, selling, or storing agricultural products produced on a farm (on the premises). The term ‘agriculture’ shall not include the commercial feeding of garbage or offal to animals, the slaughtering of livestock for marketing, or the disposal of sludge except for fertilization of crops, horticultural products, or floricultural products in connection with an active agricultural operation or home gardening.”
E. AVIATION

Joint Base Andrews

Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility Washington, D.C. (JBA), formerly Andrews Air Force Base, is a significant national, regional, and local facility. At the local level, JBA provides employment for many residents of Subregion 5 and Prince George’s County and contributes significantly to the local economy. Base operations have other effects on the local area, including traffic, aircraft noise, land use, real estate, and the environment.

In December 2007, the US Department of Defense updated the 1998 Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study for JBA. The purpose of the AICUZ program is to promote compatible land development in areas subject to aircraft noise and accident potential. Prince George’s County initiated a Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) with JBA in the fall of 2008. The purpose of the JLUS is to balance community interests with the military mission at JBA through land use policies and regulations. This study was completed in 2009.

Goals

- Land use and development is compatible with airport operations in accident potential zones and within the moderate to high noise contours defined by the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone Study for Joint Base Andrews and within aviation policy areas.
- Land uses in the vicinity of general aviation airports that are compatible with flight operations.
- The community is aware of the location of the airport and the occurrence and attendant risk associated with low-flying aircraft.

The Regulatory Environment

Imaginary surfaces, defined by the Federal Aviation Administration, are surfaces in space above and around airfields that need to be kept obstacle-free for safe air navigation. There are seven types of imaginary surfaces that need to be regulated to preclude uses, activities, or structures that might be hazardous to aircraft operations. The outermost surface, the outer horizontal surface, extends from JBA at an elevation of 150 feet above mean sea level, and the approach departure clearance surface extends as far as six miles from Joint Base Andrews, south of Brandywine and west to include portions of Accokeek. From a land use perspective, the key use characteristics that are of concern are:

- Structures within 10 vertical feet of some of the imaginary surfaces
- Uses that would attract birds or waterfowl
- Light emissions that would interfere with pilots’ navigation

Noise

Federal and state regulations and guidelines ensure the reduction of noise levels to acceptable standards. The consensus of these standards is that 65 “A-weighted” decibels (DNL 65 dBA Ldn) is the maximum noise level generally acceptable for residential areas.

---

[5] Other uses of concern not regulated directly or wholly through land use are light emissions that would interfere with pilots, air emissions, and electrical emissions.
Map IV-7: Accident Potential Zones, Noise Contours, and Aviation Policy Areas
Map IV-7: Accident Potential Zones, Noise Contours, and Aviation Policy Areas, shows the area within the 65 dBA Ldn and greater noise exposure area for aircraft operations at JBA. Portions of Subregions 4, 5, and 6 are exposed to aircraft-generated off-base noise. Subregion 5 is affected south of JBA in a roughly 0.75 mile wide band that extends south of Brandywine Road, east of the MD 5/US 301 intersection. (See also recommendations on noise in Chapter V: Environment.)

Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones

The AICUZ study also includes three areas at greater risk of aircraft accidents, aircraft accident potential zones, in both incoming and outgoing directions from the base runways: the clear zone (CZ) and accident potential zones (APZ) I and II (Map IV-7: Accident Potential Zones, Noise Contours, and Aviation Policy Areas). The CZ has the highest accident potential of the three zones, followed by APZ I and APZ II. Federal land use compatibility guidelines have been developed for each noise zone and accident potential zone. In APZ I, the guidelines recommend uses such as: industrial/manufacturing, transportation, communication/utilities, wholesale trade, open space, recreation, and agriculture. Uses that concentrate people in small areas or attract large gatherings of people are not acceptable. In APZ II, compatible uses include those of APZ I, as well as low-density single-family residential, low-intensity personal and business services, and commercial or retail uses.

The CZ on the south side of the runway is entirely within JBA. The area in the APZ I extends south to the MD 223 and Old Alexandria Ferry Road intersection. This area within APZ I includes a mixture of uses with varying degrees of compatibility with the land use guidelines in the AICUZ study. Uses that are consistent with the guidelines are in the industrial area east and west of Old Alexandria Ferry Road, Tanglewood Community Park, and an area north of Bellefonte Lane that was purchased by the federal government in 2007. Uses that are inconsistent with the guidelines are the Tanglewood Special Education Center; the commercial cluster at the MD 223/Old Alexandria Ferry Road intersection; a residential cluster on the west side of Alexandria Ferry Road, north of its intersection with MD 223; and a few residential streets north and south of MD 223, such as Colonial Lane, Green Street, Lantern Lane, and Sweeney Drive.

Over time, some areas in the APZ I have changed from residential uses that are inconsistent to industrial uses that are consistent with the guidelines. One such area is along Poplar Hill Lane and Delano Road. The County has supported these changes provided they comprise contiguous properties, ideally in full blocks, so that intact residential neighborhoods are not broken up by small, industrial uses enabled through piecemeal rezonings. This master plan reinforces the 1993 policy to transition these areas from residential to industrial land uses.

The APZ II extends south to the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center at Dangerfield Drive and Redman Avenue. Incompatible land use includes developed residential areas with densities above two dwelling units per acre, such as Fox Run Estates.

It will be difficult to make all uses around JBA in Subregion 5 fully compatible with the noise guidelines. A portion of the 70 dBA Ldn and greater noise exposure area extends south along Dangerfield Road and Commo Road into some established residential neighborhoods. The JLUS recommends procedures to balance community interests with the military mission at JBA and to minimize conflicts.

---

6 Day-Night Average A-Weighted Sound Level (DNL) is the measure of the total noise environment. DNL averages the sum of all aircraft noise producing events over a 24-hour period, with a 10 dB upward adjustment added to the nighttime events (between 10:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.).
General Aviation Airports

General aviation airports provide an alternate means of travel to and from the region for the business and recreational small plane owner or operator. At general aviation airports, a standardized air traffic circulation pattern is used to regulate air traffic movement to, from, and around airports. The airport traffic pattern is the typical route an airplane will use to depart from or land at an airport. Upon departure, an aircraft is in the airport traffic pattern until it has achieved pattern altitude, when it can fly horizontally toward its destination. An aircraft landing at an airport will enter the traffic pattern at a certain altitude and remain in the pattern until it is on the ground. An aircraft is either ascending or descending while in the pattern. The airport manager establishes the pattern of the airport; it is approved by the FAA and published on navigation maps.

There are two general aviation airports in Subregion 5. Potomac Airfield is located along Tinkers Creek, east of Allentown Road in Rose Valley. Washington Executive Airport is located west of Piscataway Road and south of Steed Road. Locally designated aviation policy areas (APAs) surround each airport to establish standards of safety and land use compatibility. The APA regulations (Section 27-548.32 of the County Code) mitigate risk of damage to persons and property in the event of an aircraft accident. In the vicinity of general aviation airports, the standards:

- Ensure that, immediately beneath an aerial approach, future residential development will be sufficiently low density to allow for open areas in which an aircraft could land in an emergency without endangering lives or damaging property.
- Ensure that the height of new structures will be evaluated for compliance with federal and state height regulations.
- Ensure that prospective purchasers of property in each of the APAs around Washington Executive Airport and Potomac Airfield be notified of the general aviation airport, as shown on Map IV-7: Accident Potential Zones, Noise Contours, and Aviation Policy Areas.
Potomac Airfield, a general aviation airport, is located east of Allentown Road, between Steed Road to the north and Old Fort Hills Road to the south. An airport has operated at this location since the 1960s. Small, general aviation aircraft provide an alternate means of travel to and from the region for the business and recreational small plane owner or operator.

In Prince George’s County there are special exception requirements for airports in Section 27-333 of the County Zoning Ordinance. The Special Exception for Potomac Airfield (SE-1130) was approved in 1965 when County airport regulations were less restrictive. In 2002, the Prince George’s County District Council enacted legislation that established aviation policy areas surrounding all of the County’s general aviation airports. The intent of the legislation is to ensure the safe operation of the airports by mitigating the risks of loss of life or damage to property in the event of crashes. Through zoning and subdivision regulations, aviation policy areas limit the exposure to risk within a mile of the airport runway and also require disclosure of the airport’s presence in the community to prospective purchasers of property within a mile of the airport.

**Strategies**

**Short term**

Implement the 2009 JLUS recommendations, including establishing procedures to balance community interests with the military mission and to minimize conflicts.

**Ongoing**

- Continue to work with JBA to promote compatible land development in areas subject to aircraft noise and accident potential.
- Require development within DNL 65 dBA Ldn and greater noise exposure areas to be properly protected from the transmission of noise with barriers that affect sound propagation and/or the use of sound absorbing materials in construction.
- Evaluate development and redevelopment proposals in areas subject to noise using Phase I noise studies and noise models.
- Provide for the use of noise reduction measures when noise issues are identified.
- Ensure that APA, APZ boundaries and noise contours are identified when development proposals in the vicinity of JBA or a general aviation airport are submitted to the County for review.
- Maintain compatible land use designations, appropriate zoning, and subdivision design in aviation policy areas.
- Implement disclosure requirements for prospective purchasers of property within one mile of the airport and mitigate potential hazards to air navigation, pursuant to aviation policy area regulations in the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance.
F. AMENDMENTS OF THE 2002 GENERAL PLAN

The Subregion 5 master plan amends the 2002 General Plan as follows:

• Designate the Brandywine Community Center and refine its boundaries to focus on the future transit station when its exact location is determined.

• Remove a corridor node at the intersection of MD 5 and A-65.

• Reclassify approximately ten-acres from the Rural Tier to the Developing Tier on the east side of McKendree Road north of Mister Road. This area is eligible for sewer service in the County Water and Sewer Plan and reclassification to the Developing Tier will be consistent with its water and sewer service category (Map IV-8: General Plan Amendments).

Pressure to Amend the Rural Tier Boundaries

During preparation of the Subregion 5 master plan, several requests were made to staff to remove properties from the Rural Tier and place them in the Developing Tier. The Subregion 5 master plan recommends one change to the Rural Tier boundary (see Map IV-7: Accident Potential Zones, Noise Contours, and Aviation Policy Areas) where a ten-acre site may have been placed in the Rural Tier erroneously. The plan does not support additional changes for the following reasons:

• Much of the Rural Tier is already compromised by development, making it difficult to achieve the goal of conserving remaining agricultural and other natural resource lands. Making the Rural Tier smaller will increase pressure on remaining resource lands.

• Climate change and energy needs require communities to reassess how they use land resources. Rural land near major urban areas is an increasingly valuable resource and commodity for food and energy production and, potentially, for offsets for development activities, emissions, or pollution.

• Thanks to significant development capacity in the Developing Tier, there is no compelling market need to increase its size, or to provide additional development opportunity. Furthermore, significant acreages of land in the Rural Tier are designated for low density residential development.

• Moving land from the Rural Tier to the Developing Tier within the Mattawoman Creek watershed would have negative impacts on water quality in the creek and its tributaries. While development of well and septic can also affect water quality, the impacts from higher density development, including impervious surfaces and other associated impacts, would be greater.

• The Subregion 5 master plan’s recommended policy is to support redevelopment and infill development in existing and planned development areas rather than greenfield development that takes up natural resource lands.
Map IV-8: General Plan Amendments
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V: ENVIRONMENT

Subregion 5 contains environmental assets of County and State importance, especially the Mattawoman Creek Watershed. The primary environmental issues that are addressed in this chapter are protection of the Mattawoman Creek watershed, connectivity of the green infrastructure network, and water quality. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the current state of the environment in the subregion and to develop goals, policies, and strategies to protect the subregion’s environmental integrity. This chapter covers green infrastructure, water quality, the Mattawoman Creek watershed, the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area, air quality, green building, and noise intrusion. Policies and strategies are provided throughout this chapter in order to reach the following goals:

Goals

- The natural environment and its associated ecological functions are preserved, enhanced, and restored as a fundamental component of sustainable development.
- A development pattern that complements the natural systems, incorporating open space and green infrastructure connectivity into growth strategies.

A. Green Infrastructure

The 2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan is a comprehensive vision for conserving significant environmental ecosystems in Prince George’s County. Green infrastructure is an interconnected system of public and private lands that contain significant areas of woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas that provide valuable ecological functions and incur minimal intrusions from land development, light, and noise pollution. The network is divided into three categories: countywide and locally significant regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gaps.¹

(Map V-1: Environmental Corridors and Special Conservation Areas)

The Green Infrastructure Plan states that the network boundaries should be refined during the master plan process to reflect areas of local significance and that additional opportunities for connectivity and resource protection should be considered. This master plan identifies three primary and three secondary corridors that are within the green infrastructure network (Map V-1: Environmental Corridors and Special Conservation Areas). Primary corridors are Mattawoman Creek, Tinkers Creek, and Piscataway Creek. Secondary corridors are larger tributaries to the primary corridors: Burch Branch, Butler Branch, and Timothy Branch.

¹ Regulated areas are environmentally sensitive features (streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, severe slopes, and buffers) protected during the development review process. Evaluation areas contain environmentally sensitive features (interior forests, colonial waterbird nesting sites, and unique habitat) not currently protected. Network gaps are areas critical to the connection of the regulated and evaluation areas.
The primary environmental corridors support stream systems that flow generally east to west through the subregion towards the Potomac River. The corridors include the mainstems of the major waterways within the study area and receive most of the depositional runoff from surrounding land uses. The secondary environmental corridors are areas where connectivity is critical to the long-term viability and preservation of the green infrastructure network, and they are critical to preserving the subregion’s water quality. Conservation and preservation of these corridors, particularly the headwater areas, will preserve and improve downstream water quality, including that of the Potomac River. Table V-1: Primary Corridors provides water quality details for the primary corridors.

Map V-1: Environmental Corridors and Special Conservation Areas
Table V-1: Primary Corridors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>Subwatershed</th>
<th>Index of Benthic Integrity Rating¹</th>
<th>Aquatic Habitat Quality¹</th>
<th>303 (d) list categories²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tinkers Creek</td>
<td>Tinkers Creek</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>Bacterial, Biological, Nutrients, Sediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataway Creek</td>
<td>Piscataway Creek</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Bacterial, Biological, Nutrients, Sediments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Potomac River</td>
<td></td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Bacterial, Biological, Nutrients, Sediments, Metals, Toxics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mattawoman Creek</td>
<td>Mattawoman Creek</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Biological, Nutrients, Sediments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, 2005. Scale: Good, Fair, Poor, Very Poor.
² Maryland Department of the Environment, 2006. The 303(d) list is Maryland’s list of impaired surface waters submitted in compliance with section 303(d) of the 1972 Federal Clean Water Act.

Special Conservation Areas

The Green Infrastructure Plan places special emphasis on special conservation areas (SCAs), which are areas of countywide significance. Three of the ten SCAs in the County are in Subregion 5 (Map V-1: Environmental Corridors and Special Conservation Areas). The largest is the Mattawoman Creek Stream Valley which extends along the southern portion of the subregion bordering on Charles County. The other SCAs in Subregion 5 are the Potomac River Shoreline and Piscataway Park. Mattawoman Creek is discussed in more detail below in Section B.

Local Conservation Area

Within the Piscataway National Park in Accokeek, the Moyaone Reserve is also identified in this plan as a local conservation area due to its significance as an area with low impact development, two working farms, and Potomac River frontage entirely within the Mount Vernon viewshed (Chapter IX: Historic Preservation). Individual lots are five acres or larger and all have scenic easements to protect the view of the Maryland shoreline from Mount Vernon viewed. The easements were acquired by the Accokeek Foundation in the 1960s and 1970s and eventually deeded to the federal government. Many residents of the Moyaone Reserve have a strong conservation ethic and are involved in the environmental education activities of the Hard Bargain Farm at the Alice Ferguson Foundation and the National Colonial Farm at Piscataway National Park. The Moyaone Reserve can effectively act as an example and model for how, with large lot zoning and scenic easements, the aims of protecting both landowner property values and the environment can coexist. The local conservation area designation in this plan ensures that development within the Moyaone Reserve will be evaluated for its impacts on the environmental, scenic vistas, and community character.
Woodlands, Wildlife and Habitat

Subregion 5 is home to diverse terrestrial habitats, including large tracts of woodlands, grasslands, and wetlands that support a rich diversity of wildlife. Forested areas cover approximately 26,000 acres and comprise over half (55 percent) of the subregion’s total area. Woodland characteristics vary within the subregion with dominant deciduous forests in the southern part of the subregion and areas of mixed deciduous or coniferous forests towards the northwest near Hyde Field and Friendly High School. Small pockets of coniferous forests are also interspersed across the master plan area.

Urban and rural forests and woodlands have been damaged and continue to be threatened by human and natural forces, such as sprawling development, insufficient care or maintenance, poor harvesting practices, wildfire, and insects and disease putting ecosystem viability at risk. When trees and forests are damaged, ecological features such as air and water quality or wildlife and fish habitats are degraded, and nearby communities suffer, sometimes showing signs of economic and social decline. Woodlands reduce runoff, erosion, and air pollution and provide habitats for wildlife. The largest contiguous forest tracts are located along Piscataway Creek and the Mattawoman Creek Stream Valley, in the south central portion of the subregion. Much of the subregion’s woodlands are included in the green infrastructure network. Smaller pockets of woodland are scattered throughout the subregion outside the green infrastructure network.

Open grasslands, which provide unique habitat for a variety of species, such as ground-nesting birds, are quickly disappearing due to development on open lands. Grasslands are not prevalent in the subregion; only approximately four percent of the total land area is classified as open land or pasture that might support grassland, but many of these areas are undeveloped parcels in urban settings or managed areas (golf course and athletic fields). Some grasslands can be found in portions of Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park in the eastern portion of the study area.

Maryland is located within the Atlantic Flyway, which is one of the three major bird migration routes in North America. Within the subregion, Piscataway Park is a known birding location. The park’s fields, forests, and wetlands provide a variety of habitat for bird species, specifically forest-nesting neotropical migrants. The park also provides habitat for several warbler species suffering increasing habitat stress due to regional habitat fragmentation.

State Sensitive Species Project Review Areas (SSPRA) identify known occurrences of rare, threatened, or endangered species and other sensitive habitats. These occur primarily along the lower reaches of the Potomac River, Piscataway Creek, Mattawoman Creek, and Tinkers Creek. All or portions of each of these SSPRAs are included within the green infrastructure network.

The County’s Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance places a priority on the preservation of woodlands in conjunction with floodplains, wetlands, stream corridors, and steep slopes and emphasizes the preservation of large, contiguous woodland tracts.
Policies

- Implement the master plan’s desired development pattern while protecting sensitive environmental features and meeting the full intent of environmental policies and regulations.
- Ensure that new development incorporates open space, environmentally sensitive design, and mitigation activities.
- Protect, preserve, and enhance the identified green infrastructure network.

Strategies

Ongoing

- Protect primary corridors (Mattawoman Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Tinkers Creek) during the review of land development proposals to ensure the highest level of preservation and restoration possible. Protect secondary corridors to restore and enhance environmental features, habitat, and important connections.
- Protect the portions of the green infrastructure network that are outside the primary and secondary corridors to restore and enhance environmental features, habitat, and important connections.
- Preserve or restore regulated areas designated in the green infrastructure network through the development review process for new land development proposals.
- Evaluate land development proposals in the vicinity of SCAs to ensure the SCAs are not impacted and that green infrastructure connections are either maintained or restored.
- Continue to implement the County’s Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, which places a priority on the preservation of woodlands in conjunction with floodplains, wetlands, stream corridors, and steep slopes and emphasizes the preservation of large, contiguous woodland tracts.
- Preserve habitat areas to the fullest extent possible during the land development process.
- Target public land acquisition programs within the designated green infrastructure network to preserve, enhance, or restore essential features and special habitat areas.
- Increase areas for native grasslands on public lands to provide habitat for ground-nesting birds and other species, particularly opportunities in Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park.
- As agricultural needs change, support the transition of pasture land to native grassland.
- Support and implement new recycling and trash management programs including, but not limited to the Alice Ferguson Foundation’s Trash Free Potomac Watershed Initiative; provide recycling and the effective management of trash, yard waste, household hazardous waste and bulky materials; require yard waste to be recycled in biodegradable bags.
B. WATER QUALITY, STORMWATER MANAGEMENT, AND GROUNDWATER

Water quality in existing streams within the master plan area is generally poor, although aquatic habitat in three of the subregion’s seven watersheds was ranked fair. Major contributors to poor water quality include sediments, nutrients, and toxins from development and other land uses. Concerns in Subregion 5 are:

- Proximity of development to streams – Stream buffer requirements currently vary with stream location. Existing buffer requirements are 25 feet for nontidal wetlands and 50 feet for perennial streams.
- Nutrient-leaching – Septic systems may not adequately process their nutrient intake. As systems age, some systems may leak nitrogen to the surrounding environment, including surface and groundwater.
- Areas developed without stormwater management or with poorly performing facilities due to poor initial design and/or lack of maintenance.
- Unsuitable agricultural practices that contribute to poor water quality and sedimentation, the overuse of fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides, and soil degradation.

Tributary Strategies

Maryland’s Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy Statewide Implementation Plan and the local basin plans resulted from the 1983 Chesapeake Bay 2000 Agreement and describe ways to reduce nutrient pollution loads in sub-watersheds that drain to the bay. The Maryland Tributary Strategy was completed in 2004. The Statewide Implementation Plan was completed in 2007 and includes methods for nutrient reductions from stormwater, septic systems, growth, agriculture, point sources, and air sources. Subregion 5 lies in two tributary watersheds (basins): the Middle Potomac and Lower Potomac. The state is encouraging the use of tributary strategies as implementation tools for waters with approved total maximum daily loads (TMDL). TMDLs prescribe the pollutant reduction levels that are necessary to meet the revised water quality standards. Like the bay nutrient reduction goals, a TMDL sets a limit, or cap, on pollutants that impair water quality and cause violations of water quality standards for a stream, lake, river, or the bay.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load (TMDL), which has been called the bay pollution diet, is the largest and most complex TMDL to date. Issued in 2010, the bay-wide TMDL requires that the seven jurisdictions with water flowing into the Chesapeake Bay create watershed implementation plans (WIP) for reducing nitrogen, phosphorus, and sediment. TMDL limits are set for all sources within the watershed. These sources include discharges from point sources (such as sewage treatment plants, industrial wastewater systems, and urban and suburban stormwater systems), non-point sources (such as runoff from farms, rural residential areas, and septic systems), and air deposition (emissions from power plants and motor vehicles). The goal of the WIPs is to achieve overall bay-wide reduction targets. The TMDL is designed to ensure that all pollution control measures to fully restore the Bay and its tidal rivers are in place by 2025, with 60 percent of the actions completed by 2025.

---

2 TMDLs are prepared by the Maryland Department of the Environment and approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

3 Maryland’s Chesapeake Bay Tributary Strategy Statewide Implementation Plan, January 2008.
2017. The TMDL is supported by accountability measures to ensure cleanup commitments are met, including short and long-term benchmarks, a tracking and accounting system, and additional federal actions, if necessary, to spur progress.

**Water Resources Functional Master Plan**

Prince George’s County approved the [*Countywide Water Resources Functional Master Plan*](#) in September 2010. This plan addresses the relationship of growth to water resources specifically for adequate waste disposal, safe drinking water, and issues related to water quality due to stormwater runoff in receiving streams.

As mandated in HB 1141, all Maryland counties and municipalities that exercise planning and zoning authority are required to prepare and adopt a Water Resources Element (WRE) in their comprehensive plans. This Countywide Water Resources Functional Master Plan (Water Resources Plan) fulfills the requirements of the WRE.

The purposes of the Water Resources Plan are to:

- Ensure a safe and ample supply of drinking water from both surface and groundwater sources and adequate treatment of wastewater.
- Minimize the nutrient loading impacts to our groundwater, streams, rivers, and the Chesapeake Bay from the uses we employ on our land.
- Improve data collection and promote a watershed planning process to achieve a desirable balance of sustainable growth and preservation of the Chesapeake Bay.
- Provide water resources data that can be transparently interpreted to establish growth area boundaries, inform land-use recommendations, and target preservation/conservation/restoration areas.

The 2010 Water Resources Functional Master Plan evaluates existing growth and anticipated future development and considers any impacts to, and demands on, water resources including drinking water, wastewater, and stormwater. The Water Resources Plan provides growth guidance expressed as goals, policies, and strategies to address water quality impacts associated with land use in the county. The plan contains recommendations for growth policies, land use, environmental conservation and efficiency, interagency and intergovernmental communication and coordination, outreach and education, community engagement, regulatory revision, and data and systems management. Finally, the Water Resources Plan provides a sound foundation and support for smart growth principles and the establishment of sustainable development capacities in Prince George’s County based on water resources.

**Stream Restoration**

Freshwater rivers and streams have been seriously degraded by our activities on the land. Sediment from runoff and in-stream erosion are the primary sources of non-point source pollution in our waterways. State and County agencies have undertaken or are planning several stream assessment and restoration initiatives in Subregion 5:

- The Stream Corridor Assessment (SCA) survey was developed by the Department of Natural Resources’ Watershed Restoration Division as a tool to help identify environmental problems and prioritize restoration opportunities on a watershed basis.
- A stream corridor assessment for the Piscataway Creek watershed (in progress as of 2008).
- Creating an inventory of restoration and mitigation sites. These areas would be identified during future development and permitting processes as priority mitigation targets (ongoing).
Wetlands
Wetlands act as buffers by regulating the flow of pollutants into the rivers, streams, and groundwater. As stormwater flows over land and passes through a wetland, suspended sediments are trapped by vegetation and settle into the wetland soil. Wetland vegetation filters excess nutrients and suspended solids from precipitation and stormwater thus mitigating their flow into local waterways or into groundwater.

Wetlands also help control erosion and flooding. Like a natural sponge, wetlands soak up and hold large amounts of flood and stormwater, releasing water gradually back into the water systems. This quality makes wetlands important in urban and suburban areas where impervious surfaces increase the rate and volume of runoff.

Wetlands commonly receive stormwater runoff from development sites because they are usually located at low points where runoff is directed. This can result in impacts such as sediment deposition and pollutant accumulation in wetlands, changes to wetland hydrology, and a shift in the makeup of wetland vegetative communities. These indirect impacts, although they originate outside the wetland itself, can drastically change wetland functions, such as flood control, habitat, and water quality protection.

Groundwater
Groundwater is water located below the ground surface in soil pore space and rock fissures. Groundwater is recharged from and eventually flows to the surface, discharging into streams and wetlands or as seeps and springs. An aquifer is an underground water layer within permeable rock or unconsolidated materials such as gravel, sand, or clay. Aquifers are basically underground reservoirs that provide clean potable water via drilled wells that access the aquifer water and pump it to the surface.

There are several aquifers in the County: Patuxent, Patapsco, Magothy, and Aquia. Two of them—Patapsco and Magothy—require coordination with Charles County and the Maryland Department of the Environment.

During the Subregion 5 master plan preparation process, it was determined that unchecked development may have an adverse effect on well water levels, severely affecting the portions of Subregion 5 that rely on domestic wells for potable water.

Lowering the water pump in a well can usually correct for localized draw down. However, many of the domestic groundwater wells installed in Subregion 5 during the 1970s and early 1980s were “telescoping” wells. If telescoping wells suffer structural deficiencies or inability to access the water table due to falling water levels, the well must be replaced with a large-diameter casing to facilitate access to the lower water table.

Septic Systems
A household septic system properly designed, installed, and maintained on suitable soil is designed to function, in effect, as a sewage treatment plant. Properly functioning septic systems contribute an average of 29 pounds of nitrogen per household per year to groundwater. Nutrient removing septic systems contribute 14.4 pounds. Unlike septic, nitrogen from industrial discharges, sewage plants, and agricultural operations is already regulated. The amount of nitrogen from septic going into open water in the Mattawoman watershed is significantly higher than other areas.

4 Telescoping wells initially employ a wide-diameter well casing to house the submersible pump; however, a smaller diameter casing is substituted once the water table is accessed. As a result, there is a limited depth within the casing that the submersible pumps can access.
because of the region’s sandy soils, high water tables and the percentage of watershed residents on septic. Repair to failing septic systems, existing septic upgrades, and new denitrification systems represent the best management practice for reduction of nitrogen leaking into streams and groundwater.

**Sewer Overflows**

Sewer overflows that have taken place at the Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant and sewer line breaks have discharged effluent into Piscataway Creek. In 2005, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) entered into a consent decree with the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and the U.S. EPA covering Prince George’s and Montgomery Counties. Under the decree, WSSC has to implement reporting, monitoring, inspection, maintenance, repair, and replacement remedial measures for its sewer collection system as part of a comprehensive 12-year plan. In the area specific to the Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant and the Mattawoman Basin, WSSC must conduct sewer system evaluation surveys, develop a water quality monitoring plan, determine bacteria sources, and test for fecal coliform.

**Flood Management**

For flood management, the 100-year floodplain should be preserved as part of the natural system of a stream to provide adequate storage for flood waters and sufficient floodway capacity to safely move flood waters downstream.

**Environmentally-Sensitive Design (ESD) Stormwater Management Techniques**

Environmental Site Design is a stormwater management strategy to maintain or restore the natural hydrologic functions of a site in order to achieve natural resource protection and fulfill environmental regulatory requirements. ESD employs a variety of natural and built features that reduce the rate and temperature of runoff, filter out pollutants, and facilitate the infiltration of water into the ground.

**Agriculture**

Agricultural activities such as tillage, drainage, intercropping, rotation, grazing, and extensive usage of pesticides and fertilizers have significant implications for water quality and wild species of flora and fauna.

**Policies**

- Encourage the restoration and enhancement of water quality in degraded areas and the preservation of water quality in areas not degraded.
- Protect and restore groundwater recharge areas such as wetlands and the headwater areas of streams.

**Strategies**

**Short Term**

- Require nitrogen removal septic systems for all new development proposed within the Mattawoman watershed and retrofit existing septic systems within 1,000 feet of surface waters and tributaries. (The Maryland Department of the Environment offers a free septic-system upgrade through the Bay Restoration Fund.)
- As part of the countywide water resources functional plan, consider recommending the use of denitrification septic systems.
- Encourage replacement of telescoping wells in areas subject to falling groundwater levels. Broaden awareness of funding sources for well replacement.
• Support DoE on its various watershed and stream restoration initiatives. Target environmental mitigation projects to sites identified in the countywide catalog of mitigation sites, when developed.
• Identify locations without stormwater management or with poorly performing facilities that would be suitable for public and private stormwater retrofit projects.
• Support managed woodlands to promote sustainable forestry and provide clean water, improve stream health, stabilize soil, reduce nutrients, and sequester carbon through actively growing forests and tree biomass.
• Encourage the use of conservation tillage to minimize surface soil disturbance during planting and reduce soil erosion as well as sediment runoff.
• Encourage cover crops such as winter wheat, rye, or barley to reduce soil erosion and absorb excess nitrogen and phosphorous that remains in the soil after the summer crop has been harvested.
• Provide eligible farmers with support to develop nutrient management plans that comply with the state’s nutrient management law.
• Encourage the use of watering troughs and fencing to keep livestock out of streams.
• Identify opportunities to establish streamside buffers, wetlands, and other wildlife habitat areas through the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP). The program helps protect water quality in local streams and rivers by reducing soil erosion, controlling nutrient runoff, and increasing wildlife habitat.
• Encourage reduction of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers through Integrated Pest Management (IPM).
• Encourage no-till farming, rest-rotation grazing, crop rotation, and intercropping.
• Support manure management programs by building manure sheds, transporting manure to areas that need it, and developing management plans to help farmers, especially poultry growers, handle their excess waste.

**Ongoing**

• Evaluate the yard waste recycling program and ensure that it is as environmentally sound as possible.
• Emphasize protection and preservation of the headwater wetlands and headwaters areas of streams to preserve and maintain area hydrology when reviewing land development proposals.
• Support groundwater recharge areas through techniques such as bioretention and rain gardens, and enhance existing wetland areas and stream buffers to maintain groundwater recharge areas.
• Explore wastewater reuse to reduce demands for potable water for non-potable uses.
• Encourage protection of land along high quality waters and in headwater areas of high quality watersheds, especially Mattawoman Creek and Piscataway Creek, both of which contain Tier II waters.
• Strive to achieve or surpass established TMDLs in the Mattawoman and Piscataway Creeks.
• Evaluate applicability of tributary strategies in Subregion 5 during development review of new projects.
• Reduce or eliminate any potential flood hazards and prevent future flood hazards caused by new development and increased imperviousness.
• Protect and preserve existing forests and wetlands through existing land conservation and protection programs.
• Provide for expanded recreational and aesthetic opportunities in floodways and floodplains.
• Maintain, to the maximum extent practicable, the natural hydrologic patterns during development.
• Work with WSSC to reduce, respond to, and remediate sewer overflows.
• Complete stream corridor assessments for all watersheds in the subregion in support of the countywide watershed restoration efforts.
• Develop a long-term plan to evaluate aquifer capacity and demands.
• Coordinate with Charles County and the Maryland Department of the Environment to address the use of the Patapsco and Magothy aquifers.
• Reduce non-potable use of water from the Patapsco aquifer.

1 Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an effective and environmentally sensitive approach.
C. WATERSHEDS

Mattawoman Creek

The Mattawoman Creek watershed encompasses 62,190 acres in Charles and Prince George’s Counties. Approximately 27 percent of the watershed (16,500 acres) is in Prince George’s County. It includes portions of Subregions 5 and 6, and portions of both the Developing and Rural tiers (Map V-2: River Basins and Watersheds).

Mattawoman Creek has been recognized as “the best, most productive tributary to the Chesapeake Bay.” The tidal wetlands of Mattawoman Creek are essential nursery areas for numerous species of fish, and the main stem and tributaries of the creek are among the Potomac basin’s most important spawning waters. The Maryland 1999 Clean Water Action Plan identified Mattawoman Creek as a priority for restoration and protection. The portion of the creek in Prince George’s County contains a listed Tier II water (Chapter II, Background), and land near the creek contains two Sensitive Species Project Review Areas (SSPRAs), and strategic forests under the state’s Strategic Forest Land Assessment.

The 2005 Green Infrastructure Plan identified the Mattawoman Creek watershed as a special conservation area (SCA). Since land use activities have the potential to significantly affect resources in the watershed, a special assessment of land use and water resources was conducted as part of the Subregion 5 master plan process. Key issues in the watershed are the following:

• Increased development threatens water quality in Mattawoman Creek. Impervious surface ratios that exceed 10-15 percent of a watershed are highly correlated with stream degradation. In 2000, impervious cover in the entire watershed was approximately 7 to 8 percent. Development projections estimate impervious cover for the entire watershed increasing to 14 percent by 2020.

• Mattawoman Creek has an approved total maximum daily load for nutrients per federal and state requirements.

• A little over half (52 percent) of the Mattawoman Creek watershed in Prince George’s County is in the Rural Tier in Subregions 5 and 6. However, the Rural Tier in Subregion 5 does not have low density zoning consistent with its Rural Tier designation in the General Plan.

• Most of the future Brandywine Community Center, which is anticipated to receive a significant amount of growth, is located in the Mattawoman watershed (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).

• Land use policies in the watershed in Charles and Prince George’s Counties are somewhat inconsistent with each other. Approximately 40 percent of the watershed in Prince George’s County is in the Rural Tier, while almost all the watershed in Charles County is in that County’s Development District.

• While large areas of the watershed in Prince George’s County are wooded, valuable sand and gravel resources underlie many parcels and mining activity may continue for many years in the Rural Tier.

---

6 Blocks of forest that provide the optimal mix of ecological and socioeconomic values necessary to support natural resource based industries and maximize ecological benefit, such as habitat that supports forest interior dwelling species. http://www.dnr.state.md.us/forests/conferences/sfla/
7 This section summarizes the assessment. The full assessment is available from M-NCPPC.
8 Mattawoman Creek Watershed Management Plan. US Army Corps of Engineers, 2003. Estimates for the Prince George’s County portion developed for the Subregion 5 plan were 4.7 percent in 2002 and are projected to be 12.6 percent for future land use.
Relatively little of the watershed in Prince George’s County is permanently protected from development densities that would degrade the watershed. Approximately 900 acres are preserved in Subregions 5 and 6 as parkland. An additional 1,600 acres within the watershed in Subregion 6 are owned by the U.S. military at the GlobeCom site. Thus, of the 16,500 acres of the Mattawoman watershed in Prince George’s County, only 2,500 acres, or 15 percent are currently protected.

As of 2008, there were approximately 2,100 dwelling units and 4,700 jobs in the Prince George’s County portion of the watershed. By 2030, approximately 6,200 dwelling units and 9,700 jobs are projected (Table V-2, Dwelling Units and Employment Growth in the Mattawoman Creek Watershed).

<p>| Table V-2: Dwelling Units and Employment Growth in the Mattawoman Creek Watershed |
|----------------------------------------|--------|--------|</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Units</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>Build-out</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,138</td>
<td>6,185</td>
<td>9,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>4,787</td>
<td>9,738</td>
<td>18,811</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: these projections are based on data used in the preparation of the 2009 Preliminary Subregion 5 Master Plan.

**Drinking Water**

Public water in the Developing Tier portion of the Mattawoman Creek Watershed is provided by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). As of 2008, average daily demand in this area was 0.5 million gallons per day (MGD), less than one percent of the County use. By 2030, development will create demand for approximately 1.6 MGD of water. To date, no specific concerns have been raised about WSSC’s future ability to provide public drinking water to its service area. However, the countywide water resources element is expected to provide a more detailed discussion of future water supplies.

Average daily well water demand outside of the public water service area within the Prince George’s County portion of the Mattawoman Creek Watershed as of 2008 was estimated to be 0.22 MGD. By 2030, development will create demand for approximately 0.36 MGD. The Upper Patapsco aquifer is the primary source for private wells, and there has been no indication of groundwater supply problems within the Mattawoman Creek Watershed.9

**Wastewater**

Portions of the Mattawoman Creek Watershed in Prince George’s County are served by public sewer by Charles County’s Mattawoman Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) located near the town of Indian Head. By agreement between Charles County and WSSC, Prince George’s County is allocated up to three MGD of the plant’s capacity (currently 20 MGD). As of 2008, total average daily flow to the plant was 9.48 MGD, of which approximately 0.42 MGD was from Prince George’s County. At buildout, based on current (pre-SMA) zoning, Prince George’s County would discharge approximately 2.36 MGD to the Mattawoman WWTP, leaving approximately 0.64 MGD of remaining capacity.

Development in the Rural Tier within the Mattawoman Creek Watershed relies primarily on private septic systems for wastewater treatment. As of 2008, non-public wastewater discharge was approximately 0.2 MGD. By 2030, this will increase to approximately 0.35 MGD. One of the most frequent causes of groundwater contamination is nitrates

9 The only area in Subregion 5 with a known groundwater accessibility issue is the Moyaone community west of MD 210 (see discussion in Section V-B).
from septic systems effluent. The Mattawoman Creek Watershed TMDL for nitrogen is 117,000 lbs/year for the entire watershed. Nitrogen discharge from septic systems in the Prince George’s County portion of the watershed as of 2008 is approximately 8,900 pounds per year, less than 10 percent of the TMDL. Loadings from septic systems from future growth will increase, but not disproportional to the size of the area of the watershed in Prince George’s County.

**Stormwater**

Stormwater can reduce water quality when runoff carries pollutants such as nutrients, metals, and sediments into waterways without treatment. As noted above, as of 2002, approximately five percent of the Mattawoman Creek Watershed in Prince George’s County was impervious. By 2030, land use change will increase impervious cover to levels associated with water quality impairment and the conversion of forest to residential uses will increase loadings of nitrogen and phosphorous to levels disproportionately high for the size of the area of the watershed in Prince George’s County.

**Piscataway Creek**

The Piscataway Creek Watershed encompasses 69 square miles in Prince George’s County. Headwaters originate to the west and east of Joint Base Andrews Naval Air Facility Washington, referred to as JBA, (in the vicinity of Camp Springs, Clinton, along Woodyard Road). On the southwest side of JBA two branches join to form Tinkers Creek, the major tributary to Piscataway Creek. Surface water runoff flows into Tinkers Creek.

Piscataway Creek Watershed lies partially in Subregion 5 and partially in Subregion 6. It is the largest watershed in Subregion 5, encompassing approximately 24,500 acres, a little over 50 percent of Subregion 5. The headwaters of Piscataway Creek originate on and in the vicinity of JBA in Subregion 6. The tidal wetlands at the mouth of Piscataway Creek are important to the overall ecology of the Lower Potomac River Basin and the natural productivity of the area supports resident and migratory fish, waterfowl, and many marsh birds. All land within 1,000 feet of the lower, approximately 4.5 miles of Piscataway Creek, is within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (CBCA) and subject to Prince George’s County’s Critical Area regulations.

Several rare, threatened, and endangered species have been found in the Piscataway Creek Watershed, including the federally listed endangered plant Sandplain geradi (Agalinis acuta) and the state listed threatened Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus). The Piscataway Creek Watershed is considered a stronghold watershed for two species of fish, the American Brook Lamprey (Lampetra appendix) and the Comely Shiner (Notropis amoenus), which are state listed threatened. Stronghold watersheds are essential for the conservation of these species in Maryland. According to the 2000-2004 Maryland Biological Stream Survey, these species tolerate maximum impervious surfaces of 12.9 and 8.7 percent, respectively.

Two sections of Piscataway Creek in Subregion 5 contain listed Tier II waters. One section is located between MD 210 and Gallahan Road in the eastern area of the watershed, and the other between Branch Avenue and Surratts Road near the central area of the watershed. Maryland’s 1999 Clean Water Action Plan identified Piscataway Creek as a priority for restoration and recommended it for protection. According to that Plan, as of 1998, the watershed was 16.7% impervious. Noted above in Section B (Water Quality) sewer overflows that have taken place at the Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant and sewer line breaks have discharged effluent into Piscataway Creek. Under the Clean Water Act, Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) are required to be developed for impaired waters that are too degraded to meet water quality standards in order to
achieve and maintain water quality standards. TMDLs remain in place in perpetuity even if the water quality standards are met or if the waterbody is removed from the Section 303(d) impaired list. The non-tidal Piscataway Creek watershed has an approved TMDL for fecal bacteria.\textsuperscript{10} Fecal bacteria are microscopic single-celled organisms (primarily fecal coliforms and fecal streptococci) found in the wastes of warm-blooded animals. Their presence in water is used to assess the sanitary quality of water for body-contact recreation, for consumption of molluscan bivalves (shellfish), and for drinking water. Excessive amounts of fecal bacteria in surface water used for recreation are known to indicate an increased risk of pathogen-induced illness to humans. Infections due to pathogen-contaminated recreation waters include gastrointestinal, respiratory, eye, ear, nose, throat, and skin diseases (EPA, 1986).\textsuperscript{11}

The 2005 Green Infrastructure Plan identified Piscataway National Park, located in the Piscataway Creek and Lower Potomac River Tidal Watersheds, as a special conservation area (SCA). The Potomac River Shoreline, which contains a portion of the Piscataway Creek Watershed, is also a SCA (Map V-1: Environmental Corridors and Special Conservation Areas). The Green Infrastructure Plan reported that the Piscataway Creek watershed ranked “fair” for the Benthic Index of Biological Integrity (IBI) and “poor” for aquatic habitat (Table V-1, Primary Corridors). The poor physical quality of the aquatic habitat is likely due to urbanization and failing septic systems. According to the Piscataway Creek TMDL, there are approximately 1,800 septic systems located mainly in the eastern and southern areas of the non-tidal Piscataway Creek Watershed.

Recommendations by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) regarding threats, conservation strategies, inventory, data, and modeling needs are summarized for coastal plain streams and available at: http://www.dnr.state.md.us/wildlife/WCDP_Chapter_Part4_20050926.pdf.

The Planning Department has funded a stream corridor assessment and the County’s Department of the Environment has begun work on a Watershed Management Plan and Watershed Restoration Strategy for the Piscataway Creek Watershed.

This Subregion 5 Master Plan supports environmental protection of Piscataway Creek and its watershed in several ways:

- The Future Land Use map (Map IV-1: Future Land Use) seeks to support the protection of lands within Piscataway Creek Watershed with the designation of some lands near the main tributary as Residential Low–Transition Area, which would require a minimum 60 percent open space through conservation subdivisions. Approximately 15 percent of the Piscataway Creek Watershed is designated “Residential Low-Transition Area.”

- Over 50 percent of the Piscataway Creek Watershed is designated Residential Low.

- Approximately 15 percent of the Piscataway Creek Watershed is in the Rural Tier which has the lowest development potential.

- Land in the southern and western part of the Piscataway Creek watershed is in the Priority Preservation Area (Map IV-6: Priority Preservation Area).

- Land along the Piscataway Creek mainstream is designated as a stream valley park (Map VII-2: Existing and Future Parks and Community Centers).

\textsuperscript{10} The fecal bacteria TMDL for Piscataway Creek is 201 billion Most Probable Number (MPN) of Escherichia coli per day, which is distributed between load allocation for non-point sources (118 billion MPN/day) and waste load allocations for point sources (83 billion MPN/day) such as wastewater treatment plants. The Maryland Department of Environment monitors water quality to determine compliance with the TMDL.

\textsuperscript{11} See Maryland Department of Natural Resources website.
Policies

• Ensure that, to the fullest extent possible, land use policies support the protection of the Mattawoman Creek and Piscataway Creek watersheds.
• Conserve as much land as possible, in the Rural Tier portion of the watershed, as natural resource land (forest, mineral, and agriculture).
• Minimize impervious surfaces in the Developing Tier portion of the watershed through use of conservation subdivisions and environmentally sensitive design and, especially in the higher density Brandywine Community Center, incorporate best stormwater design practices to increase infiltration and reduce run-off volumes.

Strategies

Short Term

• Retain low density zoning in the Rural Tier to retain forest land, reduce the density of development, reduce the amount of impervious cover, and reduce the number of new septic systems.
• Adopt a Residential Low-Transition Area that would require conservation subdivisions, as recommended in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern. This would cluster development and reduce impervious surfaces and pollutant loads from runoff.
• Revise the countywide stormwater management ordinance to incorporate revisions in the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual (revised May 2009) and other enhanced stormwater management policies.
• Designate the Priority Preservation Area per the recommendations in Chapter IV. Three areas are proposed, including portions of the Mattawoman creek watershed in Subregion 5 and two areas west of MD 210 (Map IV-6: Priority Preservation Area). A priority preservation area (PPA) is one where strong land use policies and preservation efforts ensure that development does not convert or compromise agricultural or forest resources.¹

Ongoing

• See ongoing actions under water quality and stormwater management. (Section B. Water Quality, Stormwater Management, Groundwater).
• Incorporate stormwater management best management practices, especially in the future Brandywine Community Center, to increase infiltration and reduce run-off volumes.
• Continue to work with Charles County to minimize environmental impacts to Mattawoman Creek.
• Require mining companies to achieve post mining reclamation that meets environmental needs, with a strong emphasis on reforestation, and consideration for grassland creation.
• Work with landowners to permanently preserve land in the Mattawoman watershed through existing land conservation programs.
• Encourage the retrofitting of existing septic systems in the watershed to reduce nitrogen run-off.

Longer Term

• Expand the monitoring well network in order to better assess groundwater levels.
• Conduct groundwater flow modeling to estimate future groundwater conditions.
• Consider conducting a more in-depth Mattawoman Creek management plan.

¹ The full definition is in the Annotated Code of Maryland, Agriculture Article. See also House Bill 2 (the Agricultural Stewardship Act of 2006). See Prince George’s County Approved Priority Preservation Area Functional Master Plan, July 2012.
D. CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA

The Maryland General Assembly enacted the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area law in 1988 to foster more sensitive development along the shorelines of the Chesapeake Bay and to minimize damage to natural habitats and degradation of water quality. State-wide goals for protection of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (Critical Area) include minimizing water quality impacts from pollutants in runoff; conserving fish, wildlife, and plant habitat; and establishing land use development policies that accommodate limited growth while also addressing adverse environmental impacts inherent to human activity.

The Critical Area in Subregion 5 extends along the Potomac River into the lower reaches of Piscataway Creek. All of the Critical Area in the master plan area is within the designated green infrastructure network.

Overlay zoning districts apply within the Critical Area. Nearly all the Critical Area in Subregion 5 is in the Resource Conservation Overlay (R-C-O) which has a maximum residential density of one dwelling unit per 20 acres. Two small areas are in the Limited Development Overlay (L-D-O)—maximum residential density one dwelling unit per four acres. The County periodically revises and updates its Critical Area program. Many of the recommended actions elsewhere in this chapter also support and encourage resource protection and enhancement when applied to the Critical Area.

Policy

• Enhance the County’s Critical Area protection program in response to local, regional, and statewide initiatives and legislative changes.

Strategies

• Ensure that the primary and secondary buffers are protected and enforced to the fullest extent possible.
• Increase enforcement activities as needed within the Critical Area.
E. AIR QUALITY AND GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

The 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan discusses air quality primarily in relation to improving air quality in the Developed Tier by enhancing environmental features and green infrastructure elements. Since 2002, climate change and greenhouse gas emissions have emerged as major issues at the international, national, and local levels.

The Washington Metropolitan Area is a nonattainment area\textsuperscript{12} for ground-level ozone, an invisible gas formed when volatile organic compounds (VOC) and nitrogen oxides (NO\textsubscript{x}) react in sunlight. The primary sources of VOCs and NO\textsubscript{x} are utilities and other industrial activity, motor vehicles, small gasoline-powered engines, solvents, cleaning solutions, paints, and insecticides.

Gases that trap heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHGs). Some GHGs such as water vapor, carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide, and ozone occur naturally but are also emitted to the atmosphere through human activities. Other GHGs such as fluorinated gases are created and emitted solely through human activities.

The Maryland Climate Action Plan developed in August 2008 recommends a 90 percent reduction in GHG emissions by 2050. Also in 2008, the Prince George’s County Council adopted a resolution identifying the goal of reducing countywide GHG emissions below 80 percent of 2008 levels by 2050 (CR-24-2008).

The County has an important role to play in reducing GHG emissions and preparing for the impacts of climate change through policies and actions in the areas of land use planning, transportation, woodland conservation, and energy use.

Prince George’s County has created the position of a County Energy Manager, whose responsibilities include the creation of a greenhouse gas emissions inventory to account for County GHG emissions. The Department of the Environment (DoE) is developing a program to implement reduction strategies and monitor the program goals.

\textsuperscript{12} A nonattainment area is an area where air pollution levels persistently exceed the national ambient air quality standards.

Policies

• Reduce air pollution through transportation demand management (TDM) projects and programs.
• Promote “climate-friendly” development patterns through planning processes and land use decisions.
• Increase awareness of the sources of air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions.

Strategies

Short Term

• Develop a strategic climate action plan that examines Prince George’s County GHG emissions and reduction strategies.
• Engage in outreach to educate and raise awareness regarding how residents and businesses can address air quality and climate change at the local and household levels.

Ongoing

• Reduce air pollution and energy use by placing a high priority on transportation demand management (TDM) projects, transit, and mixed use development (Chapter VI: Transportation).
• Design development and redevelopment projects to minimize the need for motor vehicle trips (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).
• Provide local and subregional pedestrian and bicycle facilities (Chapter VI: Transportation).
• Encourage the use of clean energy sources such as solar and wind power.
Map V-3: Chesapeake Bay Critical Area
F. GREEN BUILDING AND ENERGY EFFICIENCY

The 2002 General Plan includes a vision to reduce overall energy consumption and implement more environmentally sensitive building techniques. Green building is the practice of increasing the efficiency with which buildings use resources—energy, water, and materials—during the building’s life cycle through better siting, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and removal. Green buildings are designed to reduce the overall impact of the built environment on human health and the natural environment. Buildings have a huge impact on energy use and resource consumption. In the U.S., buildings account for 39 percent of total energy use, 12 percent of the total water consumption, and 68 percent of total electricity consumption. In September 2007, the County established a Green Building Executive Steering Committee and Energy Efficiency Council as part of the County’s Going Green Initiative. The committee was tasked to evaluate the feasibility of the following green building goals and develop the following goal-specific implementation guidelines, actions, and financial strategies:

- Reduce 2007 energy consumption per square foot in all existing County buildings by 20 percent by the year 2015.
- Design and construct all new County buildings and public schools in accordance with the LEED silver rating.
- Establish incentives for both new and existing private commercial buildings to achieve a LEED silver rating or an equivalent rating under a comparable green building performance measure.
- Establish a green building education and outreach program.
- Ensure that a sufficient number of development and permit review staff possesses LEED accreditation and are able to sign off on tax credits and certifications, and to adequately assist commercial developers or large-scale property owners in meeting performance measures.

LEED is developing standards for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) that would allow for evaluation and certification of neighborhoods regarding their level of energy and environmental design.

---

13 Prince George’s County Going Green Initiative.
14 The Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Green Building Rating System™ is a voluntary national standard developed by the U.S. Green Building Council for the design, construction, and operation of high performance green buildings.

Policy

- Encourage the use of green building techniques that reduce resource and energy consumption.

Strategies

Short term

- Implement the recommendations of the County’s Green Building Executive Steering Committee and Energy Efficiency Council.

Ongoing

- Consider vehicle fleet improvements: as vehicles are replaced, continue and increase hybrid or alternative-fuel vehicle purchases.
- Implement anti-idling policies and consider preferred parking for hybrid vehicles.
G. NOISE INTRUSION

Noise is generally defined as any form of unwanted sound. Noise is a composite of all background noises that emanate from point and non point sources and are transferred to a receptor or receiver. The amount of noise transmitted can vary considerably due to elevations, the existence of barriers, and project design. Federal, state, and local ordinances and guidelines have been developed to ensure the reduction of noise levels to acceptable standards. The consensus is that for exterior noise, 65 “A-weighted” decibels (dBA), averaged over a 24-hour period (Day/Night Level or Ldn), is the maximum noise level generally acceptable for residential areas.

In Subregion 5, major sources of noise are aircraft operations at JBA, construction and mining operations, and vehicular traffic. Noise around JBA is discussed in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern.

Mining and construction operations affect the noise environment, sometimes significantly, but the relatively small numbers and intermittent nature means that the impact is relatively insignificant when compared to the noise impact of all vehicular traffic along roadways. Local highways generate noise according to the speed and volume of traffic carried, as well as other factors including noise reception location and topography. Freeways are normally the noisiest facilities. The use of sound-deadening barriers or other sound attenuation measures can reduce noise to acceptable residential levels.

Policy

• Ensure that excessive noise-producing uses are not located near uses that are particularly sensitive to noise intrusion.

Strategies

Ongoing

• Evaluate development and redevelopment proposals in areas subject to significant noise intrusions using Phase I noise studies and noise models.
• Provide for adequate setbacks for development exposed to existing and proposed noise generators and roadways of arterial classification or greater.
• Provide for the use of noise reduction measures when noise issues are identified.
• Require development within 65 dBA Ldn and greater noise exposure areas to be properly protected from the transmission of noise with barriers that affect sound propagation and/or the use of sound absorbing materials in construction.
• Work with the Maryland State Highway Administration to ensure that as state roads such as MD 5 and US 301 are upgraded, appropriate noise reduction measures are incorporated into the roadway design.
H. SAND AND GRAVEL MINING

Under state law, a comprehensive plan must incorporate land use policies and recommendations to balance mineral resource extraction with other land uses, and to prevent the preemption of mineral resource extraction by other uses. This resource provides an economic base for jobs, value-added services, and economic benefits. However, mining projects can have significant impacts on nearby communities and property owners, particularly with respect to noise, dust, and truck traffic. See Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern and Chapter VIII: Economic Development for policies and strategies that address these issues.

Strategies

• Continue to review proposed mining projects for impacts on the integrity of the master plan, using the following guidelines:
  * Mining operations should minimize impacts on scenic, historic, cultural, or recreational assets.
  * Post-extraction uses should support the plan’s preservation goals with mined land reclaimed for agricultural and forest uses.
  * Additional considerations for post-extraction uses should be community uses such as parks and trails.

• Educate the community on the special exception review process for mining operations.

• Increase monitoring and enforcement of the special exception conditions of approval for ongoing mining operations.

• Evaluate the utilization of a mineral overlay zoning district that corresponds to the unexploited sand and gravel deposits, avoiding already developed lands, to protect mineral resources. The boundaries of the district could be limited to the PPA. Within the overlay district, require the following:
  * Surveys of mineral resources prior to development for other uses.
  * Offering access to mineral resources, if present, prior to development.
  * Mitigation requirements for development projects that proceed without exploiting the resource. Mitigation could consist of placing a protective easement on other land in need of protection, or payment of a fee-in-lieu to support the County’s land preservation programs.
  * Increase setback and buffering requirements on potential mining sites adjacent to residential properties to minimize the potential effects of noise and dust from future mining.
  * Post-mining reclamation requirements that match preservation, community recreation, and environmental needs. Within the PPA, these should encourage reclamation for agriculture or woodland.
Map V-4: Sand and Gravel Resources, Southern Prince George’s County
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VI: TRANSPORTATION

OVERVIEW

The Subregion 5 transportation system includes roads for vehicular and transit mobility, sidewalks for pedestrians, and recreational trails for bicycling, hiking, and horseback riding. General aviation provides an additional mobility option in Subregion 5. The road system in this master plan accommodates both local and through trips, and links the study area to the region’s overall transportation network. The network includes regionally significant roads such as state-funded MD 5, MD 210, and MD 223; and roads that carry substantial through and commuter traffic in addition to local trips (Chapter II: Background). The network also consists of County-maintained roads, such as Floral Park, Surratts and Livingston Roads, as well as numerous residential streets. Residents of the master plan area use the transportation network to commute to jobs, social activities, schools, and shopping.

Subregion 5 faces several major transportation issues that will require a strong commitment from all levels of government to achieve a multi-modal transportation system that better meets today’s demand and projected future growth. Funding for new facilities and improvements, including roads and transit, is critical to meet existing needs, ensure that growth continues in the designated centers, and ensure that transportation facilities are in place to serve projected growth in the region. Prior plans have identified major road facilities that were needed to accommodate new growth; however, many of these projects have remained unfunded. The transportation network also contains many older roads that were not designed to function as major thoroughfares. These facilities now require upgrades to meet safety and transportation needs. The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance evaluates impacts upon the transportation network in the area immediately surrounding new development. Consequently, only segments of the network are constructed by developers, if and when development occurs. There is no remedy for existing transportation shortfalls.

This chapter identifies and evaluates issues for the major transportation sectors within the subregion and recommends improvements. Information is provided in the context of previously recommended road improvements in the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment, procedures used in evaluating the transportation impact of new development, adequate public facilities, and roadway capacity needs anticipated in the short and long range. Policies and strategies are set forth at the end of this chapter to address projected transportation needs and concerns that arose during the plan preparation process.
The future transportation network will improve traffic flow on major roadways, establish new roads and connections in the community, and increase opportunities to use public transit. It will also enhance sidewalks, bikeways, and trails that link the communities within Subregion 5. Designated scenic and historic roads will be conserved and enhanced as a defining element of community character, linked to the historic development patterns of the county. New developments designed as transit-oriented communities will complement future bus rapid transit or light rail stations in Brandywine and Clinton. These communities will provide an alternative to the predominant suburban development pattern in Subregion 5 by providing shopping, medical services, recreation, and transit in proximity to each other. The available transit will provide convenient access to jobs and services outside the community.

**Goals**

- Regional transportation facilities provide for the efficient movement of people and commerce.
- Transportation improvements are completed to serve existing development and projected growth in Subregion 5.
- Improvements to the road network are concurrent with development so that roadway and intersection capacities are adequate to meet projected growth.
- A multi-modal transportation network is completed that increases mobility options for pedestrians, bicyclists, and transit riders in Subregion 5.
- Natural and cultural features of scenic and historic roads, including viewsheds, are preserved to the greatest extent possible during the infrastructure phasing and development review processes.

**A. Roads**

**Transportation Issues**

- Many roads in Subregion 5 are relatively old; built when the area was more rural in character. Today, these narrow, older roads have become important commuter thoroughfares. Roads in this category include all or portions of MD 223 (Piscataway Road), MD 373 (Accokeek Road), MD 381 (Brandywine Road) and Old Brandywine Road, Temple Hills Road, Old Alexandria Ferry Road, and Floral Park Road. These roads carry more traffic at higher speeds than they were designed to handle. They are in need of upgrades and improvements to serve current transportation needs.
- Continuous traffic flows along certain roads, especially at peak hours, create difficult and/or dangerous situations for residents exiting their driveways or small side streets onto main roads, especially when making left turns. This occurs on segments of roads such as MD 223, MD 373, MD 381, Temple Hills Road, and Thrift Road where there are relatively high traffic volumes, continuous vehicle flow, and no signalized intersections to stop traffic, thereby creating gaps for side traffic to enter main roads.
- Citizens are concerned about new residential subdivisions being approved prior to roads being upgraded to support existing traffic volumes.
- Developer-funded road improvements will help address some of the existing inadequacies in the roadway system, but these improvements do not address the entire problem. There are many failing roadway links that are not the responsibility of the development community.
Improving road facilities is challenging and can rarely be accomplished easily or quickly due to high right-of-way acquisition costs, the extensive time it takes to gain federal and state approval (from the planning stage to completion of construction), and limited funding from County, state, and federal sources. The primary concern is to fund necessary road improvements in a way that addresses existing problems and helps meet future demand. Impact fees, surcharges, forward funding, and other methods of raising County road revenues have been used in other localities to address these problems with varying degrees of success. There is a need to explore other funding sources in order to address transportation issues raised during this master planning process.

Increased congestion along roadways is also a result of growth and development in adjoining jurisdictions.

**Major Network Roads in Subregion 5**

- **MD 5 (Branch Avenue):** MD 5 is a major commuter route linking Southern Maryland to Washington, D.C. The short segment of MD 5 from Subregion 6 (adjacent to the southwest boundary of JBA) to MD 223 (Woodyard Road) has already been upgraded to a freeway.
- **US 301 (Crain Highway):** As a major link between Baltimore, southern Maryland, and Richmond, Virginia, US 301 carries a large volume of regional through traffic. US 301 crosses Subregions 3, 5, and 6. The past master plan recommends an upgrade of existing US 301 to freeway status along its entire length from US 50 in Bowie, southward to the Charles County line.
- **MD 210 (Indian Head Highway):** MD 210 is a major commuter route linking Southern Maryland to Washington, D.C.
- **MD 223 (Woodyard Road/Piscataway Road):** MD 223 currently experiences heavy traffic volumes, especially between Steed Road and Rosaryville Road, as it is the only major route that crosses Subregion 5 from east to west. MD 223 functions as the subregion’s “Main Street” by connecting residential subdivisions and local commercial centers to the major north-south roads.

**Existing Conditions**

**Existing Level of Service**

As part of this master plan preparation process, the existing road network was reviewed in relation to traffic volumes from existing development and projected traffic volumes from approved but not developed ‘pipeline’ development, and road improvements that are either funded through the state’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), the County’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), or conditioned for funding and construction by developers.

This review showed that traffic conditions in Subregion 5 will continue to deteriorate until planned improvements are completed, absent additional road improvements beyond those funded by the state or County, or required to be built by developers.

**Road Improvements Since 1992**

Since 1992, eight major improvements have either been made to the Subregion 5 road network or are imminent\(^1\) *(Table VI-1: Roadway Improvements, 1992 – 2008).* Minor improvements to the road network have occurred as conditions of development approval, such as right-of-way dedication along frontages (which may result in

\(^1\) 1992 was picked rather than 1993 so as to include the MD 5 / MD 223 interchange in the list.
improvements relating to acceleration, deceleration, and left-turn lanes into new developments). In addition, traffic signals have been installed at intersections near new developments to control the flow of traffic onto major roads. These types of minor road improvements are not identified in Table VI-1: Roadway Improvements, 1992–2008.

Although not constructed yet, two additional projects are in the Prince George’s County FY 2008–2013 Approved CIP: one has money allocated for design or construction in budget year FY 2008, and the other is currently under construction. The remaining project is the interchange at MD 5, MD 373, and MD 381. It is in the Maryland State Highway Administration’s (SHA) FY 2007–2012 Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP). Although it is not funded for construction, it is fully designed. Additional road projects are listed in the CIP and the CTP, but are not funded for construction.

Existing Traffic and Approved Development

As of January 2008, 22 intersections in Subregion 5 and two road segments failed to meet adequacy standards (Table VI-3: Inadequate Road Segments and Intersections in Subregion 5 (as of 2008)). Of the 24 inadequate locations, two are links, 14 are signalized intersections, and eight are unsignalized intersections. MD 5 has the largest number of inadequacies, followed by US 301, MD 223, MD 210, and Temple Hills Road.

Despite approved developer-funded and government-programmed improvements, the following roads in Subregion 5 are projected to experience failing Level of Service E or F conditions:

• MD 223 (Woodyard/Piscataway Road) east of MD 5.
• MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) from Subregion 7 to MD 373 (Accokeek Road).
• MD 381 (Brandywine Road) between MD 223 and Piscataway Creek.
• Farmington Road east of MD 210.
• Steed Road, Surratts Road between MD 381 and Dangerfield Road, and Temple Hills Road north of Kirby Road.

The two failing roadway links include a long segment along MD 5 south of Surratts Road and a segment of MD 223 between MD 5 and Brandywine Road. These roadway links are evaluated in separate state planning studies to identify potential improvement strategies. A County CIP project, listed in the design phase, will address two failing Brandywine Road intersections at Surratts Road and Thrift Road. Improvements to the MD 223/Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road intersection will be developer-funded as a condition of development approval.

The currently failing intersection locations are all in the Developing Tier and are primarily along or near the MD 5 Corridor. Other major roads with failing intersections are US 301, MD 223, MD 210, Brandywine Road, and Temple Hills Road. Two of the failing MD 5 intersections at MD 373 (Accokeek Road) and Brandywine Road are designated for replacement by a single grade-separated interchange through the state’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), but the project is currently not funded for construction. Developer-funded improvements have been constructed at the MD 5/Surratts Road intersection, but further upgrades are necessary to address congestion, and an interchange is recommended in this plan.
### Completed Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Funding Program/Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Construction of MD 228.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>State CTP (Consolidated Transportation Program)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Widening of MD 228 to four lanes from MD 210 to Charles County.</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Widening of MD 210 to six lanes from Piscataway Creek to MD 228.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Reconstruction of MD 210/MD 228 intersection.</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>New MD 5/MD 223 interchange.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MD 5/Coventry Way interchange (included elimination of MD 5/Old Branch, MD 5/Old Alexandria Ferry Road, and MD 5/Malcolm Road intersections).</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Widening of US 301/MD 5 from T.B. to Charles County.</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Relocation of MD 223 onto a new alignment between Piscataway Creek and Livingston Road.</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Under Construction, County Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Funding Program/Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD669531</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road—Drainage. Construction of curb and gutter and an enclosed drainage system. An additional turning lane from Temple Hills Road onto MD 223 is part of this project.</td>
<td>Will be completed during FY 2008.</td>
<td>Prince George's County CIP (Capital Improvement Program).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Under Design, County Capital Improvements Program (CIP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Funding Program/Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FD669001</td>
<td>Surratts Road—Upgrading Surratts Road to a collector type roadway from the vicinity of Beverly Avenue westward to Brandywine Road. The project also includes improvements to Brandywine Road from Thrift Road to just north of Surratts Road. This project will improve existing traffic service and provide sufficient capacity for projected area development.</td>
<td>Active project currently in design/engineering phase. Money for construction budgeted in FY 2011.</td>
<td>Prince George's County CIP. This project has been in the CIP since 1989.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Under Design, State Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
<th>Year Completed</th>
<th>Funding Program/Entity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PG1751</td>
<td>MD 5 at MD 373/381—Construction and relocation of the interchange at MD 5, MD 373 and MD 381.</td>
<td>The project has been completely designed and is on hold until funding is available.</td>
<td>State CTP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sixteen developer-funded transportation improvements have been identified in traffic impact studies and approved as planning board conditions. Each of these projects has been imposed as a condition of development for at least one specific development, and each is waiting to be designed and constructed pending development activity (Table VI-2: Developer-Funded Projects in Subregion 5 (as of 2008)). Of these sixteen developer projects, eleven are located at Subregion 5 intersections that are currently failing. The remaining five improvements are required to address failing conditions with approved development.

Table VI-2: Developer-Funded Projects in Subregion 5 (as of 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Key</th>
<th>Primary Link</th>
<th>Cross Street (or segment end)</th>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>MD 373</td>
<td>Widen/Reconfigure Turn Lanes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Widen/Reconfigure Turn Lanes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Moores Lane</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MD 210</td>
<td>MD 373/Livingston Road</td>
<td>Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MD 210</td>
<td>Pine Drive</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue / Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Modify Signal/Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td></td>
<td>Temple Hills Road</td>
<td>Modify Signal/Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td></td>
<td>Steed Road</td>
<td>Modify Signal/Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td></td>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>New Signal/Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td></td>
<td>Windbrook Drive</td>
<td>New Signal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td></td>
<td>Purple Fields Drive/Baroque Boulevard (Bevard site access)</td>
<td>New Signal/Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Old Alexandria Ferry Road/Dangerfield Road</td>
<td>Add Turn Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>US 301 Northbound</td>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>US 301 Northbound</td>
<td>Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>US 301 Southbound</td>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>US 301 Southbound</td>
<td>Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>Signalization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The M-NCPPC Transportation Section, Countywide Planning Division, 2008

* These projects also require State Funding

Major Transportation Studies

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is undertaking two major planning studies within Subregion 5, the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvement Project and the MD 223 Piscataway Road/Steed Road. A brief description of each study follows:

US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is studying potential transportation solutions for US 301 traffic between the US 301/MD 5 interchange and Turkey Hill Road in Charles County, south of Waldorf. This study is the latest in a long series of studies of US 301, which began in 1981 with various access control studies and continued with the Eastern Bypass Corridor Study and the Washington Bypass Joint Study. The latter study concluded with hearings in 1990 but no official recommendation. This was followed by a US 301 Transportation Study Task Force between 1993 and 1996. This task force studied relationships between land use and transportation issues, and the resulting US 301 South Corridor Study focused on
Table VI-3: Inadequate Road Segments and Intersections in Subregion 5 (as of 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID Number</th>
<th>Primary Facility</th>
<th>Cross Street (or link segment)</th>
<th>AM CLV*</th>
<th>AM LOS*</th>
<th>PM CLV*</th>
<th>PM LOS*</th>
<th>Year of Analysis</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>MD 5 to Brandywine Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>South of Surratts Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Daily link</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unsignalized Intersections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID Number</th>
<th>Primary Facility</th>
<th>Cross Street (or link segment)</th>
<th>AM CLV*</th>
<th>AM LOS*</th>
<th>PM CLV*</th>
<th>PM LOS*</th>
<th>Year of Analysis</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>MD 210</td>
<td>Farmington Road</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Woody Terrace</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Burch Hill/Earnshaw</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Moores Lane</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>US 301 Northbound</td>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>US 301 Northbound</td>
<td>Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>US 301 Southbound</td>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>US 301 Southbound</td>
<td>Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road</td>
<td>Kirby Road</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td>Fail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Unsignalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signalized Intersections**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map ID Number</th>
<th>Primary Facility</th>
<th>Cross Street (or link segment)</th>
<th>AM CLV*</th>
<th>AM LOS*</th>
<th>PM CLV*</th>
<th>PM LOS*</th>
<th>Year of Analysis</th>
<th>Type of Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Surratts Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Thrift Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>MD 210</td>
<td>MD 373/Livingston</td>
<td>1462</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1626</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Old Alex Ferry/Dangerfield</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1371</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Old Branch/Brandywine</td>
<td>1571</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1796</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Rosaryville Road</td>
<td>1384</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>1567</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Brandywine Road</td>
<td>1851</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2064</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>MD 373</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>1930</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>MD 5</td>
<td>Surratts Road</td>
<td>1727</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1593</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>US 301</td>
<td>MD 381</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>US 301/MD 5</td>
<td>Chadds Ford Drive</td>
<td>1879</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2129</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>US 301/MD 5</td>
<td>Clymer Drive</td>
<td>2051</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2683</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>US 301/MD 5</td>
<td>McKendree/Cedarville</td>
<td>1278</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Signalized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: The M-NCPPC Transportation Planning Section.

* CLV=Critical Lane Volume. LOS=Level of Service.
** Unsignalized Intersections are either pass or fail.
transportation improvement strategies from the US 301/MD 5 interchange to the Governor Harry W. Nice Memorial Bridge over the Potomac River. This study was placed on hold in 2001 pending the completion of more detailed environmental and engineering studies.

In 2006, SHA initiated engineering and environmental analysis for the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project. As of fall 2008, the study identified the detailed alternatives to be studied, including an alternative that would upgrade existing US 301 and alternatives that would provide eastern and western bypass alignments around Waldorf. The County does not support new alignment alternatives for US 301 within Subregions 5 or 6 because of the impacts that these alignments would have on land in the Rural Tier. Recommendations in this plan reflect Prince George’s County Council Resolution CR-72-2001 (November 13, 2001) which states that the Western Bypass (F-10) should be removed from the long-range plans for Subregion 5 and that the MD 5/US 301 roadway should be upgraded along its existing alignment with the least possible impact to the existing business community.

**MD 223 Piscataway Road/Steed Road to MD 5**
SHA has initiated a long-term planning study of MD 223 between Floral Park Road and MD 4 (in Subregion 6). The overall study has three segments: MD 4 to MD 5, MD 5 to Steed Road, and Steed Road to Floral Park Road. During 2008, only the Steed Road to MD 5 segment was an active project planning study (A-54) and funding for that study was deferred. The purpose of the study is to improve safety conditions and increase the existing roadway capacity to accommodate projected traffic volumes. Alternatives will examine the number of lanes, intersection improvements, and bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The remaining two MD 223 segments are intended to be funded for project planning studies at a later date.

**Evaluation of Transportation Systems with Projected Growth**
By 2030, Subregion 5 will contain approximately 11,300 more dwelling units than are present in 2008 (Chapter II: Background), a growth rate of 61 percent. However, this growth will not be evenly distributed throughout the subregion. Approximately 8,400 new units would be built in both the Brandywine and Clinton areas, with the remaining 2,900 new units to be built in the Accokeek area.

Approximately 2,700 new jobs are anticipated as part of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) program and other job reassignments initiated by the Department of Defense. This will have an impact on the roads in Subregion 5, particularly around Joint Base Andrews. In addition to the major highways described above, Temple Hills Road, Surratts Road, Accokeek Road, and Brandywine Road will be impacted by BRAC related traffic.

Much of the projected residential development in Subregion 5 relies on employment and commercial activity outside of Subregion 5. Thus, the subregion’s major roads, US 301, MD 5, MD 210 and MD 223, are expected to bear a large share of the increased traffic. The provision of timely upgrades to these roads is a high priority for the implementation of this plan. **Table VI-4: Recommended Road Improvements by 2030** shows the recommended road improvements to support the growth envisioned in this master plan to the year 2030.
The full list of recommended road upgrades (including future freeway interchanges) are listed in Table VI-4 on the following page and are illustrated on Map VI-1: Inadequate Intersections and Road Segments and Map VI-2: Roadways.

**Table VI-4: Recommended Road Improvements by 2030**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Proposed Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New Roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-53</td>
<td>Woodyard Road (MD 223)</td>
<td>MD 5 to Rosaryville Road</td>
<td>120’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-54*</td>
<td>Piscataway Road/Woodyard Road (MD 223)</td>
<td>MD 210 to MD 5</td>
<td>Varies (120’ minimum)</td>
<td>4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-55</td>
<td>Accokeek Road/Accokeek Road Relocated (MD 373)</td>
<td>Relocated between Duckett Road and US 301/MD5 (build relocated section)</td>
<td>Varies (120’ minimum)</td>
<td>4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-63</td>
<td>Brandywine Employment Spine Road</td>
<td>A-55 to MD 5</td>
<td>120’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-65</td>
<td>Old Fort Road Extended</td>
<td>MD 223 to MD 5</td>
<td>Varies (120’ minimum)</td>
<td>4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-501</td>
<td>Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to MD 5</td>
<td>80’–100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-502</td>
<td>West Brandywine Spine Road</td>
<td>MD 5 to A-55</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-503</td>
<td>Matapeake Business Drive</td>
<td>A-55 (south of Timothy Branch) to A-55 (at A-63)</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-703</td>
<td>Old Fort Road Extended</td>
<td>C-719 to MD 223</td>
<td>80’–100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-513</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue/ Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to MD 5 (at Kirby Road)</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-516</td>
<td>Steed Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Allentown Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-533</td>
<td>Tippett Road</td>
<td>Thrift Road to MD 223</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-609</td>
<td>Surratts Road</td>
<td>Brandywine Road to Dangerfield Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Interchange</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>MD 5 at Surratts Road Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>MD 5 at A-65/C-613 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>MD 5 at A-63/C-522 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>US 301/MD 5 at A-55 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>US 301/MD 5 at A-55/C-502 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-10</td>
<td>US 301 at A-63 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>MD 210 at Farmington Road Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>MD 210 at MD 373 (Livingston Road) Interchange, if deemed necessary, with MD 373 going over MD 210.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>MD 210 at E-7 (MD 228, Berry Road) Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7</td>
<td>MD 228 at Manning Road East Interchange</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Intersection</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-520</td>
<td>Windbrook Drive at Floral Park Road: Consider replacing four-way stop with appropriate traffic controls.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M-NCPPC Transportation Section, Countywide Planning Division, 2008

*In Lieu of widening beyond four lanes, consider the construction of C-514 or A-65 as a means of providing a parallel route for traffic.
Major State Road Recommendations by 2030

Several of the major roads within the subregion are part of the Maryland State Highway Administration system and are key links in the transportation system. Improvements are planned for several of these facilities or a project planning study is currently underway. A summary of the planned improvements is provided below.

- **MD 5 (Branch Avenue):** MD 5 is a major commuter route linking Southern Maryland to Washington, D.C. This plan recommends that it be upgraded to freeway status from I-495 to Charles County. The short segment of MD 5 from Subregion 6 (adjacent to the southwest boundary of Joint Base Andrews) to MD 223 (Woodyard Road) has already been upgraded to freeway status. Interchanges in Subregion 5 (F9, Branch Avenue) are proposed at Surratts Road, proposed A-65, proposed A-63, and US 301 (reconstruct). See also interchanges listed for US 301 (F9, Branch Avenue). A transitway along MD 5 is in the early planning stages for right-of-way preservation (see below, under Transit).

- **US 301 (Crain Highway):** As a major link between Baltimore; southern Maryland; and Richmond, Virginia; US 301 carries a large volume of regional through traffic. US 301 crosses Subregions 3, 5, and 6. This master plan contains recommendations to upgrade US 301 to freeway status (a recommendation that is consistent with the recommendations in other master plans) along its entire length from US 50 in Bowie to the Charles County line. Interchanges in Subregion 5 are planned at proposed A-63 (partial—F-10), MD 5, proposed A-55 (partial—F9, Branch Avenue), and McKendree Road/Cedarville Road. The interchanges in the Brandywine area would provide local accessibility to planned land uses (Map VI-2: Roadways). Within Subregion 5, the US 301 freeway would use the existing US 301 alignment; however, new alignment segments east and west of the existing US 301/MD 5 roadway are being evaluated by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) (Section: US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Project).

- **MD 210 (Indian Head Highway):** MD 210 is a major commuter route linking Southern Maryland to Washington, D.C. This plan recommends upgrading MD 210 to freeway status from Subregion 7 to MD 228. From MD 228 to Charles County, MD 210 would be upgraded to an expressway (F-11). The road is currently being upgraded to freeway status from the Capital Beltway to Old Fort Road South. This plan recommends upgrading existing at-grade intersections along MD 210 to interchanges at Farmington Road, MD 373 (Livingston Road) if deemed necessary, and MD 228 (E-7). If an interchange at MD 210 and MD 373 is necessary, the preferred design to retain connectivity between communities east and west of MD 210, is for the MD 210 freeway (F-7) to run beneath MD 373.

- **MD 223 (Woodyard Road/Piscataway Road):** This plan recommends that MD 223 be upgraded to a four- to six-lane arterial between Livingston Road and MD 4 (in Subregion 6), with a proposed extension of the arterial facility along Livingston Road and Farmington Road to connect to MD 210. MD 223 experiences heavy traffic volumes, especially between Steed Road and Rosaryville Road, which result from it being the only major route that crosses Subregion 5 from east to west. MD 223 functions as the subregion’s “Main Street” by connecting residential subdivisions and local commercial centers to the major north-south roads. MD 223 has four failing intersections within Subregion 5, and these conditions are projected to worsen. In some segments, continuous traffic flows make turning to or from MD 223 difficult.
Road Improvement Priorities

To ensure that funding is prioritized for new road improvements for both state and County roads, the following roads are top priority in Subregion 5:

State roads:
1. MD 5 interchanges at Surratts Road, Burch Hill Road (A-65), and Brandywine Road.
2. MD 223 widening between Steed Road and Subregion 6.
3. US 301/MD 5 upgrade between Charles County and T.B.
4. MD 223 widening between Floral Park Road and Steed Road.

County roads:
1. Surratts Road between Brandywine Road and MD 5.
2. Completion of the Brandywine Spine Road and West Brandywine Spine Road, including connections to US 301 and MD 5 north and south of T.B.
3. Widening of Brandywine Road between Thrift Road and MD 223.
4. Widening of the Floral Park Road approaches to MD 5 and MD 223.
5. Construction of A-65 from Old Fort Road to MD 223 or (if the former is constructed by developers) from MD 223 to MD 5.

2030 to Buildout

The adequacy of the recommended transportation network is tested by assuming the buildout of all vacant land within the subregion and the overall transportation network. This test is done using a transportation demand forecasting model. Such a model is a computerized procedure that takes into account Subregion 5 information as well as similar information in the remainder of Prince George’s County and the surrounding jurisdictions.

A transportation technical bulletin will be included with the final version of this plan. It will provide detailed traffic forecasting procedures, detailed results, and the reasoning behind the ultimate (or buildout) transportation recommendations. The new recommended roads and interchanges required at buildout are shown in Table VI-5: Recommended Road Improvements at Buildout, Beyond 2030.

This bulletin is available upon request from M-NCPPC Planning Information Services, Lower Level, County Administration Building, Upper Marlboro, MD.
### Table VI-5: Recommended Road Improvements at Buildout, Beyond 2030

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification</th>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Proposed Right-of-Way</th>
<th>Proposed Lanes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New and upgraded roads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-9</td>
<td>Branch Avenue (MD 5)</td>
<td>Charles County to Subregion 7</td>
<td>300’</td>
<td>6–8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-10*</td>
<td>Crain Highway (US 301)</td>
<td>MD 5 to Subregion 6</td>
<td>300’–450’</td>
<td>6–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-11</td>
<td>Indian Head Highway (MD 210)</td>
<td>MD 228 to Subregion 7</td>
<td>Varies</td>
<td>6–8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-5</td>
<td>Indian Head Highway (MD 210)</td>
<td>Charles County to MD 228</td>
<td>250’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-7</td>
<td>Berry Road (MD 228)</td>
<td>Charles County to MD 210</td>
<td>250’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-53</td>
<td>Woodyard Road (MD 223)</td>
<td>MD 5 to Subregion 6</td>
<td>120’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-54</td>
<td>Piscataway Road/Woodyard Road (MD 223)</td>
<td>MD 210 to MD 5</td>
<td>Varies (120’ minimum)</td>
<td>4–6, Multi-lane boulevard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-55*</td>
<td>Accokeek Road/Accokeek Road Relocated (MD 373)</td>
<td>MD 210 to US 301/MD 5 (at McKendree Road)</td>
<td>Varies (120’ minimum)</td>
<td>4–6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-63*</td>
<td>Brandywine Employment Spine Road</td>
<td>A-55 to F-9 at C-522</td>
<td>‘120’</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-65</td>
<td>Old Fort Road Extended</td>
<td>MD 223 to MD 5</td>
<td>Varies (80’ minimum)</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-500</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Subregion 7</td>
<td>80’–100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-501</td>
<td>Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to MD 5</td>
<td>80’–100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-502</td>
<td>West Brandywine Spine Road</td>
<td>MD 5 to A-55</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-503</td>
<td>Matapeake Business Drive</td>
<td>A-55 (south of Timothy Branch) to A-55 (at A-63)</td>
<td>100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC-703</td>
<td>Old Fort Road Extended</td>
<td>C-719 to MD 223</td>
<td>80’–100’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-510</td>
<td>Dangerfield Road</td>
<td>Surratts Road to MD 223</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-511</td>
<td>Coventry Way</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue to Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-512</td>
<td>Kirby Road</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road to Old Branch Avenue</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-513</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to MD 5 (at Brandywine interchange) to MD 5 (at Kirby Road)</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-514</td>
<td>Surratts Road Extended</td>
<td>MD 223 to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-515</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road Extended</td>
<td>C-514 to MD 223</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-516</td>
<td>Steed Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Allentown Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-517</td>
<td>Shady Oak Parkway</td>
<td>MD 5 to Dyson Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-518</td>
<td>Hyde Field/Edelen Collector Facility</td>
<td>MC-703 to Steed Road</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-519</td>
<td>Gallahan Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Old Fort Road South</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-520</td>
<td>Windbrook Drive</td>
<td>Thrift Road to MD 223</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-521</td>
<td>Thrift Road</td>
<td>Tippett Road to Windbrook Drive</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-523</td>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Subregion 7</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-524</td>
<td>Livingston Road/Bealle Hill Rd.</td>
<td>MD 373 to A-54</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-525</td>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>MD 210 (at Independence Road) to MD 210 (at MD 373)</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-526</td>
<td>Manning Road East</td>
<td>MD 210 to MD 228</td>
<td>80’</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>Road Name</td>
<td>Limits</td>
<td>Proposed Right-of-Way</td>
<td>Proposed Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-527*</td>
<td>Accokeek Road</td>
<td>A-55 to MD 5 at the Brandywine interchange</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-528</td>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>A-63 to C-610</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-529</td>
<td>Farmington Road</td>
<td>Livingston Road to MD 210</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-530</td>
<td>Berry Road</td>
<td>MD 373 to A-54</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-531</td>
<td>Danville Road</td>
<td>MD 373 to Floral Park Road</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-532</td>
<td>Gardner Road</td>
<td>Charles County to MD 373</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-533</td>
<td>Tippett Road</td>
<td>Thrift Road to MD 223</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-609</td>
<td>Surratts Road</td>
<td>Brandywine Road to Subregion 6</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-610</td>
<td>Cherry Tree Crossing Road Relocated</td>
<td>A-63 to Subregion 6</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-613*</td>
<td>MD 381 (Brandywine Road/Brandywine Road Extended)</td>
<td>F-9 at the Brandywine interchange to Subregion 6</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-617</td>
<td>Cedarville Road</td>
<td>A-63 to Subregion 6</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>2–4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-718</td>
<td>Allentown Road</td>
<td>Old Fort Place to Steed Road</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-719</td>
<td>Old Fort Road South/Old Fort Place</td>
<td>Gallahan Road to Allentown Road</td>
<td>80'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-500</td>
<td>Bealle Hill Road</td>
<td>MD 228 to MD 373</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-501</td>
<td>Manning Road East</td>
<td>MD 228 to MD 373</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-503</td>
<td>Pinta Street Extended</td>
<td>Kirby Road to Chris-Mar Avenue</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-504*</td>
<td>McKendree Road</td>
<td>MC-502 to MD 373</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-505</td>
<td>Missouri Avenue</td>
<td>MD 381 to Dyson Road</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-510</td>
<td>Windbrook Drive</td>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-511</td>
<td>Thrift Road</td>
<td>Tippett Road to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-512</td>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>60'</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-502</td>
<td>Louie Pepper Drive</td>
<td>MD 223 to Bellefonte Lane</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-503*</td>
<td>Short Cut Road</td>
<td>A-63 to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>70'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New and upgraded interchanges**

- F-9 (MD 5) at Surratts Road Interchange
- F-9 (MD 5) at A-65/C-613 Interchange
- F-9 (MD 5) at A-63/C-522 Interchange
- F-9** (MD 5) at F-10 (US 301) Interchange
- F-9 (US 301/MD 5) at A-55 Interchange
- F-9 (US 301/MD 5) at A-55/C-502 Interchange
- F-10 (US 301) at A-63 Interchange
- F-11 (MD 210) at Farmington Road Interchange
- F-11 (MD 210) at MD 373 (Livingston Road) Interchange, if deemed necessary, with MD 373 going over MD 210
- F-11 (MD 210) at E-7 (MD 228, Berry Road) Interchange
- E-7 (MD 228) at Manning Road East Interchange

* Alignment revised from 1993 Subregion V Master Plan.
** Existing interchange to be reconstructed.
*** Includes two reversible lanes or six lanes plus fixed guideway transit facility.
Implementation Of Transportation Recommendations

Adequate Public Facilities

The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance is the County’s primary tool to ensure that public facilities, including roads, are adequate prior to the construction of new development. Over time, several issues have been identified with the administration of the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance, including the standards used to determine adequacy and the timing of the facility review. This section provides an overview of the implementation issues and options for improving the ordinance.

Road Adequacy Standards

The Prince George’s County Planning Board approves preliminary subdivision plans. Before the Planning Board can approve a preliminary plan of subdivision an adequacy test on road conditions must be performed. To help with the test, a traffic impact study (TIS) to analyze traffic impact of a proposed development, prepared by the developer, is required where a development proposal will generate 50 trips or more during any peak commuting hour. In cases where a development will generate less than 50 trips, the developer may be requested to complete a limited traffic study or traffic counts to determine adequacy. The TIS must review:

• Existing traffic conditions.
• Future conditions—a combination of existing conditions plus the impact of previously-approved development as well as growth in through-traffic.
• Future conditions plus the traffic that will be generated by the proposal.

Adequacy Criteria

In order for a subdivision to be approved, the TIS must address both of the following criteria:

• There will be adequate access roads and intersections available to serve traffic generated by the proposed subdivision, or such roads have 100 percent construction funding included in the County’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP) or the state’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP).

• Traffic generated by the proposed subdivision will be accommodated on nearby intersections and roadways without exceeding the designated level-of-service (LOS), or roadway improvements and/or trip reduction programs fully funded by the developer will alleviate the inadequacy. (See Appendix 10: Understanding Level-of-Service).

LOS adequacy thresholds by General Plan policy tier are as follows:

• Developing Tier: LOS D
• Rural Tier: LOS C

3 The quality of traffic operations along a roadway or within an intersection is described utilizing the level-of-service (LOS) concept. LOS is a qualitative measure describing operational conditions within a traffic stream. LOS incorporates measures such as speed, travel time, freedom to maneuver, and traffic interruptions. LOS is measured on an A to F scale with LOS A representing the best operating conditions and LOS F representing the worst.
When Adequacy is Not Met

The Prince George’s County Planning Board may approve a subdivision where an existing road condition does not meet the adequacy criteria. There are two methods within which this can occur:

- **Developer-funded improvements:** Generally an applicant/developer proposes to fund and implement roadway improvements or trip reduction programs that will alleviate the inadequacy. Most of the developer-funded roadway improvements in Subregion 5, shown in Table VI-2: Developer-Funded Projects in Subregion 5, were required through Planning Board conditions of approval.

- **Transportation facilities mitigation plan:** The second method is available only along the US 301, MD 5, and MD 210 facilities within Subregion 5, and involves a proffer of mitigation improvements as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance. Through the submittal of a transportation facilities mitigation plan by an applicant, the Planning Board may allow applicants to mitigate, or offset, their site impact and meet a relaxed adequacy standard as defined in the Subdivision Ordinance. The results of mitigation are improved transportation conditions due to the facility improvements built by the developer, but not to a degree that fully meets the levels of adequacy described previously. Under this portion of the Subdivision Ordinance, developments generating 25 or fewer trips may proffer a pro-rata share of the cost of mitigating roadway improvements.

Regardless of whether the first or second method of approval is used, the objective is to ensure that traffic conditions at the time of completion of a development will be improved as compared to the previous traffic conditions.

Issues and Options

Congested roads carry extensive regional traffic as well as local traffic. Even if local traffic were to stay at current levels, regional traffic will increase, thereby increasing overall traffic. A relatively large proportion of the capacity issues are a direct result of commuter traffic—not that of County residents—passing through Subregion 5. Significant equity issues surround County funding of road improvements that carry substantial commuter traffic from outside the County.

Roadway inadequacies are concentrated in a few key areas: MD 5/US 301 in Brandywine, MD 5 and MD 223 in Clinton, and MD 210 in Accokeek. These are state roads that require state funding for improvements and upgrades. The state is experiencing financial shortfalls regarding the provision of road improvements. Due to very limited County and state resources for road improvements and construction, alternative funding sources must be identified.

The identification of a needed improvement in the County CIP as having 100 percent construction funding does not guarantee its construction but can be used to satisfy APF criteria. For example, an intersection improvement project may be in the County CIP for design and engineering and for full construction funding in the sixth year of the CIP. This indication that the improvement will be constructed enables the approval of new preliminary subdivisions in its vicinity because the APF requirement of 100 percent funding of the improvement is satisfied. An example of such a project is the Brandywine Road-Surratts Road intersection and adjoining segments. It has been in the County’s CIP since 1989. It is currently in the design and engineering phase,
with 100 percent construction funding, such that new development is allowed to be approved in the vicinity of this intersection, thereby continuing to increase congestion. Meanwhile, the needed improvement has appeared in the later years of every approved CIP since 1989. One option would be to change the working definition of “100 percent construction funding” of improvements in the CIP to that which has 100 percent construction funding in the first year of the CIP.

The APF test is a useful means of obtaining facility improvements and new roads. Examples include the MD 223 at Piscataway Creek project and Project A-65 (Old Fort Road extended to MD 5). Needed construction of portions of these road projects are conditions of approval for new developments. If developers could not fund and construct the improvement, their recourse would be to delay development until state or county funds were budgeted for these projects.

One approach to improving existing roads is to identify and implement short-term improvement strategies that can be implemented within available rights-of-way. Driveways or side streets from which it has become difficult for drivers to turn onto main roads are minor in the big picture but are potentially dangerous and frustrating for residents. A number of low-cost and low-impact projects can help to manage traffic flow in the existing transportation system until longer-term, more costly road improvements are funded and constructed. Typical short-term improvements include the addition of turning lanes and new traffic signals, optimizing traffic signal phasing and coordinating with other signals, adding bypass lanes, implementing driveway access controls, and constructing intersection geometric and safety improvements.

**Policies**

- Achieve consistency between the County’s Capital Improvement Program (CIP), the state’s Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) road improvement projects, and the recommended improvements in the approved master plan.
- Reconcile project funding, and the road improvements recommended in the master plan, and document prior to finalizing the CIP and CTP each fiscal year.
- Pursue and establish a variety of dedicated funding sources and strategies to complete the recommended 2030 and buildout transportation network.
- Ensure that transportation facilities are constructed in a timely fashion that will support planned growth; the transportation facilities identified in the 2030 road network (*Table VI-4: Recommended Road Improvements by 2030*) should be completed within the 2030 timeframe.
- Implement land use strategies that will reduce vehicle trips and miles traveled by encouraging mixed-use developments and increasing employment in targeted growth areas.
- Ensure that transportation facilities are adequate prior to approval of new development or rezoning proposals. Fund and approve transportation facilities identified in the CIP.
- Continue to support and implement the recommendations in the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*.
- Maintain significant amounts of land designated for future low-density residential development to mitigate congestion generated by local traffic.
Strategies

• Support the land use policies established in this plan that reduce vehicular travel demand, such as mixed use, and transit-oriented development, and increase employment development within Subregion 5 (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern) as development is reviewed for approval.

• Evaluate the traffic impact study procedures to determine if greater mitigation should be required from developers of small- to medium-size developments. The cumulative impacts of these projects often affect regional traffic and are not addressed in the traffic impact study.

• Evaluate additional funding options for transportation, including the viability and legality of transportation impact fees, bond funding mechanisms, an excise tax, and special financing districts.

• Explore opportunities to access public funding for transportation needs and support transportation management efforts.

• Conduct an annual evaluation of the CIP and CTP preliminary recommendations to ensure consistency with the recommendations in the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation. The annual review should also evaluate APF requirements, plan priorities, and growth patterns to identify and recommend additional CIP projects.

• Implement short-term strategies to reduce congestion on roads carrying comparatively high-traffic volumes relative to their built capacity. Candidate roads would include Brandywine Road, Temple Hills Road, Old Alexandria Ferry Road, and Surratts Road. Short-term strategies might include:
  i) Exploring solutions such as signalization, signal timing/optimization, bypass lanes, medians, and turn lanes through better coordination with County Department of Public Works and Transportation and the Maryland State Highway Administration.
  ii) Providing opportunities to implement short-term strategies during the development review process, including driveway access controls, access management plans, and opportunities for better connectivity and mobility between residential areas.

• Evaluate the adequate public facilities ordinance, specifically the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals” to see whether establishing geographic policy areas—to analyze road capacity and serve as the geographic basis for restricting or deferring development in specific areas until road inadequacies are addressed—would better address the road adequacy issues.

• Document and address “minor” inadequacies such as driveways or side streets that conflict with main roads. Encourage better connectivity between adjacent subdivisions, thus allowing residents to get to locations where they can safely access roadways, such as at signalized intersections. Use short-term, case-by-case solutions.

• Collaborate with the State Highway Administration (SHA) to upgrade state roads with developer contributions. Project costs can be split and/or County funding can accelerate what would otherwise be a lower priority state project.

• Explore opportunities to solve local mobility and safety issues by participating with SHA to provide seed funding of state projects with local transportation network interest, such as the MD 223 project from Floral Park Road to MD 4.

• Require that preliminary subdivision plan approvals be contingent upon adequate provisions for right-of-way needs to accommodate long-term transportation demand. The use of dedication of reservation must be utilized where appropriate and other strategies of reservation should be pursued where more traditional strategies cannot be used.

• Implement the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT) policies and strategies for streets, roads, and highways as they apply to new development applications and the preparation of plan recommendations.
Map VI-2: Roadways
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Map VI-3: Roadway Insets: Clinton and Brandywine
Changes from the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan Roadway Recommendations

The majority of the transportation recommendations in this master plan are carried forward from the 1993 master plan. However, changes to the road network are necessitated by the recommended Brandywine Community Center concept which was not a subject of the 1993 master plan and other decisions made since 1993. These changes include:

- Eliminate the proposed US 301 Western Bypass Alignment (the portion of F-10 formerly known as the Waldorf Bypass) extending from the existing US 301/MD 5 interchange to a crossing of Mattawoman Creek.

- Combine the F-9 and A-64 facilities into a single facility, F-9, thereby eliminating A-64. Upgrade the proposed interchange at F-9 and Cedarville Road/McKendree Road to a full-movement interchange, and include the northern end of a ramp system to serve MD 205. This is recommended to be consistent with the upgrade alternative for the US 301 Waldorf Area Transportation Improvements Study.

- Shift the proposed A-55 interchange location (as shown in the 1993 master plan) to a new location approximately one mile south of the existing US 301/MD 5 interchange. Modify the interchange from a partial to a full-movement interchange.

- Realign proposed Relocated MD 373/Accokeek Road (A-55) to intersect the proposed full interchange with upgraded US 301/MD 5 approximately one mile south of the existing US 301/MD 5 interchange. This includes rerouting A-55 to the south of Lake Ruth. Extend A-55 over the Timothy Branch at or near the proposed A-63 crossing, and redesignate A-63 south and east of the Timothy Branch as A-55.

- Delete I-500 and its right-in right-out access with A-64. Delete I-504, given that Long’s Subdivision has been extensively rezoned and replatted.

- Redesignate and upgrade the north-south portion of Matapeake Business Drive as MC-503. Extend this facility to the north to intersect with A-55, and extend to the south from the roundabout over the Timothy Branch to A-55.

- Realign C-527, the proposed Accokeek Road connection to Brandywine Road, to intersect C-522 at the proposed MD 5/A-63 interchange southbound ramp terminal intersection. Extend C-527 along a portion of MD 373 previously shown as A-55.

- Delete extension of P-504, McKendree Road, from the existing roadway to A-55 along the previous F-10 alignment. Realign the north end of McKendree Road to intersect A-55 opposite Becker Road.

- Delete C-613 between Missouri Avenue and Subregion 6 due to environmental constraints. Redesignate the section of C-613 between Missouri Avenue and MD 5 as C-517. Designate existing Missouri Avenue as P-505.

- Upgrade MD 381 to a collector with the designation C-613. Extend C-613 with an overpass of US 301 and an extension northward from T.B. to intersect A-63 at the proposed MD 5/A-63 interchange northbound ramp terminal intersection.

- In recognition of the smaller right-of-way dedication within the Bevard North property, redesignate the portion of A-65 northwest of MD 223 as an extension of MC-703. South and east of MD 223, maintain the A-65 designation, and realign to reflect right-of-way dedication from adjacent properties. The right-of-way for A-65 should vary from a minimum of 80 feet at stream crossings to 120 feet in general, and it should be constructed as a two-lane to four-lane facility as deemed appropriate by projected traffic volumes.

- Delete P-502 in recognition that the development in this area has been fully realized and platted with appropriate connections.
• Delete the portion of C-526 between MD 228 and MD 373, and designate Manning Road East between MD 228 and MD 373 as P-501. This includes an extension of Manning Road East on a new alignment north and east of Menk Road.

• Upgrade Tippett Road to a two-lane collector roadway with shoulders.

B. TRANSIT

Existing Transit Service

The transit network in Subregion 5 is limited, and primarily links the Clinton and Accokeek areas to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Metrorail system. Two agencies provide transit service in Subregion 5: WMATA and the County’s TheBus service. Map VI-4: Transit shows existing transit service in Subregion 5, including park-and-ride lots.

The County-operated TheBus service has two routes in the northern portion of the subregion. Route 30 connects the Clinton Park-and-Ride Lot to the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station via Piscataway Road and Temple Hills Road; Route 32 connects the Clinton Park-and-Ride Lot to the Naylor Road Metrorail Station (at the MD 5/Suitland Parkway interchange near the District of Columbia line) via Woodyard Road, Old Alexandria Ferry Road, and Coventry Way.

The County also offers paratransit services throughout the subregion. Call-A-Bus offers demand-response, curb-to-curb service for residents who are not served by or cannot use existing bus or rail services. Priority is given to senior and disabled persons. Senior Transportation Services (STS) provides regularly scheduled transportation throughout Prince George’s County to senior and disabled County residents.

The northern parts of the subregion are served by WMATA Metrobus routes C11 and C13, which connect Clinton to the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. Metrobus routes W13 and W14 also operate through the northwestern portion of the subregion, utilizing Old Fort Road South and Allentown Road, and terminating in Washington, D.C.

The Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) operates express commuter bus service along MD 5 and MD 210 between Washington, D.C., and three southern Maryland counties (Calvert, Charles, and St. Mary’s); however, none of these routes stop in Subregion 5.

The Clinton Park-and-Ride Lot and the Accokeek Park-and-Ride Lot are the only park-and-ride lots in the subregion. The 424-space Clinton lot is located on Stuart Lane and Woodyard Road (MD 223) near MD 5, and is served by TheBus routes 30 and 32 and Metrobus routes C11 and C13. The Accokeek lot is located on MD 373 at MD 210 and is served by Metrobus Route W19 which connects to the Southern Avenue Metrorail Station. The Branch Avenue Metrorail Station, located near Auth Way (near the I-95/I-495/MD 5 interchange), and is the most convenient Metro Station for residents of Subregion 5.

The Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) is conducting the Southern Maryland Transit Study along the MD 5 and US 301 corridor in Prince George’s County and Charles County. The purpose of the study is, with public inputs, to designate a preferred alignment for either a bus rapid transit (BRT) or light rail transit (LRT) system in the MD 5 corridor to address future transit needs. This study is concentrating on alignments that link southern Maryland to the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. This service would be very attractive for existing and future residents of Brandywine and Clinton.
### Policies

- Expand transit service in Subregion 5 to mitigate traffic congestion, reduce air pollution, and provide alternative means of transportation.
- Implement transit-oriented development (TOD) at designated locations in the recommended Brandywine Community Center.
- Preserve right-of-way in the MD 5/US 301 corridor in Subregion 5 for planned bus-rapid transit or light rail service and station areas.

### Strategies

- Implement the recommendations for a transit system contained in the MTA’s Southern Maryland Transit Corridor Preservation Study.
- Pursue the expansion of commuter bus service from the recommended Brandywine Community Center to the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. This could be accomplished by expanding existing MTA bus service and would assist in providing regional transit mobility. It would also strengthen market demand for transit service in the MD 5 corridor, expediting the implementation of such service.
- Pursue the expansion of bus transit services to link Brandywine and the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station until the full MD 5 transit system is implemented. This will support the land use recommendations that envision the Brandywine Community Center as a major transit-oriented mixed-use node.
- Develop a complementary set of circulator bus routes to connect passengers within the Brandywine area (the community center edges and beyond, as described in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern) and other neighborhoods near future stations to the corridor transit services once BRT or LRT service is implemented within the MD 5 corridor.
- Evaluate the transit service market for increased regional transit services to be provided by WMATA or MTA. Evaluate the potential for service from Clinton and Accokeek directly to downtown Washington, D.C.
- Review existing TheBus service to ensure that bus routes and frequency of service align with residential and employment needs within Subregion 5. Specifically explore the potential to expand TheBus to serve population and employment centers such as Brandywine and growing residential and commercial areas west of Clinton along MD 223 (beyond the existing bus service).
- Implement the following recommendations for transit services for the Brandywine Community Center:
  * Construct two BRT/LRT transit stations and provide related circulator bus service.
  * The use of structured parking at the Brandywine Community Center transit station to accommodate park-and-ride users, thereby preserving a larger land area for future mixed-use transit-oriented development.
  * The use of structured or surface parking to serve the proposed transit station at the MD 5/A-63 interchange in the area north of the Brandywine Community Center.
  * Obtain dedicated right-of-way for transit along MD 5 and US 301 as part of planned future upgrades of these roads to freeways.
C. SIDEWALKS, BIKEWAYS, AND TRAILS

To improve connectivity, the plan recommends a variety of trails to improve the multi-modal transportation network in Subregion 5. Recommendations are provided for on-road dual-route bicycle facilities, sidewalks, and off-road trails. The proposed network of sidewalks, bikeways, and trails is part of a larger multi-modal transportation system that will provide non-vehicular circulation and recreational opportunities for people in the subregion. Sidewalks, neighborhood bikeways, and trails are important for providing safe routes to school and building walkable communities. This plan proposes both on-road and off-road trails that can serve a number of different users, including commuters, recreational enthusiasts such as hikers and bicyclists, and those in the equestrian community. Because the region contains many new, existing, and planned subdivisions and employment areas, biking and walking are more important than ever. Connections to local and regional transit systems in the subregion are proposed in an effort to make commuting by bike and walking easier. When possible, all on- and off-road facilities should be designed and constructed according to the recommendations of the 2000 Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), Millennium Edition, and the 1999 Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO).

Sidewalk needs and trail connections were identified by residents as important community needs during workshops and community meetings for this master plan. Sidewalk connectivity in Subregion 5 is limited and discontinuous. Even though sidewalks exist in portions of Clinton, connectivity for pedestrians remains a challenge. A variety of facilities are needed to improve the walkability in Clinton. This plan recommends stream valley trails, sidepaths, on-road bicycle facilities (such as designated bike lanes), and sidewalk construction as part of a comprehensive, multi-modal network allowing residents to make trips by walking or bicycling. All neighborhood sidewalks should connect to recreational trails and regional dual-route facilities. Please refer to the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan for detailed discussions and recommendations for sidewalks, bikeways and trails in Clinton.

Sidewalks, bikeways, and trails vary by type of facility and user. The plan discusses each of these facilities below and provides a consolidated list of recommendations to improve them within the subregion.

Sidewalks

Generally, sidewalks are planned for all roads within all areas containing concentrations of people. Pedestrians can use sidepaths, sidewalks, and trail connections that serve multiple types of users. Standard-sized sidewalks are needed along roads that currently do not contain pedestrian facilities. Sidewalks encourage local foot-traffic, improve the health of people in the area, and provide safe access to transit, commercial, and service areas.

Bikeways

*On-Road Dual-Route Bicycle Facilities*

Dual routes are roads that contain an off-road bicycle and pedestrian facility and an on-road bicycle facility. An appropriate on-road component of a dual-route facility would be a shared use roadway, where the bicyclist shares the road with vehicles, or a painted bike lane. Even a wide, outside curb lane or a paved road shoulder can be used by bicyclists. Off-road components of a dual-route facility would be either a sidepath or wide sidewalk that could be used by bicyclists, equestrians and pedestrians. Dual routes are planned along most of the major roadways where four or more travel lanes are proposed.
On-Road Bicycle Facilities

Connectivity is crucial to the overall usability of the trail network, and this plan emphasizes an interconnected network of facilities that also serve functional purposes, such as commuting to work or school. Table VI-6: Recommended Major On-Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements lists the recommended on-road dual-route facilities in Subregion 5. When possible, these facilities will contain both an on-road and an off-road bicycle component. Recommended trails are shown on Map VI-5: Trails.

Roads in the southern part of the subregion are used by recreational and long-distance cyclists. Relatively low traffic volumes make these roads suitable for long distance cycling, commuting to work or school, connecting parks, natural areas, and other destinations. However, as development occurs and traffic volumes increase, it is important that bicycle-compatible road improvements are incorporated into frontages and road construction projects. Bicycle signage and safety improvements should be incorporated into frontage improvements along designated shared-use roadways when developments are approved or when construction occurs. Appropriate bikeway improvements along designated bikeways may include paved shoulders, painted bike lanes, bike signage, or wide outside curb lanes.

Trails

Off-Road Trails

Preserving and protecting land in stream valleys for parks, open space, and trails has been planning policy in Prince George’s County for many years. Most off-road trails recommended in Subregion 5 (Map VI-5: Trails) are in stream valley corridors, and are particularly important because they connect to destinations throughout the region.

Sidepaths are recommended in this plan to serve as multi-use trails along roadways. Sidepaths are typically separated from the roadway by a planted area or some other separation. As with on-road bicycle facilities, all trail designs should refer to the AASHTO guide before planning and construction.

Trails are recommended in this plan to serve mostly recreational users and to provide connections between various land uses and destinations. Trails can be completely natural or compacted surfaces. Paved trails of asphalt or concrete are appropriate in some areas, including the interior areas of parks, schools, and subdivisions. Most of the existing and planned natural-surface and compacted-surface trails can be designed to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and equestrians.

Many existing trails are displayed in Map IV-5: Trails and are located within the major parks in the subregion: Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park, Cosca Regional Park, and Piscataway National Park. Piscataway National Park also contains portions of the Potomac National Heritage Trail, which stretches from Piscataway National Park to Broad Creek and National Harbor. The portions of the National Heritage Trail in Piscataway Park include natural surface trails and a waterfront boardwalk, although some gaps exist in the overall network. Bicycle access to these trails is provided along Farmington Road West and Bryan Point Road, which function as relatively low volume, shared-use bikeways.

Roads that are not listed in the table are considered “shared use roads,” which typically have a wide outside lane or shoulder and low traffic volumes and require no further paving or striping improvements to safely accommodate bicycles. Until such time as these roads are planned for improvements, they will remain open-section roads and be considered as shared use roadways.
**Policies**

- Promote pedestrian and bicycle opportunities as part of a multi-modal transportation network.
- Promote dual-route facilities along all of the major road transportation corridors.
- Connect a spine network of trails to the most populated areas.
- Expand and promote hiker/biker/equestrian recreational activities.
- Promote and encourage cycling and walking for commuting purposes as an alternative to driving a car.
- Promote safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities in and around public schools, and in population centers such as Clinton and Brandywine.
Table VI-6: Recommended Major On-Road Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road</th>
<th>Limits</th>
<th>Facility Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Road (MD 373)</td>
<td>Livingston Road to Brandywine Avenue; A-55 to Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allentown Road</td>
<td>Steed Road to Old Fort Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Road (MD 228)</td>
<td>MD 210 to Charles County line</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Road</td>
<td>MD to Charles County line</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cherry Tree Crossing Road</td>
<td>A-63 to Rosaryville Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry Way</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue to Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dangerfield Road</td>
<td>Surratt Road to Woodyard Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallahan Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road to A-65</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirby Road</td>
<td>Temple Hills Road to Old Branch Avenue</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road/</td>
<td>Piscataway Road to Farmington Road East</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bealle Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Road</td>
<td>MD 210 to Accokeek Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 210</td>
<td>Charles County line to Subregion 7</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD 223</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to Subregion 6</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>MD 5 to Dangerfield Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Branch Avenue/ Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to MD 5 at Kirby Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Fort Place</td>
<td>Allentown Road to Old Fort Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Fort Road East</td>
<td>Old Fort Road to Branch Avenue</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steed Road</td>
<td>MD 223 to Allentown Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surratt Road</td>
<td>Brandywine Road to Tippett Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temple Hills Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road to Kirby Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrift Road</td>
<td>Windbrook Drive to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Head Highway (MD 210)</td>
<td>MD 228 to Beltway</td>
<td>Sidepath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Road (MD 228)</td>
<td>Charles County to MD 210</td>
<td>Sidepath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyson Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Road to Cherry Tree Crossing Road</td>
<td>Sidepath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tippett Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road to Thrift Road</td>
<td>Dual Route</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Strategies

• Construct sidewalks along all major transportation facilities in areas where there are concentrations of people.

• Retrofit the roads in the Clinton area that are recommended for sidewalks and sidepaths in this plan to make the area more pedestrian friendly.

• The following specific sidewalks are recommended in the Clinton area:

  * **Temple Hills Road.** Provide continuous sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides.
  
  * **Kirby Road and Old Alexandria Ferry Road.** Provide continuous sidewalks along both sides.
  
  * **A-65.** A sidepath trail has been approved for construction through several development projects. It will provide a safe and convenient pedestrian connection between several residential communities and to the Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Trail. In addition to sidepath construction, designated bike lanes should also be provided to safely accommodate on-road bicycle traffic.
  
  * **Thrift Road.** A bikeway or sidepath. Communities abutting Cosca Regional Park do not have safe, non-motorized access to the park. A side path along Thrift Road would provide this access.

• Construct the following Off-Road trails:

  * **Potomac Heritage Trail Connector Trails:** Work with the National Park Service to provide natural surface trail connections between the existing trails along the south side of Piscataway Creek. A possible link along the existing Mockley Point trail could provide a continuous trail from the National Colonial Farm to the trails to the south side of Piscataway Creek. Also, coordination with the National Park Service and the Critical Area Commission should continue to implement the planned trail connection from King Charles Terrace to Piscataway Drive, which will provide a safe connection for bicyclists and pedestrians around Piscataway Creek. No trails are planned along private roads in the Moyaone Reserve.
  
  * **Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Trail:** Piscataway Creek is one of the primary stream valley trail recommendations in southern Prince George’s County and runs through portions of both Subregions 6 and 5. Significant segments of the stream valley have been acquired by the Department of Parks and Recreation as development has occurred. Existing trails are located in the northeast portion of the subregion and will be connected to the Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Trail. In conjunction with the Charles Branch Trail in Subregion 6, the Piscataway Creek Trail will be part of a “cross-country” connection linking the Potomac River at Fort Washington with the Patuxent River Greenway near Jug Bay. This trail will also link to the extensive trail system and recreational facilities at Cosca Regional Park.
  
  * **Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Trail:** This trail will connect to the Pea Hill Branch and Piscataway Creek trails, provide access to the Clinton area, and provide access between adjoining residential communities. A portion of the trail has been approved for construction through the Bevard North development.
  
  * **Pea Hill Branch Stream Valley Trail:** This local stream valley trail will improve pedestrian access in the Clinton area and connect to the Tinkers Creek Trail.
  
  * **Burch Branch Stream Valley Trail:** This trail will connect the bikeway along Floral Park Road with the stream valley trail along Piscataway Creek. It will also provide a trail connection through the open space network to the west of the Brandywine Community Center core (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).
**Mattawoman Creek Stream Valley Trail:** This trail will run the entire length of Mattawoman Creek in Prince George’s County, and will connect to Charles County’s trail system. A segment of this trail and trailhead facility has been approved for construction through the Homeland development near the Charles County boundary in Accokeek. Access to Mattawoman Creek should also be provided for canoes and kayaks as part of the development of a water trail.

**Timothy Branch Steam Valley Trail:** This trail will stretch along Timothy Branch between Dyson Road and Mattawoman Creek. It will provide access to the Brandywine Community Center.

**Butler Branch Stream Valley Trail:** This trail will provide trail access from the planned Piscataway Creek Trail to the extensive existing trails in Cosca Regional Park.

- Expand the on-road and off-road facilities that connect the major population centers with transit-related facilities.
- Complete sidepaths and bike lanes in areas of higher population to increase connectivity in Subregion 5. Emphasize the following roads: MD 223, Piscataway Road, Temple Hills Road, Livingston Road, Old Branch Avenue, Steed Road, Allentown Road, Old Fort Place, and Gallahan Road.
- Develop street and sidewalk/trail connections between adjacent subdivisions as new development occurs.
- Coordinate with the National Park Service to provide bicycle-compatible road improvements along the Potomac Heritage National Scenic Trail On-Road Bicycle Route:
  * Build bikeway improvements and signage along Farmington Road West and Bryan Point Road.
  * Facilitate bicycle and pedestrian crossings of MD 210 as improvements are made along MD 210.
  * Identify suitable trail alignments through the historic district from Oxon Hill Road to Fort Washington Road, with priority given to providing safe bicycle and pedestrian access.
- Develop recreational and interpretative programs, facilities, and thematic trails that build on the recreational, natural, historic, and scenic attributes of the subregion.
- Encourage developers at employment destinations to provide new sidewalks, bicycle trails, lockers, bike friendly intersection improvements, and trail connections as part of their development proposals.
- Provide bicycle parking at all major transit locations and within all new employment-related developments.
- Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities as part of new development in the Brandywine Community Center.
- Install bicycle signage and safety improvements along designated shared-use roadways when development occurs or roadways are upgraded. Bikeway improvements may include paved shoulders, painted bike lanes, and bike signage.
D. CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT OF SPECIAL ROADWAYS

The preservation of existing roads as historic and scenic assets is important in retaining the heritage and community character of the County. Several reports have inventoried the countywide historic and scenic assets for conservation and enhancement, these include the 1984 Scenic Roads Study; the 1988 Rural Historic Landscapes and Scenic Roads Study, Subregion V; the 1992 Historic Sites and Districts Plan; and the 2005 Analysis of the 1828 Levy Court Road Survey. As a result, roadways have been designated as scenic and/or historic in area master plans, functional master plans, or through separate resolutions of the County Council.

The conservation and enhancement of these specially-designated roadways is intended to provide safe and enjoyable travel, while preserving the scenic and historic features, both within the rights-of-way and on adjacent land. It is also necessary that all road designs and construction provide, insofar as practicable, a consistently safe but visually varied environment that is pleasing to all road users and adjacent property owners.

The designated scenic and historic roadways, in the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation, and roadways designated by this plan, are shown on Map VI-6: Special Roadways and described in Table VI-7: Designated Special Roadways.

Scenic and Historic Roads

A scenic road is defined in Subtitle 23 of the County Code as “a public or private road which provides scenic view along a substantial part of its length through natural or man-made features, such as forest or extensive woodland, cropland, pasture, or meadows; distinctive topography including outcroppings, streambeds and wetlands; traditional building types; historic sites; or roadway features such as curving, rolling roadway alignment and leaf tunnels.”

An historic road is defined in Subtitle 23 as “a public or private road which has been documented by historic surveys, and which maintains its historic alignment and landscape context through views of natural features, historic landscape patterns, historic sites and structures, historic farmstead groupings, or rural villages.” Historic roads are designated through an action of the County Council. Historic features may include: brick and stone boundary walls, gateposts, boundary posts or stones, mile markers, fences, steps, commemorative markers, monuments, pedestrian or vehicular tunnels and other similar features.

Scenic and Historic Roads were first designated in Subregion 5 with the approval of the 1993 master plan. The Historic Roads designated that master plans were based on a listing of early roads included as an appendix to the 1992 Historic Sites and District Plan. In June 2005, the Natural and Cultural Resources Division, Department of Parks and Recreation, completed an analysis of the 1828 Levy Court Road Survey, Prince George’s County, identifying locations where the early roads of the County still exist. This evaluation was used during preparation of the 2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation as the basis for recommending the designation of additional historic roads segments.
A review of candidate roadways listed in previous scenic road inventories and recommendations of staff were used to compile a listing of scenic road segments which are proposed for designation.

The guidelines for scenic and historic roadways previously contained in the Historic Preservation Chapter of the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan have been consolidated in the “Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways in Prince George’s County, Maryland,” Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T, 2006), and include scenic-historic road sections from the DPW&T standards for development proposals along scenic and historic roadways.

The “Master List of Scenic and Historic Roads” is a listing of roads which have been designated as scenic or historic by the County Council. The list is maintained by the Department of Planning, M-NCPPC. The listing is consulted in the review of applications to determine if scenic and/or historic concerns are applicable.

When an application is proposed on a designated scenic or historic road, an inventory of scenic and historic features, which is comprised of text and maps necessary to describe significant visual features of the site, is requested. Guidance in the preparation of visual inventories can be found in the above mentioned DPW&T design guidelines and in publications such as “National Register Bulletin 18: How to Evaluate and Nominate Designed Historic Landscapes” and “National Register Bulletin 30: How to Identify, Evaluate and Register Rural Historic Landscapes.”

Natural and cultural resources within the rights-of-way and adjacent to scenic and historic roads are important and are in need of protection. The predominant encroachment on these resources occurs when new development proposals are submitted. Extensive efforts have been made to preserve and enhance the viewsheds of designated scenic and historic roads through the careful evaluation of these proposals, the placement of new development out of the viewsheds as much as possible, and the preservation or enhancement of the existing vegetation along the roadway. Scenic easements have been established to provide permanent protections to the viewsheds adjacent to scenic and historic roadways.

### Policies

- Conserve and enhance the scenic and historic values along special roadways
- Conserve and enhance the viewsheds along designated roadways

### Strategies

- Require submission of an inventory of scenic and historic features with all applications that propose work within the right-of-way of a designated roadway.
- Utilize the “Guidelines for the Design of Scenic and Historic Roadways in Prince George’s County, Maryland” (DPW&T, 2006) and the scenic-historic road sections from the DPW&T standards when evaluating applications within the rights-of-way of scenic and historic roadways.
- During the review of applications that involve work within the right-of-way of a designated roadway, consider a variety of techniques to protect the scenic and historic qualities of the designated roads. These techniques include alternative ways to circulate traffic, the use of the historic road section as one leg of a needed dual highway, provision of bypass roads, and limiting certain types of development and signs in the viewshed.
• Consider a variety of techniques to protect the scenic and historic qualities of the designated roads during the review of development applications that involve work within the right-of-way of a designated roadway. These techniques include alternative ways to circulate traffic, the use of the historic road section as one leg of a needed dual highway, provision of bypass roads, and limiting certain types of development and signs in the viewshed.

• Review existing County Code and related standards for conflicts with the conservation and enhancement of designated roadways and make recommendations for code changes as necessary.

• Maintain a database and a GIS layer of designated roadways.

• Utilize existing County Code provisions for scenic easement tax credits by establishing a voluntary easement program to protect viewsheds along designated roadways.

• Prepare corridor management plans for significant designated roadways.

• Implement the recommendations of established corridor management plans.

• Require submission of an Inventory of Scenic and Historic Features with all applications that propose work adjacent to the right-of-way of a designated roadway.

• Require the conservation and enhancement of the existing viewsheds of designated roads to the fullest extent possible during the review of land development or permit applications, whichever comes first. Elements to be considered shall include views of structures from the roadway, design character and materials of constructed features, preservation of existing vegetation, slopes and tree tunnels, use of scenic easements, and limited access points.

• Develop guidelines for the design of activities adjacent to designated roadways to include building setbacks, landscaping, scenic easements, and utility clearing.
Map VI-6: Designated Special Roadways
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Names</th>
<th>Limits of Roadway</th>
<th>Functional Class</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Designated Historic</th>
<th>Designated Scenic</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Road (MD 373)</td>
<td>Bealle Hill Road to 0.9 mi W of Branch Avenue (MD 5)</td>
<td>Arterial Parkway</td>
<td>1992 HS &amp; D Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84/85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Road (MD 373)</td>
<td>0.4 mi west of Branch Avenue (MD 5) to MD 5</td>
<td>Expressway/Arterial</td>
<td>1992 HS &amp; D Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Road (MD 373)</td>
<td>0.9 mi west of MD 5 to 0.4 mi west of Branch Avenue (MD 5)</td>
<td>Expressway/Arterial</td>
<td>1992 HS &amp; D Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Road West</td>
<td>Livingston Road to End</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bealle Hill Road</td>
<td>Berry (MD 228) to Accokeek (MD 373)</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bealle Hill Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Rd (MD 373) to Livingston Rd</td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berry Road</td>
<td>Livingston Road to Accokeek Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Road (County)</td>
<td>Marbury Road to Piscataway Road/Woodyard Road</td>
<td>Collector (C-513)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Road (County)</td>
<td>Marbury Road to Kathleen Lane</td>
<td>Collector (C-513)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine Road (MD 381)</td>
<td>“Timothy Branch” (Kathleen Lane) to CSX RR tracks (Subregion 6 boundary)</td>
<td>Major Collector/Collector (C-614)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Point Road</td>
<td>Main Boulevard to Accokeek Road East/Livingston Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Point Road</td>
<td>Farmington Road W to National Colonial Farm</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bryan Point Road</td>
<td>Main Boulevard to Farmington Road West</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>CR-113-1992</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cactus Hill Road</td>
<td>Old Marshall Hall Road to Bryant Point Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Subregion 5 Master Plan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarville Road</td>
<td>A-55 to Chalk Point RR</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1992 HS&amp;D Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedarville Road</td>
<td>US 301 to A-55</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1992 HS&amp;D Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danville Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Rd (MD 373) to Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Rural Collector (C-521)</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Road/West</td>
<td>Livingston Road to 650 Farmington Road West</td>
<td>Rural Collector</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington Road East</td>
<td>MD 210 to Livingston Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Livingston Road to Piscataway Road (MD 223)</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road (MD 223) to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84/85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallahan Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road (MD 223) to 12600 Gallahan Road/Old Piscataway</td>
<td>Collector (C-519)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallahan Road</td>
<td>12600 Gallahan Road to Old Fort Road</td>
<td>Collector (C-519)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Names</td>
<td>Limits of Roadway</td>
<td>Functional Class</td>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Designated Historic</td>
<td>Designated Scenic</td>
<td>Planning Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Road (MD 373) to Charles County</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>84/85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Road West to Charles County</td>
<td>Collector &amp; Arterial</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>Bealle Hill Road to Floral Park Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>Farmington Road West to Indian Head Highway</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>Bealle Hill Road to Farmington Road East</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livingston Road</td>
<td>Farmington Road East to Floral Park Rd</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80/84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marshall Hall Road</td>
<td>Old Marshall Hall Road to Charles County</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKendree Road</td>
<td>US 301 to 0.6 mi W of US 301 (A-55)</td>
<td>Major collector</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKendree Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Road to 0.6 mi west of US 301</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Branch Avenue</td>
<td>Brandywine Road to Baldwin Avenue</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Branch Avenue</td>
<td>St Barnabas Road to (Just short of) Woodyard Road/ Piscataway Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Farmington Road West</td>
<td>650 Old Farmington Road West to Livingston Road</td>
<td>Collector</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Marshall Hall Road</td>
<td>Cactus Hill Road to Charles County</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>Staff Recommendation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Marshall Hall Road</td>
<td>Livingston Rd to Old Colonial Lane/Cactus Hill Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1984 Scenic Roads</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piscataway Road (MD223)</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to Woodyard Road</td>
<td>Arterial</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84/81A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharperville Road</td>
<td>Accokeek Road to Charles County</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steed Road</td>
<td>Piscataway Road (MD 223) to Allentown Road</td>
<td>Major Collector (C-516)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrift Road</td>
<td>Tippett Road to Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A/81B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wharf Road</td>
<td>Farmington Road W to Piscataway Bay</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1993 Subregion 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windbrook Drive</td>
<td>Floral Park Road to Thrift Road</td>
<td>Local</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81B/85A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodyard Road</td>
<td>Old Branch Avenue to Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>Arterial (A-53)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodyard Road</td>
<td>Rosaryville Road to Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>Arterial (A-53)</td>
<td>1828 Levy Court Survey</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>81A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VII: PUBLIC FACILITIES

Public facilities that meet the educational, safety, and recreational needs of all Subregion 5 residents are essential elements of a thriving, livable community. These facilities provide important services, such as education and public safety, as well as opportunities for community involvement and enrichment at libraries and recreational facilities. The analysis of such facilities for this master plan shows where facilities are needed to serve the projected growth in Subregion 5. The results below are presented for schools, libraries, police stations, and fire stations.

Goals

- Needed public facilities are provided at locations that effectively and efficiently serve the existing and future population.
- Schools operate at 100 percent of capacity or less to provide an effective, quality learning environment.
- Priority is given to funding public facilities to support development in the Developing Tier policy area.
- All new public facilities are constructed to LEED (Leadership in Energy Efficiency and Design) standards or the equivalent and existing buildings will be retrofitted to make them energy efficient.

A. PUBLIC SCHOOLS

There are 12 public schools in Subregion 5: one academy serving grades PreK-8, five elementary, two middle, three high schools, and one special education school.

In 2008, Prince George’s County Public Schools conducted a facilities condition assessment of public schools within the County. This assessment was updated in September 2012. The assessment explores the physical conditions of schools, both internal and external. The study measured schools based upon a facilities condition index (FCI) which is a measurement of “a facility’s condition represented by the ratio of the cost to correct a school facility’s deficiencies to the current replacement value of the facility.” Facilities constructed after 1992 were not included in this assessment.

Schools with an FCI of 0-40 percent are considered to be in good condition. Schools with an FCI of 40-75 percent are considered to be in fair condition and an FCI greater than 75 percent is considered poor condition. There are no schools within the subregion rated in poor condition (See Table VII-1). Clinton Grove Elementary School is ranked at 71 percent which is almost at the poor condition level.
In the FY 2014-2019 CIP, Clinton Grove Elementary School and Eugene Burroughs and Stephen Decatur Middle Schools are budgeted for renovation. Additionally, funding is budgeted in the CIP to construct new classrooms and renovate existing classrooms at Surrattsville High School to accommodate classes with a smaller than 25:1 ratio. This effort is a part of the School System’s Secondary School Reform Initiative.

Prince George’s County Public Schools owns two unimproved possible future school sites in Subregion 5:

- The Nothey Farm site located east of MD 223, north of Windbrook Drive, in the Tippett community.
- A site adjacent to the Piscataway Preserve development located west of Danville Road, in Accokeek.

Future elementary, middle, and high school needs were derived from Subregion 5 dwelling unit projections (see Chapter II), average pupil generation rates by dwelling unit, and taking into account current seating capacities (Table VII-1). New elementary schools are built to a capacity of 740 students, middle schools to a capacity of 900-1000 students, and high schools range from 1500-2200 students.
By 2030, future growth is projected to occur in all three of the Subregion 5 communities, with the majority of the growth occurring in Brandywine and Clinton. There will be an additional 11,300 dwelling units which will generate an estimated 1,777 elementary, 1,054 middle, and 709 high school students. These additional students will create the need for 2 new elementary schools and 1 new middle school by 2030. One additional elementary school site needs to be acquired to implement this recommendation.

At build-out (beyond 2030), this plan projects an additional 25,000 dwelling units. These units will generate the need for approximately 3,969 elementary, 2,835 middle, and 2,627 high school seats. At build-out, school needs will increase to five elementary schools, two middle schools, and one additional high school. The need for these facilities is not addressed in this master plan.

To meet the needs for 2030, the following school sites should be considered:

**Table VII-2: School Site Recommendations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Site Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>Near Floral Park Road, adjacent to the Piscataway Preserve development; the site is owned by the Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>Near Accokeek Road, west of the Lakeview at Brandywine development; site to be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Clinton/Tippett</td>
<td>Near Piscataway Road and the Windbrook development; the site is owned by the Board of Education.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Policy 1**
Construct new public schools at locations that are convenient for the populations they serve and require minimal bussing of students.

**Strategy**
- Acquire one elementary school site in a location that will serve future residential development.

**Policy 2**
Construct and renovate schools in order to operate at 100 percent of capacity or less and to provide a quality, energy efficient learning environment.

**Strategies**
- Conduct an energy audit of public school buildings and, based on the outcome, retrofit buildings to reduce energy consumption.
- LEED™ certified professionals are used when designing new facilities.
B. LIBRARIES

There are two library branches of the Prince George’s County Memorial Library System located in Subregion 5. These facilities are the Accokeek Branch located on Livingston Road in Accokeek and the Surratts-Clinton Branch located on MD 223 in Clinton (Map VII-1). The FY 2014-2019 CIP contains a project for rehabilitation and expansion at the Surratts-Clinton Branch.

Data collected by the library system has shown that internet usage has grown rapidly over the past several years and public access computers are being fully utilized by the public in county libraries. This growing demand for public access computers and Wi-Fi may necessitate larger buildings or other means to provide service. With the changing use of libraries by county residents, there is a need to fully explore all of the ways to provide library services and their implications for new and existing facilities. Current library standards recommend one library branch per 40,000 to 80,000 residents. The plan projects that by 2030 the population in the subregion will reach approximately 82,000 people.

Policy 1
All Developing Tier residents should live within a 10-minute drive time to libraries.

Strategies
• Locate an additional library facility in Subregion 5 (in the Brandywine Community Center) to support the projected population increase past 2030. Consider co-locating the site with another public facility.
• Consider the adaptive reuse of existing buildings for library facilities to meet the need for additional access to computers.

Policy 2
• The library system meets an increasing demand from the community for computing and internet technology in library facilities.

Strategy
• Continue to evaluate and improve existing library facilities and services, including computing and internet services.
C. PUBLIC SAFETY

Police

The Prince George’s Police Department is the primary law enforcement agency in the county. Subregion 5 is served by the District V station located on Groveton Drive in Clinton (Map VII-1). The Prince George’s County 2008 Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan (PSFMP) includes a recommendation to relocate this station to the intersection of US 301 and Rosaryville Road in Subregion 6. In addition, the construction of the new District VII station in the vicinity of MD 210 and Fort Washington Road in Subregion 7 is anticipated to provide service to the majority of the area that is the subject of this plan. Funding for the construction of the new District V station is budgeted in FY 2014 and FY 2015 and construction funding for the new District VII station is budgeted in FY 2017 and FY 2018 of the current CIP.

Policy 1

Locate police, public safety, and fire/rescue facilities to meet the needs of the community and in accordance with the standards contained in the PSFMP.

Strategies

• Reaffirm the PSFMP recommendation for the construction of the District VII Police Station in Fort Washington (County CIP item KJ500853).

• Amend the PSFMP recommendation relocating the Brandywine Fire/EMS Station; the priority of this project should move from “high” to “highest”:
  * Name: Brandywine Fire/EMS Station – Co. 40
  * PA: 85A
  * Tier: Developing
  * Strategy: Relocate the existing station to a site in the vicinity of Brandywine Road and Dyson Road.
  * Justification: A new station is needed to provide adequate space for larger fire and rescue vehicles than are now in use by the Fire/EMS Department. The existing station is in a poor location to serve the increasing development in the Brandywine area.

Fire and Rescue

Two fire and rescue stations are located in the Master Plan area: Company 24 (Accokeek) and Company 25 (Clinton). Company 40 (Brandywine), currently located in Subregion 6, provides additional service to the subregion.

Based on current service demands and response time criteria, the PSFMP recommends the relocation of the Brandywine Fire/EMS station from its present location in Subregion 6 to a site in the vicinity of Brandywine Road and Dyson Road in Subregion 5. The PSFMP also recommends that a new station (Piscataway) be constructed near the intersection of Brandywine Road and Danville Road.

These facilities are funded in the current CIP. Company 25 (Clinton) is budgeted for renovation; Company 40 (Brandywine) is budgeted for replacement; and the Piscataway Fire/EMS station, which will be located near the intersection of Danville Road and Brandywine Road, is budgeted for construction in the current CIP.
D. PARKS AND RECREATION

Park and recreation facilities in Prince George’s County are divided into six categories:

1. **Neighborhood Park and Recreation Areas**: include mini-parks, playgrounds, parks, recreation centers, and park/schools with acreage of less than 20 acres. Parks serve residents in the immediate vicinity.

2. **Community Park and Recreation Areas**: include community center buildings, parks, recreation centers, and cultural centers between 20 and 200 acres. Neighborhood and community park areas are classified as local parks.

3. **Regional Park and Recreation Areas**: include stream valley parks, regional parks (parks with more than 200 acres), cultural arts centers, and service facilities. These facilities serve residents of an entire region within the county.

4. **Countywide Park and Recreation Areas**: include river parks, historic sites and landmarks, hiker/biker/equestrian trails, unique natural features, conservation areas, and service facilities. Parks in this category are available to all county residents.

5. **Urban Park and Recreation Areas**: include urban parks and urban nature centers that serve county residents with severely limited access to outdoor nature areas.

6. **Special Park and Recreation Areas**: include aquatic facilities, ice rinks, golf courses, shooting centers, athletic complexes, equestrian centers, airports, marinas, and reclamation areas. These facilities are available to all county residents.

There are approximately 4,782 acres of local and regional park, recreation and public open space land in Subregion 5 (Table VII-3: Public Park, Recreation, and Open Space Land Inventory and Map VII-2: Existing and Future Parks and Community Centers). Of this total inventory:

- Approximately 79 percent is owned by M-NCPPC, 17 percent is federally-owned land, and 4 percent is County-owned.
- Approximately 3,872 acres are “regional” parkland (Piscataway Park, Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park, and Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park) and 910 acres are local parkland, consisting mainly of neighborhood and community parks.
- Of the “local” parkland, approximately 260 acres are in Accokeek, 261 acres are in Brandywine, and 389 acres are in Clinton.

Private open space helps satisfy local recreation demand in the subregion, including Potomac Ridge Golf Course in Accokeek, and the open space network in planned developments and major subdivisions.
### Table VII-3: Public Park, Recreation, and Open Space Land Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Parks</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>Cambridge Estates Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cedar Chase Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connemara Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Crotona Park Community Park</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>Accokeek East Community Park</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accokeek Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blackburn Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danville Community Park</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Danville Estates Community Park</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gardner Road Community Park</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Accokeek</td>
<td></td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandywine</td>
<td>Brandywine Area Community Park</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham Acres Community Park</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dyson Road Community Park</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floral Park Road Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Heatherwick Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pleasant Springs Community Park</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Savannah Drive Community Park</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Brandywine</td>
<td></td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Old Fort Hills Community Park</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pine Tree Manor Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Valley Neighborhood Park/School</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Stephen Decatur Community Center Park</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sweetgum Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tanglewood Community Park/School</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Temple Hills Estates Neighborhood Playground</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Valley View Community Park</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Waldon Woods Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windbrook Community Park</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Windbrook South Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Clinton</td>
<td></td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total Local</td>
<td>910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cheltenham Conservation Area</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearwater Nature Center</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cosca Regional Park</td>
<td>779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mattawoman Watershed Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pea Hill Branch Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park I and II</td>
<td>1,224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piscataway Park</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rose Creek Connector Trail</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Surratt House Historic Site</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thrift Road Schoolhouse Historic Site</td>
<td>&lt;1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Regional</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>4,782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Needs**

The Subregion 5 population is projected to be approximately 82,100 by 2030 (*Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment*). Based on county park and recreation acreage standards, a total of approximately 1,230 acres of local parkland and 1,640 acres of regional parkland will be needed to serve this population.

The current inventory (*Table VII-3: Public Park, Recreation, and Open Space Land Inventory*) reflects much regional parkland (3,870 acres), more than double the projected need (1,640 acres) for this type of land.

Subregion-wide the local parkland need will be 1,230 acres compared to the existing 910 acres. Therefore, an additional 320 acres of local parkland will be needed. The greatest need for local parkland will be in Clinton, where the projected need by 2030 will be approximately 730 acres compared to the 389 acres existing. Accokeek and Brandywine both have sufficient local parkland to meet projected needs through 2030, although additional acquisitions are recommended to meet long-term needs, including the proposed Brandywine Center and the proposed acquisition of land along Mattawoman Watershed Stream Valley Park and Timothy Branch.

Timothy Branch, which is located east and west of US 301/Crain Highway, offers many opportunities for preservation and passive recreation. A portion of Timothy Branch runs adjacent to Rose Creek Connector Trail, which is accessed from McKendree Road. The existing trail will ultimately connect with the Chaddsford community to the north and Mattawoman Stream Valley Park to the south. Timothy Branch also runs behind the new Brandywine Crossing shopping center. Acquisition of the branch will be explored from this location to Brandywine Road with an eventual trail connection to Brandywine Area Community Park.

Population growth in the subregion will increase the demand for recreational programs and activities at community centers. Subregion 5 currently contains one community center, Stephen Decatur Community Center, in Clinton. The facility is scheduled to receive a renovation and expansion in the spring of 2014. The South Clinton Community Center, originally slated for a new facility at Cosca Regional Park, has shifted to a new, planned aquatic facility for the southern area. The new facility, known as the Southern Area Aquatic and Recreation Complex (SAARC), to be built at Brandywine Area Park, will meet the recreation needs of a greater population in southern Prince George’s County. SAARC is a new multi-generational facility funded for design and construction in the FY 2014 – FY 2019 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The facility will include an aquatic venue, as well as other recreation components to serve the recreational and leisure needs of all age groups. This facility is slated for completion in the summer of 2016. In addition, the new Fort Washington Forest Community Center, located just outside of Subregion 5 on MD 210, is a new, 22,000 square-foot venue that includes a gymnasium, a fitness room, a computer lab, multi-purpose rooms, a teen lounge area, and an arts and crafts room (*Map VII-2: Existing and Future Parks and Community Centers*).
Policies

• Provide park and recreation acreage consistent with the following standards:
  * A minimum of 15 acres of M-NCPPC local parkland for every 1,000 residents (or the equivalent amenity in parks and recreation service).
  * A minimum of 20 acres of regional, countywide, and special M-NCPPC parks for every 1,000 residents.
• Provide a variety of recreational facilities and programs based on the needs and interests of the community.
• Construct facilities that are functional, safe, energy efficient, and sensitive to the surrounding environment.
• Conserve stream valleys and other valuable natural resource areas.

Strategies

Acquire and develop the following parkland.

Short-term

Accokeek
• Thirty-acre community park adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park.
• Forty-acre community park adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park west of proposed MD 228.
• Construct the Accokeek East Community Park and recreation center as shown in the FY 09–FY14 CIP.

Brandywine
• Fifty-acre community park on McKendree Road adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park.
• Construct the Southern Area Aquatic and Recreation Complex at Brandywine Area Park.

Clinton
• Hundred-acre community park at the east end of Dangerfield Place adjacent to Piscataway Stream Valley Park.
• Eighty-acre community park on Surratts Road adjacent to Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park.
• Cosca Regional Park expansion, including a 247-acre site on the north side of the existing regional park and an additional 53 acres adjacent to the property.
• Renovate and restore the Thrift Schoolhouse.
• Fifteen-acre local park on the northeast side of Windbrook Neighborhood Park near Piscataway Road.
• Renovate and expand the Stephen Decatur Community Center.
• Acquire land within Tinkers Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Mattawoman Watershed Stream Valley Parks that can be used as active or passive parkland.

Longer-term

Accokeek
• Fifty-acre community park between Livingston Road and Accokeek Road West.
• Fifty-acre local park in the vicinity of Livingston Road and Floral Park Road near Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park.
• Fifty-acre community park on Gardner Road adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park.
• Forty-acre community park along Bryan Point Road in Accokeek near the Potomac River.

Brandywine
• Seventy-acre community park on Floral Park Road near its intersection with Springfield Road.
• Sixty-acre local park on Accokeek Road near the intersection with McKendree Road.

Clinton
• Fifty-acre community park on Steed Road on east and/or west side of Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park.
• Forty-acre community park on Old Fort Road East on the east side of Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park.
Table VII-4: Proposed Parkland Acquisitions

Accokeek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Facility</th>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-acre community park adjacent to Mattawoman Creek</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>A-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-acre community park adjacent to Mattawoman Creek and west of MD 228</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>A-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek East community park and recreation center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>In FY 09–14 CIP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-acre community park—Livingston Road and Accokeek Road West</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>A-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-acre local park—Livingston Road and Floral Park Road near Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>A-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-acre community park—Gardner Road adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>A-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-acre community park—Bryan Point Road</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>A-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brandywine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Facility</th>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50-acre community park—McKendree Road adjacent to Mattawoman Watershed Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>B-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70-acre community park—Floral Park Road near Springfield Road</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>B-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-acre local park—Accokeek Road near McKendree Road</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>B-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Area Aquatic and Recreation Complex</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Short Term Need</td>
<td>B-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clinton

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Facility</th>
<th>Park Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Map Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100-acre community park—Dangerfield Road adjacent to Piscataway Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-acre community park—Surratts Road adjacent to Piscataway Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>C-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Cosca Regional Park by 300 acres adjacent to park</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>C-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate Thrift Schoolhouse</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-acre local park adjacent to Windbrook Neighborhood Park</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td>C-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renovate and expand the Stephen Decatur Community Center</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land within Tinkers Creek, Piscataway Creek, and Mattawoman Watershed Parks</td>
<td>Regional</td>
<td>Short term need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-acre community park—Steed Road on the east and west sides of Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>C-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-acre community park—Old Fort Road east of Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Long term need</td>
<td>C-6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT/RECYCLING

The Waste Management Group (WMG), a section of the Department of Environment Resources, manages solid waste in Prince George’s County. Solid waste pickup is provided throughout Subregion 5, except for a small area east of US 301 and MD 5. The County contracts with private waste haulers to collect the waste.

The County’s primary waste acceptance facility is the Brown Station Road Municipal Solid Waste Facility about four miles north of Upper Marlboro in Subregion 6. The facility is closing in 2011. The County has decided not to develop a new landfill within the County, and instead intends to ship its refuse to one of the large commercial landfills operating in the mid-Atlantic region.

Consequently, the County needs to develop a transfer facility where refuse would be consolidated for shipment. On September 16, 2008, the County Council approved CR-74-2008, which amended the Ten-Year Solid Waste Management Plan and identified a County-owned site at 6550 SE Crain Highway, southeast of Upper Marlboro in Subregion 6, as the site for a solid waste transfer station.

The County has an aggressive recycling program that, as of 2008, achieved a recovery rate of 39 percent. A trash and recycling drop off convenience center is located on Missouri Avenue in Brandywine. In addition, a County-owned yard waste composting facility is located at 6550 SE Crain Highway, southeast of Upper Marlboro in Subregion 6.

Policy 1

Implement measures to reduce the solid waste stream.

Strategies

- Minimize the solid waste stream through source reduction and recycling.
- Increase recycling—consider mandatory recycling where it is cost effective.

Policy 2

Promote the safe disposal of hazardous waste throughout Subregion 5.

Strategies

- Provide educational forums for the public on safe alternatives to using toxic compounds.
- Investigate the creation of local centers where hazardous waste can be dropped off at least twice a year.
F. WATER AND SEWER SERVICE

The Ten-Year Water and Sewer Plan prohibits the extension of public water and sewer into the Rural Tier, consistent with the General Plan’s recommendations that such services be prohibited except to address an existing health problem. The Ten-Year Water and Sewer Plan designates whether each property in the County has, or is planned for public water and sewer service. Prince George’s County approved the 2010 Water Resources Functional Master Plan. The purpose of the functional plan is to analyze the relationship between existing and future development, identify the drinking water sources and wastewater facilities needed to serve future development, and define measures to limit or control the stormwater and non-point source water pollution that will be generated by new development. The water and sewer section in this chapter is intended to inform the countywide plan.

Wastewater

Wastewater from the Developing Tier in Subregion 5 flows by gravity and is treated at two wastewater treatment plants, Piscataway and Mattawoman. Piscataway Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is the larger of the two and serves most of the land area of Subregion 5. It is operated by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC). Charles County operates Mattawoman WWTP, located near Indian Head. It serves the southern portions of Subregion 5 that are in the Mattawoman Creek watershed (Map II-3: Existing Land Cover (2008)).

**Piscataway Waste Water Treatment Plant**

Piscataway WWTP is located north of Farmington Road West, near MD 210. Piscataway’s current treatment capacity is 30.0 million gallons per day (mgd). Flows in 2008 are approximately 21.5 mgd. Approximately half of the plant’s capacity is taken up by flow from the Broad Creek Pumping Station, which serves the Broad Creek Basin north of Subregion 5 (in Subregion 7) and includes such areas as National Harbor.

WSSC has received requests for service representing approximately 5.2 mgd of future flow at Piscataway partially from the Piscataway Creek and Tinkers Creek watersheds and partially from the Broad Creek watershed. Added to current flow, this increment would result in 26.7 mgd of flow at Piscataway, or 3.2 mgd less than the plant’s capacity.

Assessing the impacts of future development in Subregion 5 on capacity at Piscataway is complicated by its relationship to the Broad Creek Pumping Station. Prior to Broad Creek being connected to Piscataway, flows from that basin went to the Blue Plains WWTP in Washington, D.C. Nevertheless, the following analysis shows that Piscataway WWTP has more than sufficient capacity to meet Subregion 5’s growth needs through at least 2030.

The requests concerning 5.2 mgd of future flow represent a significant amount of future development, equivalent to approximately 20,000 dwelling units\(^1\), or twice the total amount of pipeline residential development in Subregion 5.\(^2\) Further, the pipeline itself represents almost 85 percent of the projected total residential development through 2030.\(^3\) WSSC begins to plan for new or expanded WWTPs when flow approaches 80 percent of capacity (or 24 mgd in the case of Piscataway). Based on this analysis, it is likely that such planning will need to begin in 10 to 12 years or around the year 2020 (roughly mid-way towards the 2030 projection).

\(^1\) Average flow per dwelling unit is approximately 255 gallons per day.

\(^2\) 28,319 minus 18,670 = 9,649 (Table II-2). Note that these numbers also include projected development in the Mattawoman Creek watershed.

\(^3\) 9,649 (pipeline)/11,330 (total dwelling units 2008 to 2030) = 85 percent.
Until the mid-2000s, expanding WWTPs was a fairly routine procedure. However, nutrient load discharges from WWTPs are now capped and new point source nutrient loads must be offset, making future WWTP expansions more difficult than in the past. Therefore, it is likely that the County will need to give more careful consideration to the effect of land use on sewer demand.

Please see Chapter V: Environment for discussion of sewer overflows at Piscataway WWTP.

**Mattawoman WWTP**

By agreement between Charles County and WSSC, Prince George’s County is allocated up to 3.0 mgd of the Mattawoman WWTP’s capacity (currently 20 mgd). As of 2008, total average daily flow to the plant was 9.5 mgd, of which approximately 0.4 mgd was from Prince George’s County. At build out, based on current (pre-SMA) zoning, Prince George’s County would discharge approximately 2.3 mgd to the Mattawoman WWTP, leaving approximately 0.64 mgd of remaining capacity. Based on this assessment, Prince George’s County will not need additional capacity at Mattawoman WWTP.

**Drinking Water**

Public water in the Developing Tier portion Subregion 5 is provided by WSSC from withdrawals from the Potomac River in Montgomery County and treated at the Potomac Water Filtration Plant in Potomac. No specific concerns have been raised about WSSC’s future ability to provide drinking water to its service area, including Subregion 5. The countywide water resources functional plan is expected to provide a more detailed discussion of future water supplies.

See Chapter V: Environment for discussion of groundwater and wells water supply in the Moyaone.

---

**Policy 1**

Provide adequate public water and sewer service to areas eligible for service.

**Strategy**

Complete the countywide water resources functional plan.

**Policy 2**

Provide sewer capacity at the Piscataway and Mattawoman WWTPs to meet future needed capacity.

**Strategy**

Continue to monitor flows to the Piscataway and Mattawoman WWTPs and the effects of changes to the Broad Creek pumping station on the Piscataway plant.

---

4 Maryland Policy for Nutrient Cap Management and Trading in Maryland’s Chesapeake Bay Watershed (February 2008).

5 See analysis of Mattawoman Creek watershed in Chapter V: Environment.

6 The 2010 Approved Water Resources Functional Master Plan was approved on June 22, 2010 by CR-59-2010.
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Economic Development is one of the highest priority goals in the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan. Generally, economic development goals are put in place to improve the economic well-being and quality of life for a community by creating and/or retaining jobs as well as growing incomes and providing for a stable tax base. This chapter will provide an overview of current employment trends in Subregion 5, examine various labor markets in Subregion 5 by land use, and offer strategies for accomplishing County economic development goals.

ECONOMIC TRENDS AND OUTLOOK

Industry trends in Prince George’s County over the past twenty-five years, consistent with regional trends, show an economy shifting from manufacturing to a service economy (professional services, finance, insurance, real estate, computer services, and software).

Since 2000, employment in manufacturing and wholesale trade in Prince George’s County has declined as a percentage of total jobs while the service sector has experienced rapid growth.1

Subregion 5 has a relatively low jobs-to-population ratio compared to the County as a whole: 0.32 jobs per person compared to 0.4 for the county as a whole2, reflecting its general status as a residential, bedroom community, with relatively few jobs. As of 2008, approximately 70 percent of the jobs in Subregion 5 were in Clinton, 20 percent in Brandywine, and 10 percent in Accokeek (Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment).

Prince George’s County is expected to be the beneficiary of a shift in regional, locational, comparative advantage reflecting the presence of large tracts of developable land in proximity to the Capital Beltway, good regional accessibility provided by the Capital Beltway and a network of radial highways, such as MD 4 and MD 5, connecting from the District of Columbia to the County’s suburbs and the rebuilt Woodrow Wilson Bridge.

In Subregion 5, larger businesses are inclined to prefer locations closest to the Capital Beltway and MD 5. Other locations in the subregion do not offer the appropriate infrastructure or adequate access needed to support major employment areas. The case of Hyde Field, along MD 223 in Clinton, provides an example. Hyde Field was designated for employment–industrial use in the 1993 master plan and zoned E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area). However, the area has not developed in accordance with this designation due, in part, to the need for extensive improvements to the road network to connect the property to local expressways, MD 5 and MD 210. The future road network will eventually serve this area well. However, needed road improvements (and new roads identified as A-65 and C-514 in Chapter VI: Transportation) are not in the County’s Capital Improvement Program.

---

1 Economic Trends and Demand for Industrial, Residential, Retail and Office Land Uses in Prince George’s County. Stephen S. Fuller, George Mason University, November 2007.
2 17,669 jobs for 54,511 people (Table II-2: Population, Dwelling Units, and Employment).
The growth expected to occur at Joint Base Andrews (JBA) over the next ten years will impact employment in Subregion 5. The number of personnel assigned to Joint Base Andrews is expected to increase by 2,700 before 2020. A portion of this increase (400 positions) is related to Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) and is expected by 2011. The remainder (2,300 jobs) is related to Department of Defense reassignments to be completed by 2018. These positions are expected to generate “spin-off” jobs and economic development in the form of 13,985 jobs and demand for 10,476 housing units in the County by 2020. Although Westphalia is planned to absorb much of this growth, some employment uses may locate in Subregion 5 along Old Alexandria Ferry Road, south of the base.

Goals

- Economic development is achieved at appropriate locations in Subregion 5 as evidenced by increased employment opportunities, income, and tax base.
- An adequate amount of land is provided for commercial and industrial land uses.
- The ratio of jobs to population is increased as employment opportunities improve.
- Quality retail development locates in Subregion 5.
- Residents have increased employment options near their homes as a diversity of new jobs and employers are attracted to Subregion 5.

A. INDUSTRIAL, OFFICE, AND RETAIL

Industrial

Land once considered appropriate for employment—or industrial development along railroad rights-of-way and major highways—is now obsolete and inappropriate in many locations. An example of this is the Villages of Timothy Branch development in Brandywine. In 2008, the District Council approved a change from industrial zoning to residential and commercial zoning in an area that had been planned for employment land use for several decades.

Findings of the 2010 Prince George’s County Industrial Land Needs and Employment Study include the following:

- The County has an oversupply of industrially zoned land in Subregions 3, 4, and 5.
- Countywide, approximately 4,000 acres could potentially be rezoned from industrial to other uses without adversely affecting the availability of industrial land.
- Subregion 5 was among three planning subregions under the greatest pressure for rezoning of industrial land, the others being Subregion 3 (Bowie) and Subregion 4 (inside the Beltway north and south of MD 214, Central Avenue).

As of 2007 the total acreage of industrially zoned land in Subregion 5 was 2,220 acres, accounting for 20 percent of the countywide total of industrially zoned land. In contrast, the rentable building area in Subregion 5 accounted for just 3.4 percent (1.7 million square feet) of the County total. Of the industrially zoned land, 1,324 acres, or 60 percent, was undeveloped, a significantly higher share than the countywide total of 45 percent (Table VIII-1: Subregion 5 Industrially Zoned Land).

4 As of December 2015, there were 845 acres of industrially zoned land in Subregion 5.
Table VIII-1: Industrially Zoned Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>I-1</th>
<th>I-2</th>
<th>I-3</th>
<th>I-4</th>
<th>E-I-A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acres</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>680</td>
<td>2,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>1,324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

M-NCPPC, June 2008
Note: Due to rounding some columns or rows may not add up to the total amount.

Based on a recent industrial land use evaluation by M-NCPPC, the following categorizations and recommendations are made:

Table VIII-2: Industrial Categories and Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial Area</th>
<th>Categorization*</th>
<th>Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Woodyard Road/Old Alexandria Ferry Road</td>
<td>Healthy (Type 5)</td>
<td>Provide this established industrial area with adequate infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US 301 and Brandywine Road</td>
<td>Deindustrializing and transitioning (Type 3)</td>
<td>Given a decline in the demand for industrial zoned land; transition to other zones to respond to the market change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steed and Piscataway Roads/Hyde Field</td>
<td>Not characterized (Airport use)</td>
<td>Consider an alternative development plan to replace the Washington Executive Airport in the long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Industrial lands were characterized using a five point scale: Type 1, no demand for industrial space; Type 2, a history of industrial activity, but high vacancy rates and a drop in rental rates; Type 3, a history of industrial activity and weak demand; Type 4, evidence of healthy industrial activity; and Type 5, industrial areas that are healthy.

Office

Current office use in Subregion 5 is predominately local serving. The strongest office use in Subregion 5 is medical offices. Based on data obtained from CoStar (an online database of commercial real estate properties), 55 percent of office use is medical. This is probably influenced by the presence of Southern Maryland Hospital. The number of medical offices in Subregion 5 is an opportunity to foster a specialized employment industry that could attract quality development and other economic benefits.

Commercial Office land use in Subregion 5 is concentrated along MD 223, Old Branch Avenue, and Old Alexandria Ferry Road. In particular, the area surrounding the intersection of Coventry Way and MD 5 has the advantage of being located at the southern boundary of Joint Base Andrews (JBA). Its proximity to the Capital Beltway should encourage large office development proposals. Such proposals in this northern Clinton area would strengthen the existing stock of commercial office space.

Interestingly, much of the office development in northern Clinton is not zoned C-O (Commercial-Office) or C-A (Commercial-Ancillary), where professional and medical offices would be expected to locate. Most commercial zoning in this area is C-M (Commercial Miscellaneous), which allows many highway-oriented commercial uses as well as typical commercial office development. This explains the number of gas stations, auto repair shops, and storage warehouses in this area, creating a hodgepodge of uses that do not fully capture the area’s employment generating potential. If more of the zoning for professional offices were shifted from the southern portion of Subregion 5 to the northern section of Clinton, it is likely that a more balanced office market would develop.
Future office demand through 2030 is projected to total about 600,000 square feet. While the net new demand appears to be only 70,000 square feet (600,000 minus 530,000 existing) additional demand can be expected from the need to replace some of the existing Class C space in Clinton and to provide office space in the Brandywine Community Center.

Retail

Retail occupancy in Subregion 5 is healthy, as illustrated by an overall vacancy rate of only three percent (Table VIII-3: Shopping Centers). As of 2008, the eight shopping centers in the subregion had a total net leasable area of 1.1 million square feet available in 158 stores.

Table VIII-3: Shopping Centers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Net Leasable Sq. Feet</th>
<th>Number of Storefronts</th>
<th>Vacant Square Feet</th>
<th>Vacancy Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accokeek Village</td>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51,695</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Crossings</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>468,680</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>3,250</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Park</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>258,851</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Square</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21,761</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Station</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton Village Mart</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38,972</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry Plaza</td>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111,077</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6,018</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manokeek Village</td>
<td>Accokeek</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99,739</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub 5 Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,080,775</strong></td>
<td><strong>158</strong></td>
<td><strong>28,368</strong></td>
<td><strong>3%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: M-NCPPC, 2008*

The amount of retail development in Subregion 5, mostly located in Clinton, is deemed sufficient to meet the consumer needs of residents and the retail-level job needs of workers in the subregion. Still, additional growth in the subregion through 2030 is projected to generate demand for 250,000 to 350,000 square feet of community retail for day–to–day needs, including eating and drinking establishments.

Most, if not all of this projected demand will be supported by the development of Brandywine Crossing, a shopping center consisting of approximately 780,000 square feet, primarily for convenience goods. Another development is on the west side of US 301, south of Chaddsford Drive. This development is to include a 120,000 square foot neighborhood retail center with an anchor grocery store.

In general, to support economic development in Subregion 5, land is available to encourage small office clusters to develop in the Clinton area, support retail demand in the Brandywine area, and retain the existing amount of commercial land in Accokeek.
Policies

• Coordinate implementation of economic development strategies with land use, environmental and transportation planning policies.
• Direct future employment and retail development to strategic growth areas surrounding designated transit nodes along MD 5/US 301 so residents of Subregion 5 can work and shop near where they live.
• Provide sufficient land for employment development.
• Promote the medical sector as a specialized employment niche for employment growth.
• Before a new commercial shopping center is approved for development, a market analysis should demonstrate that there is sufficient support in the intended retail market area to justify the amount and type of commercial development proposed.

Strategies

Accokeek

• Retain the two existing commercial areas, Accokeek Village and Manokeek Village, including the undeveloped land northeast of Manokeek Village, zoned M-X-T (Mixed–Use Transportation Oriented).
• Support preservation and enhancement of Livingston Road (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).
• Retain the 2008 level of commercial land use in Accokeek.

Brandywine

• Designate the areas surrounding Matapeake Drive, at its intersection with US 301, as the Brandywine Community Center for mixed use development (residential, retail, and commercial) as described in detail in Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern.
• Retain the employment-industrial land use designation for land east of US 301 and south of Timothy Branch.
• Retain the commercial land use surrounding T.B.

Clinton and Tippett

• Prepare a Clinton Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern) to address:
  * Infill and redevelopment along MD 223—between a point just west of its intersection with Old Branch Avenue/Brandywine Road and the Clinton Park Shopping Center east of MD 5—to emphasize walkability and create a sense of place.
  * Redevelopment of land near a future MTA bus rapid transit or light rail transit stop, most likely on the east side of MD 5 near or as part of the Clinton Park shopping center, to encourage transit-ridership.
  * Additional opportunities to develop commercial offices in the north Clinton area.
  * New office development to strengthen the existing office stock and promote the medical sector as a specialized employment niche for employment growth.
  * Retain existing office/employment areas along Old Alexandria Ferry Road and Kirby Road.
  * Ensure future land use and development is compatible with Joint Base Andrews Accident Potential Zones and noise contours along the west side of Old Alexandria Ferry Road. (Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern).

1 The 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment implemented this strategy.
B. AGRICULTURE

Agriculture maintains a continued presence in Subregion 5, contributing to the countywide industry. The success of agriculture in the subregion, and indeed the County, is predicated on access to high quality agricultural soils, strong markets for farm output, and access to service and supply industries.

As noted in Chapter II: Background, in 2008 approximately 140 parcels greater than 10 acres in size in Subregion 5 had agricultural tax assessments. These parcels totaled approximately 7,600 acres, mostly in the Rural Tier. Countywide, as of 2002\(^5\), there were approximately 450 farms generating $12.2 million in sales and supporting approximately 1,130 jobs.

The State of Maryland’s Tobacco Buyout Program, initiated in 2000, created a period of realignment and uncertainty in the agriculture industry that has impacted both its structure and profitability. The effects of the buyout are easily seen in declining farm income, with the average farm in the County losing nearly $3,500 per year between 1997 and 2002. The consequences are a dramatic decline in farm profitability and investment as farmers seek alternatives to tobacco production as the primary cash crop, which historically provided up to 65 percent of farm income.

Farmers are looking toward their suburban and urban neighbors as a source of new markets, and are crafting their farm transition plans to meet the demands of these consumers. The structural change is to smaller and more flexible farm operations that often offer a more diversified array of goods such as produce, livestock, equine, and agritourism events rather than traditional grain and tobacco operations.

Through the public input for the master plan, farmers and other rural landowners raised the following issues that are important to the future growth of the agricultural industry:

- In order to effectively manage agricultural transition, farmers need to have a suite of tools available to them to protect access to productive land as a means for expansion and growth.
- Farmers need to adapt to modern production and marketing techniques by integrating processing, retailing, agritourism, and production into their operations.
- Farmers need to have the necessary legal protections to practice the business of agriculture. Such protections include better protection from nuisance claims and an arbitration system to keep such claims out of the courts and reduce the cost of legal defense.
- The ability to use agricultural land for a greater variety of related uses such as farm-based marketing and processing, wine grapes, and agritourism needs to be allowed.
- Service and supply industries in the County which have significantly diminished since the loss of the tobacco market need to be increased. The lack of infrastructure particularly influences emerging industry clusters such as equine, wineries, organic produce, and horticulture whose small size makes scale-efficient purchases difficult and forces farmers to travel farther and pay more for inputs.
- Young and beginning farmers and nontraditional agricultural operations, such as agritourism need greater access to capital; they typically cannot access traditional funding sources such as commercial banks.

\(^5\) The most recent Census of Agriculture.
Goals

• Agriculture remains viable in Subregion 5.
• Conflicts between agricultural operations and surrounding non-agricultural uses are minimized.

Policies

• Promote the continued transition of agriculture from a tobacco base to a more urban, market-driven agricultural base.
• Increase economic opportunities for farmers by enlarging the number of commercial uses and activities that can be undertaken on farms.
• Support the development of new agricultural enterprises and agricultural product markets as part of a long-term strategy to enhance the agricultural economy.
• Integrate County agricultural programs with region-wide agricultural development initiatives such as those of the Southern Maryland Agricultural Development Commission.
• Improve linkages between agricultural production and the research and development capacity at the University of Maryland College of Agriculture and Beltsville Agricultural Research Center, in order to encourage the attraction, retention, and development of regionally significant agricultural infrastructure.

Strategies

• Develop an agricultural marketing program that will continue to support agricultural transition away from tobacco and enhance market access for local farmers.
• Create an agricultural marketing position in County government to implement the agricultural marketing program.
• Create a new farmer development program to both attract farmers to Subregion 5 and assist with the development and financing of new and expanding operations.
• Review and amend the County Zoning Ordinance to ensure it permits a broad array of agricultural and agricultural-related uses to support the economic viability of farming and allow farmers to specialize their production base and infrastructure while expanding their capacity to sell local farm products at on-farm retail stands.
• Support expansion of easement language in programs such as those run by the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation to integrate sand and gravel operations within easement contracts (Section: Sand and Gravel).
• Strengthen the County’s right–to–farm policy (County Code: Section 30-101) to include the following measures:
  * Affirmatively declare the intent of the County to protect the rights of farms to carry out generally accepted agricultural practices.
  * Notify new residents in the Rural Tier that it is an agricultural industry area and that agriculture, as a normal course of business, may produce inconveniences, odors, and disruptions to other uses.
  * Provide for dispute resolution through an agricultural arbitration board to protect farmers from unwarranted claims.
• Integrate agriculture within economic development lending programs to enhance access to development capital, such as those provided by the Small Business Initiative Program at the Prince George’s County Economic Development Corporation.
• Explore the viability of a County-supported agribusiness incubation and processing facility development to encourage entrepreneurship at the farm level.
• Involve the Prince George’s County Council, the Prince George’s Soil Conservation District, the Prince George’s County Planning Board, and the Department of Parks and Recreation in exploring creation of a “critical farms program” to encourage protection of farms in the region. Evaluate programs in other jurisdictions to determine the viability, criteria, and cost of implementation.
  * Provide a means to acquire such lands through fee simple purchases for later disposition for agricultural use.
  * Create a revolving loan fund to assist new and existing farmers with the acquisition of farms that enhance land preservation goals.
C. FORESTRY

While forest covers approximately 55 percent of Subregion 5, and 65 percent of the Rural Tier, there is almost no forest industry in Subregion 5 such as tree farming, timbering, or lumber milling. This is due in part to the lack of workable timber in this area and lack of local markets. In neighboring Subregion 6 forestry is a small but not insignificant economic activity generating approximately $4.2 million in annual output. Forestry should become a stronger contributor to the Subregion 5 agricultural economy, in concert with goals and strategies in this Subregion 5 master plan to preserve the Rural Tier and to maintain the viability of agriculture. Increasing forest productivity will require a multifaceted approach:

- Protect forest resources. Producing high quality forest resources begins with protecting high quality forest soil types while improving the landowner management techniques. This subregion plan’s land use recommendations are intended in part to protect forest resources, especially in the Rural Tier.
- Improve timber quality. Improving timber quality may involve the removal of invasive species and low value succession trees that overgrow old farm fields. This type of vegetative management lends itself to on-site lumber milling, pulpwood operations, and biomass energy development.
- Enlarge the market for forest resources. Without improvement to the forest products marketplace, there will be little demand for local timber products beyond removal of the highest value hardwood species and cyclical pulpwood extraction.

Goal

- Forestry resources enhance the economic viability and sustainability of the Subregion 5 communities.

Policies

- Maintain large contiguous blocks of timberland through easement acquisition and conservation subdivisions.
- Protect prime forestry sub-soil types in the Rural Tier.
- Increase financial returns to land owners by encouraging more active timber stand management and improvements to timber stand quality.
- Recruit new forest product businesses that fit within the community context and add value to local timber markets.

Strategies

- Evaluate the potential for use of biomass fuels at County facilities such as school, administrative, and recreational facilities to create a baseline demand for local biofuels.
- Review and amend the County Zoning Ordinance to ensure it contains provisions supportive of forest industry development. Such provisions should include:
  - Allowing for biomass processing and storage of chipped and roundwood biomass.
  - Assuring reasonable accommodation of best practice forestry activities such as harvesting, thinning, planting, and minimal processing such as chipping of tops and slash.
- Include right-to-timber provisions in the strengthened right-to-farm policy.
- Support adoption of statewide forest land tax legislation that would enable the County to offer a property tax benefit. Provisions should include:
  - Managed forests of at least 10 acres containing highly productive forest soils would be eligible.
  - Beneficiaries would provide forest land protection over a typical forest management cycle of 30 years.
D. SAND AND GRAVEL MINING

Sand and gravel is an essential element of new construction in the Washington, D.C., region. Major sand and gravel deposits associated with the Brandywine geological formation (Map V-4: Sand and Gravel Resources, Southern Prince George’s County) are located in Subregion 5. There is significant potential for future sand and gravel mining due to the existence of large unmined reserves.

Goal

- The County balances the need for the extraction of sand and gravel resources, and related activities, with the potential negative impact and nuisance to nearby properties and the environment, including restricting sand and gravel mining to the Rural Tier.

As of August 2008, Subregion 5 supported seven active mines comprising approximately 1,580 acres, and there were approximately 2,130 acres of closed and reclaimed mines. There is a sand and gravel washing and processing plant on Accokeek Road in Brandywine. Additionally, the mining industry may support other independent businesses in the region, predominantly in the trucking industry, thus generating potential additional economic spin-offs in the local economy, though the specific amount of positive impact to the County has not been quantified in this plan.

Because of its high weight-to-size ratio, sand and gravel from the local Brandywine Formation is most cost effective to extract, process, and transport near its local end use. However, the region’s sand and gravel industry faces several issues and challenges:

- Access to new mining capacity is becoming limited as land is subdivided for development or broken-up into uneconomical units of production.
- Mining places a traffic burden on a rural and suburban road system that is also increasingly used by commuters, creating traffic conflicts.
- Public opinion on the effectiveness of mine reclamation often puts the community at odds with the industry, although many mine reclamation issues cited by the public as poor practice are, in fact, related to mining activities that predated current reclamation practices.

Over time, cost associated with these issues could lead to disinvestment in the industry and its eventual relocation. Improving the public’s understanding and acceptance of the industry and protecting long-term access to the resource is the focus of the following policies and strategies.
**Policies**

- Restrict sand and gravel mining to the Rural Tier, with enhanced buffering between sand and gravel mining and communities in the Developing Tier.
- Encourage the mining industry to provide specific evidence of the positive economic benefit of this activity to the County, including documentation of the positive impact of proposed mining for employment of truckers who are Prince George’s County residents.
- Improve access to financial and work force development incentives to support economic development of mining regulations.
- Foster dialogue between community residents and members of the sand and gravel community to address concerns.

**Strategies**

- Explore the feasibility of developing a mineral overlay zone to protect mineral resources. Issues to be evaluated include:
  - Real estate notices
  - Dispute resolutions
- Expand easement language in programs such as those run by the Maryland Agricultural Land Preservation Foundation (MALPF) to integrate sand and gravel operations within easement contracts.
- Integrate the sand and gravel industry within traditional economic development programming such as tax credits and abatements, workforce assistance, and assistance with state and federal small business financing.
- Conduct community outreach to improve understanding of the sand and gravel industry and to improve industry integration within the rural communities.
- Ensure that sand and gravel mine applications address all impacts on surrounding communities, including requiring applicants to mitigate on and off-site transportation impacts from mining activities and potentially limiting the daily hours of mining activities and duration of sand and gravel approvals to mitigate the nuisance to nearby communities.

See additional mineral-related strategies in *(Chapter IV: Land Use and Development Pattern and Chapter V: Environment)*, including guidelines for the review of new and expanding projects, including post extraction uses.
IX: HISTORIC PRESERVATION

Historic communities and buildings provide an appealing sense of place that is often absent in newer areas. They are important elements of an area’s cultural heritage and enhance quality of life. Subregion 5 is dotted with farms, outbuildings, barns, farmsteads, scenic roads, and vistas; all of which offer opportunities to promote the subregion’s heritage through education and recreation. Points of historic and tourist interest include general stores, shops, and churches that provide insight into the day-to-day lives of those who lived in these early towns that originated along arterial transportation routes and helped establish the foundation for today’s communities. Increased public awareness and appreciation for historic sites and archeological resources, as well as the promotion of cultural assets and heritage tourism, can instill a sense of community pride and help safeguard significant historical remnants. Encouraging maintenance of resources can lead to considerable economic returns for the County. Significant historical remnants can be safeguarded through promoting awareness of archeological sites.

Goal

- To preserve and protect historic resources which are significant for their historical, architectural, or archeological value.
- Prince George’s County has four categories of historic resources:
  * Historic resource: An area of land, a building, a structure, or a site listed in the County’s Inventory of Historic Resources, which may be significant in national, state, or local history, architecture, archeology, or culture.
    An environmental setting is the entire parcel of land around a historic resource, to which it relates physically and/or visually, and which is essential to the integrity of the historic resource.
  * Historic site: An individual historic resource that has been evaluated and found to be significant, based on criteria in Subtitle 29, the County’s historic preservation ordinance. A permit is required before any changes can be made to the exterior or environmental setting of a historic site. Historic sites are eligible for grants and tax credits.
  * Historic district: A group of historic resources comprising two or more properties found to be significant through the procedures in Subtitle 29. A historic district is protected by the historic preservation ordinance due to its significance as a cohesive unit and contribution in terms of architectural, archaeological, or cultural value.¹
  * Documented property: A property that has been surveyed and documented but is not included in the County’s Inventory of Historic Resources and is not subject to the historic preservation ordinance.

¹ No historic districts have been designated in Subregion 5. However, the historic portion of Piscataway Village includes five historic sites.
Subregion 5 has many important historic assets, including two museum properties, historic churches, historic farms, and vestiges of historic villages such as T.B. and Brandywine (Chapter II: Background). The Inventory of Historic Resources currently lists 27 historic resources and 20 historic sites in Subregion 5. Eight historic sites are listed in the National Register of Historic Places: His Lordship’s Kindness, Mary Surratt House, Wyoming and Cemetery, Accokeek Creek Archeological Site, Piscataway Park Archeological Site, Bellevue, Chapel of the Incarnation, and William W. Early House (Map IX-1: Historic Sites and Archeological Clusters). All of these historic sites have environmental settings established by the County’s Historic Preservation Commission.

The Prince George’s County Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) is responsible for the protection of historic sites. The commission’s responsibilities include reviewing applications for building permits, making comments on development applications, and assisting owners of historic properties with information and contacts.

In 2008, a Historic Property Grant Program was established for properties that are listed or determined eligible as historic sites or are listed in the National Register. The program funds the acquisition, preservation, rehabilitation, or restoration of historic properties. The program is administered by the Prince George’s County Planning Board. A more locally focused grant program is operated by the Piscataway Preservation Corporation, a non-profit organization whose goal is to preserve and enhance historic Piscataway. The corporation provides grants for building owners with frontage on Floral Park Road between Livingston Road, Piscataway Road, and St. Mary’s Church. Funding is provided by a per-lot contribution by a local developer.

The 20 historic sites in Subregion 5 include five cemeteries: Steed Family Cemetery at Site of Belleview, Wyoming (Marbury family), His Lordship’s Kindness/Poplar Hill and Cemetery, Christ Church and cemetery, and St. Mary’s Church and cemetery. A countywide cemetery inventory project is underway as of 2008.

Subregion 5 has a number of scenic and historic roads. Scenic and historic roads are addressed in Chapter VI, Transportation. Safeguarding the character of these roads assists in preserving historic landscapes.

The presence of historic buildings in the subregion has increased awareness of the need for preservation, not only of the structures but also their settings, archeological sites, and cemeteries. These places of significance are recognized for their heritage, architectural features, contribution to “sense of place” in the community, and their ability to attract tourists. However, economic constraints, improper and incompatible adjacent land uses, and standard development techniques can cause negative impacts to these properties.

A number of major historic themes found within the subregion provide opportunities to reach wider audiences of both residents and visitors. The subregion’s agricultural heritage can be seen in the historic farmsteads and historic roads. Its African American heritage can be seen in a number of documented properties identified through historic and archeological surveys, as well as the histories of communities and churches.

The preservation and interpretation of archeological resources throughout the County has increased significantly since 2005, when archeological regulations were enacted. Subregion 5 contains more than 220 identified archeological sites, most of which are located near the Potomac River or its tributaries. Most of the sites are Native American. Cultural resources include Native American encampments and villages dating from approximately 7000 BC to the early 1700s, the Town of Piscataway (1707–1900), small slave-holding plantations (1680s–1864), the 19th century crossroad Town of T.B., and
the railroad community of Brandywine. Several interpretive clusters have been identified based on the presence of archeological resources and interpretive potential (Map IX-1: Historic Sites and Archeological Clusters). They include:

1. **Piscataway Park Cluster**: The anchor of the cluster is Piscataway Park, owned and operated by the National Park Service. Many significant Native American archeological sites have been identified along the Potomac River, within the boundaries of the park. Native American culture is the primary interpretive focus of the cluster. Early European settlement and contact with Native Americans is also an important heritage component of this cluster.

2. **Mattawoman Creek Cluster**: Although very few archeological surveys of the stream valley have been completed to date, there is considerable potential for historic and prehistoric archeological resources along Mattawoman Creek. Several stream valley parks that are owned by the M-NCPPC could serve as anchors for future interpretive trails or other public outreach programs. The primary interpretive themes within the cluster include Native American culture, European and Native American contact, and development of small interior plantations.

3. **Piscataway Village Cluster**: The Town of Piscataway was established in 1707 as part of the effort to establish a stable network of towns in the Chesapeake region. Businesses such as blacksmith shops, stores, and taverns were established in the town, and farms and tobacco plantations dotted the surrounding countryside. Much of the land directly south of Piscataway has been surveyed and many archeological sites have been documented and excavated. The primary interpretive themes for the cluster include eighteenth- to twentieth-century town development, Native American settlement, and plantation economy. Public parkland lining Piscataway Creek and Louis F. Cosca Regional Park could serve as anchors for the development of interpretive trails and programs.

4. **Tinkers Creek Cluster**: Archeological surveys along or near Tinkers Creek identified many short-term prehistoric base camps. There is also a potential for the identification of small farms, plantations, and mills that were established between the eighteenth and twentieth centuries. Publicly owned stream valley parkland could serve as the basis for the public interpretation of these archeological resources.

5. **Woodyard Cluster (Subregion 5)**: This cluster is an extension of the Woodyard Cluster identified in Subregion 6, including Stephen West’s Revolutionary War factory and a large slave quarter complex at Henry Darnall’s Woodyard plantation. Poplar Hill on His Lordship’s Kindness Historic Site in Clinton and nearby publicly owned stream valley parks serve as the anchor for the cluster. Very little archeological surveying has been completed within the cluster.

6. **T.B./Brandywine Cluster**: The core of this cluster centers on the historic communities of T.B. and Brandywine. Many dwellings, businesses, and farms were developed in the two communities during the 19th century. There is a potential for identifying archeological resources associated with the two communities.

**Policies**

- Public awareness and appreciation of historic sites and resources is promoted.
- Participation and utilization of existing historic preservation programs and the creation of new incentive programs is encouraged.
- Economic development is promoted through heritage tourism and recreation.
Strategies

- Participate in regional, state, and national programs related to cultural heritage and historic preservation.
- Link recreation opportunities, such as parks and trails, to historic and cultural sites to promote public awareness of the subregion’s history.
- Encourage superior quality design of infill development around historic sites to complement their architecture and settings.
- Promote the use of historic and scenic easements to protect the settings of historic sites as properties are developed.
- Encourage the restoration of historic properties through financial incentives and public and private loan and grant funding programs.
- Continue to identify and evaluate historic resources that meet the criteria of the historic preservation ordinance for consideration of their designation as historic sites and for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.
- Establish historic districts in areas like Piscataway by encouraging neighborhood involvement and understanding of the benefits from the special recognition and the protection offered by design controls.
- Prepare historic cemetery preservation guidelines to assist property owners with cemetery maintenance.
- Ensure that archeological sites are preserved in place for future research and are interpreted for the public.
- Examine remaining tobacco barns, other agricultural buildings, and farming landscapes to determine whether special incentives or other mechanisms should be developed for their retention.
- Encourage interpretive plaques about the history or archeology of areas as part of the development review process.
- Create a citizen task force to promote cultural heritage.
- Create a community volunteer program to assist in the repair and maintenance of old buildings, barns, and cemeteries.
- Conduct workshops for property owners on architectural styles and rehabilitation techniques.
- Enhance the school curriculum to incorporate local history through hands-on experiences at cultural sites.
- Promote the area’s history to wider audiences.
- Establish a regular schedule for evaluating and re-evaluating historic resources.
- Develop interpretive themes, signage, brochures, and tour maps for archeological and historic sites.
- Market the tax credit programs (local, state, and federal) for rehabilitation of historic buildings.
- Provide for no increase in tax assessments following a restoration project.
- Establish density credits or tax credits for retention of open space around historic sites.
- Review zoning to determine whether to require larger buffer areas around historic sites.
- Expand and enhance the Mary Surratt House and Museum site by acquiring adjacent property fronting Woodyard Road to capitalize on the full potential of this national landmark.  

1 See: 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan.
This chapter reviews land use and zoning policies and practices in Prince George’s County and presents the comprehensive rezoning proposal, also known as the Sectional Map Amendment (SMA), to implement the vision of this master plan. It describes each zoning change, justifications, and the zoning inventory. The land use recommendations in this plan are reinforced by the SMA (see Map X-2: Subregion 5 Approved Zoning), which brings the zoning of the area into conformance with the land use plan. This is critical for allowing and encouraging the type of development desired at specific locations.

The District Council initiated the concurrent preparation of this master plan and SMA on November 20, 2007, via CR-88-2007. The procedure followed is in accordance with Council Bill CB-39-2005, which amended the framework for the process, whereby the District Council approves the master plan and SMA concurrently.

Comprehensive rezoning through the SMA is a necessary implementation step in the land use planning process. It attempts to ensure that future development will be in conformance with County land use plans and development policies, reflecting the County’s ability to accommodate development in the immediate and foreseeable future.

The approval of the zoning pattern proposed by the master plan and implemented by this SMA will bring zoning into greater conformity with County land use goals and policies as they apply to the Subregion 5 plan area, thereby enhancing the health, safety, and general welfare of area residents.

Approval of the SMA results in the revision of the official zoning map for Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, and 85A. Future comprehensive examinations of the zoning within the master plan area will occur in accordance with the procedures established for SMAs. The last comprehensive rezoning for the Subregion 5 plan area took place in 1993 as part of the Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B. Planning Area 85B is addressed in the Subregion 6 Sectional Map Amendment, approved on July 24, 2013 (CR-83-2013). The zoning decisions in the approved SMA are final unless the District Council approves a revisory petition, a subsequent SMA, a zoning map amendment for a specific property, or zoning is changed through judicial action. State law may allow a use on a property that is not allowed by the County Zoning Ordinance.

The following are comprehensive rezoning policies established by the Planning Board and District Council for preparation of the SMA.
COMPREHENSIVE REZONING POLICIES

Public Land Policy

The established public land policy states that all public land should be placed in the most restrictive or dominant adjacent zone, whichever bears the closest relationship to the intended character of the area. Therefore, the zoning of public land, just as private land, should be compatible with surrounding zones and provide for appropriate and preferred future uses.

A distinction is made where large parcels of land are set aside specifically as public open space. In these cases the R-O-S (Reserved Open Space) Zone or the O-S (Open Space) Zone is applied as the most appropriate zone, depending on the size of the property.

Although federal and state government property is not subject to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, the comprehensive rezoning process is meant to apply a zoning category to all land, including government property. The R-O-S Zone is generally applied to federal and state properties, unless specific uses or the intended character of the property or area should warrant another zoning category. This policy is in compliance with Section 27-113 of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance, which states that any land conveyed in fee simple by the United States of America or by the State of Maryland shall immediately be placed in the R-O-S Zone until new zoning has been approved by the District Council.

Zoning In Public Rights-of-Way

Policies governing the zoning of public street and railroad rights-of-way (both existing and proposed) are contained in Section 27-111 of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance. This SMA has been prepared in accordance with this section.
Limitations on the Use of Zones

Zoning classifications in the SMA are limited only by the range of zones available within the Zoning Ordinance at the time of final action by the District Council (Chapter XI: Guide to Zoning). However, there are certain restrictions on when these may be applied to properties (Section 27-223 of the Zoning Ordinance). Reclassification of an existing zone to a less intense zone, also known as downzoning, is prohibited where:

(g)(1) “The property has been zoned by Zoning Map Amendment within five (5) years prior to the initiation of the Sectional Map Amendment or during the period between initiation and transmittal to the District Council, and the property owner has not consented (in writing) to the zoning;” or

(g)(2) “Based on existing physical development at the time of adoption of the Sectional Map Amendment, the zoning would create a nonconforming use. This zoning may be approved, however, if there is a significant public benefit to be served by the zoning based on facts peculiar to the subject property and the immediate neighborhood. In recommending the zoning, the Planning Board shall identify these properties and provide written justification supporting the zoning at the time of transmittal. The failure of either the Planning Board or property owner to identify these properties, or a failure of the Planning Board to provide the written justification, shall not invalidate any Council action in the approval of the Sectional Map Amendment.”

In order to clarify the extent to which a given parcel of land is protected from rezoning to a less intense zone by virtue of existing physical development, the Zoning Ordinance Section 27-223(h) states that:

“The area of the ‘property’ as that word is used in Subsection (g)(2), above, is the minimum required by the Zoning Ordinance which makes the use legally existing when the Sectional Map Amendment is approved.”

Guidelines for Commercial Zoning

The comprehensive rezoning proposal will recommend the most appropriate of the “use-oriented” commercial zones listed in the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance. The choice of zone is determined by the commercial needs of the area, the master plan recommendations, and the type of use and status of the development on the property and surrounding area.
CONDITIONAL ZONING

The inclusion of safeguards, requirements, and conditions beyond the normal provisions of the Zoning Ordinance that can be attached to individual zoning map amendments via “conditional zoning” cannot be utilized in SMAs. In the piecemeal rezoning process, conditions are used to: (1) protect surrounding properties from potential adverse effects that might accrue from a specific zoning map amendment; and/or (2) to enhance coordinated, harmonious, and systematic development of the Regional District. When approved by the District Council, and accepted by the zoning applicant, “conditions” become part of the zoning map requirements applicable to a specific property and are as binding as any provision of the County Zoning Ordinance (Conditional Zoning Procedures, Section 27-157(b)).

In theory, zoning actions taken as part of the comprehensive zoning (SMA) process should be compatible with other land uses without the use of conditions. However, it is not the intent of an SMA to repeal the additional requirements determined via “conditional” zoning cases that have been approved prior to the initiation of an SMA. As such, it is appropriate that, when special conditions to development of specific properties have been publicly agreed upon and have become part of the existing zoning map applicable to the site, those same conditions shall be brought forward in the SMA. This is accomplished by continuing the approved zoning with conditions and showing the zoning application number on the newly adopted zoning map. This would take place only when it is found that the existing zoning is compatible with the intended zoning pattern or when ordinance limitations preclude a rezoning. Similarly, findings contained in previously approved SMAs shall be brought forward in the SMA where the previous zoning category has been maintained.

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN ZONES

Comprehensive Design Zones (CDZs) may be included in an SMA. Normally, the flexible nature of these zones requires a Basic Plan of development to be submitted through the zoning application process (Zoning Map Amendment) in order to evaluate the comprehensive design proposal. It is only through approval of a Basic Plan, which identifies land use types, quantities, and relationships, that a CDZ can be recognized. Under this process, an application must be filed, including a Basic Plan. The Planning Board must have considered and made a recommendation on the zoning application in order for the CDZ to be included within the SMA. During the comprehensive rezoning, prior to the submission of such proposals, property must be classified in a conventional zone that provides an appropriate base density for development. In theory, the “base density” zone allows for an acceptable level of alternative development should the owner choose not to pursue full development potential indicated by the master plan.

Under limited circumstances, CDZs may be approved in an SMA without the filing of a formal rezoning application. The recommendations of the master plan and the SMA zoning change, including any design guidelines or standards, may constitute the Basic Plan for development. In these cases, overall land use types, quantities, and relationships for the recommended development concept should be described in the SMA text and be subject to further adjustment during the second phase of review, the Comprehensive Design Plan, as more detailed information becomes available. (CB-76-2006, CB-77-2006, and Sections 27-223(b), 27-225(a)(5), 27-225(b)(1), 27-226(a)(2), 27-226(f)(4), 27-478(a)(1), 27-480(g), and 27-521(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance.)
**MIXED-USE ZONES**

Although there are several mixed-use zoning categories defined in the county Zoning Ordinance, none contain an ideal combination of use, design, and administrative regulations necessary to efficiently and effectively implement the mixed-use, pedestrian and transit-oriented development pattern recommended by the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* and recent master and sector plans, including this Subregion 5 master plan.

The Mixed-Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone allows design flexibility and a mix of land uses with high densities and intensities, provides for a variety of residential, commercial, and employment uses, and mandates at least two out of the following three use categories: (1) Retail Businesses; (2) Office/Research/Industrial; and (3) Dwellings, hotel/motel. The M-X-T Zone also encourages a 24-hour functional environment and builds on existing public infrastructure investments by limiting application of the zone to properties located near a major intersection, major transit stop/station, or at a location for which the sector or master plan recommends a mix of uses. However, the M-X-T Zone is limited in its requirements and application to “placemaking” because it lacks standards necessary to ensure the creation of a pedestrian-friendly environment. For example, there are no regulations to ensure a consistent build-to wall to help define the streets, or to establish an inviting streetscape environment with adequate pedestrian amenities such as lighting or street furniture. It lacks standards for proportion of uses, concurrency, or phasing of different uses during project construction, parking standards at Metro stations, etc. Most of these elements are negotiated during Conceptual Site Plan and Detailed Site Plan phases.

New mixed-use zoning tools are being explored that will implement the policy recommendations of the 2002 General Plan and recent master and sector plans, streamline and standardize regulations and development review procedures, and supplement or replace existing mixed-use zones and overlay zones. This effort is currently focused on a tool for mixed-use development at designated centers and corridors, future efforts will focus on tools to facilitate mixed-use development at non-centers and corridors. Meanwhile, specific modifications to the existing mixed-use zone categories have been adopted as necessary to achieve land use recommendations in plans primarily adopted or scheduled for adoption before a new zoning tool can be implemented.

**COMPREHENSIVE REZONING (SMA) CHANGES**

To implement the Subregion 5 master plan policies and land use recommendations contained in the preceding chapters, many parcels of land must be rezoned to bring the zoning into conformance with the master plan. The comprehensive rezoning process (via the SMA) provides the most appropriate mechanism for the public sector to achieve this. As such, the SMA is approved as an amendment to the official zoning map(s) concurrently with master plan approval. The zoning changes for the Subregion 5 master plan follow.

**Map X-2: Subregion 5 Approved Zoning** identifies the location of zoning changes in the Subregion 5 master plan area. Specific changes to existing zoning are shown on the following individual maps and described in the tables that accompany each map. The maps are included for illustrative purposes only.
### Table X-1: Zoning Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Prior Acreage</th>
<th>Net Change</th>
<th>Approved Acreage*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-1 (Local Commercial, Existing)</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-1.30</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-2 (General Commercial, Existing)</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>-10.08</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-A (Ancillary Commercial)</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-M (Commercial Miscellaneous)</td>
<td>367.64</td>
<td>-56.02</td>
<td>311.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-O (Commercial Office)</td>
<td>31.84</td>
<td>27.85</td>
<td>59.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center)</td>
<td>449.24</td>
<td>17.98</td>
<td>467.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area)</td>
<td>491.88</td>
<td>-470.57</td>
<td>21.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-1 (Light Industrial)</td>
<td>558.08</td>
<td>-214.48</td>
<td>343.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-2 (Heavy Industrial)</td>
<td>375.42</td>
<td>-50.00</td>
<td>325.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park)</td>
<td>69.44</td>
<td>-4.39</td>
<td>65.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-4 (Limited Intensity Industrial)</td>
<td>70.82</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>89.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-A-C (Local Activity Center)</td>
<td>144.43</td>
<td>89.77</td>
<td>234.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-X-T (Mixed Use—Transportation Oriented)</td>
<td>111.76</td>
<td>355.25</td>
<td>467.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O-S (Open Space)</td>
<td>2,918.93</td>
<td>-14.17</td>
<td>2,904.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-10 (Multifamily High Density Residential)</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential)</td>
<td>39.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>39.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-80 (One-Family Detached Residential)</td>
<td>2,995.64</td>
<td>-41.43</td>
<td>2,954.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-A (Residential-Agricultural)</td>
<td>12,083.57</td>
<td>421.26</td>
<td>12,504.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-E (Residential-Estate)</td>
<td>4,534.28</td>
<td>533.98</td>
<td>5,068.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-L (Residential Low Development)</td>
<td>1,402.31</td>
<td>-491.98</td>
<td>910.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-M (Residential Medium Development)</td>
<td>455.13</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>455.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-O-S (Reserved Open Space)</td>
<td>4,990.20</td>
<td>118.85</td>
<td>5,109.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-R (Rural Residential)</td>
<td>10,405.91</td>
<td>-112.34</td>
<td>10,293.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-S (Residential Suburban Development)</td>
<td>1,113.61</td>
<td>136.50</td>
<td>1,250.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-T (Townhouse)</td>
<td>109.56</td>
<td>114.71</td>
<td>224.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V-M (Village-Medium)</td>
<td>367.70</td>
<td>-367.70</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>44,113.99</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>44,113.99</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-of-Way</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,129.70</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,147.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acres</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,243.69</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>47,261.52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: M-NCPPC, December 2015

*Includes zoning approved by judicial decree or administrative correction between 2013–2015.
Map X-3: Approved Zoning Changes
Change Number | Zoning Change | Area of Change | Planning Area | Tax Map and Grid | Tax Account | Prior Zoning Approval(s)
---|---|---|---|---|---|---
1 | C-M to C-S-C | 8 acres | 83 | 170-E2 | 0328807 | SMA, 9/14/1993

Location and Use: 18201 Indian Head Highway, Accokeek. Northwest of the intersection of Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and Livingston Road. Undeveloped, cleared and graded.

Discussion: Rezoning from the C-M Zone to the C-S-C Zone will prevent additional auto-oriented highway uses along this corridor while acknowledging the site preparation activities that have occurred in anticipation of commercial development at this location.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>C-M to R-R</td>
<td>49.2 acres</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>161-A4, 170-F1, 170-E2</td>
<td>0366385, 0277731, 0317891, 0317883, 0318402, 0411652, 0312447, 0338053, 0338061, 0338079, 0315457, 0377507, 0377515, 0316042</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
Properties located between Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and Livingston Road. Single-family detached houses on seven parcels, all other properties are undeveloped.

**Discussion**
These properties have remained undeveloped since at least 1993. If the C-M Zone were retained, auto-oriented, strip commercial development may occur. Land use policy strives to consolidate commercial development to the extent possible in commercial centers rather than to facilitate commercial development along highways. Rezoning from the C-M Zone to the R-R Zone is to prevent excessive strip commercial along a highway. This change is consistent with a 2002 General Plan economic development strategy to, "ensure that adequate amounts of properly zoned land are available for economic development activities while avoiding over-zoning that encourages sprawl and inhibits revitalization efforts." Therefore, it is appropriate and consistent with the land use policy to rezone these properties to the surrounding Rural-Residential (R-R) Zone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>C-M to R-R</td>
<td>1.7 acres</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>152-A4</td>
<td>0298638</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**: 15717 Livingston Road, opposite the intersection of Newasa Lane and Livingston Road, Accokeek. Abandoned structures.

**Discussion**: Rezoning this property from the C-M Zone to the R-R Zone for part of parcel 16 reinforces the existing residential development pattern and makes the zoning of the subject property consistent with the surrounding R-R zoned properties. In addition, the commercial use on this property has been vacant and abandoned for an extended period of time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>R-S to R-A</td>
<td>126 acres</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>152-A4</td>
<td>See Appendix for Change 4</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, 4-94138, 4-00045, 4-02005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
West of Berry Road and north of Accokeek Road, Accokeek. Residential subdivision, mostly built.

**Discussion**
Rezoning from the R-S Zone to the R-A Zone brings the property’s zoning into conformance with the regulations under which it was subdivided and developed.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>V-M to R-A</td>
<td>367.7 acres</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>See Appendix for Change 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, 4-95131, 4-02052</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location and Use
Single-family detached houses on ten lots, all other lots are undeveloped. East side of Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and the White Hall subdivision and east of Livingston Road (MD 223), northeast of Berry Road.

Discussion
This property was subdivided in accordance with the R-A Zone regulations. Rezoning from the V-M Zone to the R-A Zone change ensures consistency between existing and future residential development and zoning per Section 27-477(c) of the Zoning Ordinance which allows for development in accordance with the prior zoning designation when land is rezoned to a Comprehensive Design Zone in a SMA. The 1993 SMA designated this property as V-M (Village-Medium Comprehensive Design Zone) and it has subsequently been subdivided using R-A Zone regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>R-R to O-S</td>
<td>4 acres</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>141-E4</td>
<td>0377697, 0377705, 0350256, 0315507, 0315499, 0402370</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
South of Piscataway Creek, west of Farmington Creek Road, Parcels 8, 14, 15, 16, 17, and 185. Single-family detached residential.

**Discussion**
The vast majority of land in the Rural Tier in the rest of the county is currently zoned R-O-S and O-S. This change adds consistency to the zoning of properties in this part of the Rural Tier in Subregion 5.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C-S-C to C-M</td>
<td>0.63 acres</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>142-B4</td>
<td>0294215, 0294199</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**  
14323 Indian Head Highway, Accokeek. North of the intersection of MD 210 with Farmington Road, parcels 55 and 76. An automotive towing business.

**Discussion**  
This property is not suitable for residential use. It is entirely within the future right-of-way for MD 210. The long-standing current use is commercial, automotive. A more marketable and possibly more attractive use at this location may be a small commercial use, such as allowed in the C-M Zone.
Change Number | Zoning Change | Area of Change | Planning Area | Tax Map and Grid | Tax Account | Prior Zoning Approval(s)
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
8 | R-A to R-T | 72.44 acres | 85A | 164-F2, 164-F1 | p/o 1152032, p/o 1191709 | SMA, 9/14/1993

Location and Use: Property located north of Mattawoman Creek (Charles County line), south of McKendree Road and west of US 301/MD 5.

Discussion: Rezoning of the 72 acres from the R-A Zone to the R-T Zone between the C-M zoned land along US 301/MD 5 and the R-A zoned land to the west allows for medium-density residential close to the edge of the Brandywine Community Center. The subject property should transition to single-family detached neighborhoods to the west, taking advantage of the large parcel size. A stream and wildlife corridor will separate future medium and low-density residential developments. Consistent with the Future Land Use map, the C-M Zone is retained along US 301/MD 5, and the R-A Zone is retained between the stream buffer and the western most property line.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C-M, R-R to R-T</td>
<td>12.57 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>164-F1</td>
<td>1147958, 3046042</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
16400 McKendree Road, north side of McKendree Road, west of its intersection with US 301/MD 5.

**Discussion**
The plan strives to concentrate commercial uses in planned centers, the area that was previously zoned commercial was too small to develop commercially, and the site should be unified under a single zoning category. Townhouse development at this location will enable residents' non-vehicular access to the Brandywine Community Center along the planned spine road, accessed from this property.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C-M to C-S-C</td>
<td>6.41 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>154-E4</td>
<td>p/o 3994712, 3994704, 3994696, 3994720, 3994746</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

7450, 7500 Albert Road, west side of US 301/MD 5, opposite the Brandywine Crossing Shopping Center, properties that are developed and used for commercial purposes.

**Discussion**

Consistent with the commercial future land use designation at this location, the grocery store (Aldi) and other commercial uses have been developed and commercially used since at least 2009. These parcels should be zoned C-S-C to eliminate nonconformance with zoning regulations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>R-R to R-T</td>
<td>23 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>154-F4</td>
<td>1187350, 1187400</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location and Use
South of Chaddsford Drive, west of Branch Avenue (MD 5), east of McKendree Road. Undeveloped.

Discussion
Zoning change from the R-R Zone to the R-T Zone is consistent with the designation of the Brandywine Community Center. The 2002 General Plan states, “The vision for the Centers and Corridors is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development.” The Brandywine concept plan envisions this area as a mix of residential and commercial uses with residential densities ranging from 4 to 20 dwelling units per acre. The future land use map designates this property as medium-density residential and the R-T Zone is consistent with this designation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I-1 to M-X-T</td>
<td>6.00 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>155-A3</td>
<td>3567880</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993 A-9502-C, SE-3272, 4-97124, TCPI/26/91, DSP-05-73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
 East of Matapeake Business Drive, Brandywine. Undeveloped site that is partially wooded.

**Discussion**
 Industrial/Employment land use was previously planned for this site on the east side of Matapeake Business Drive, however, most of the properties at this location are presently classified as mixed-use on the Future Land Use map. The remaining properties are designated for industrial land use. Mixed-use, industrial, or employment development, as opposed to more retail or residential, is desired at this location to diversify the employment opportunities in the Brandywine Community Center. The concept maps for the Brandywine Community Center classify this site at the junctures of US 302/A-55/MC-503 as mixed-use. M-X-T zoning is consistent with the designated land use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I-3 to C-S-C</td>
<td>4.43 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>154-F2</td>
<td>1134014, 1133990, 1134006, 1149087, 3466257</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, SE-3272, 4-97124, DSP-00053, DSP-05073, DSP-06077, DSP-06086, DSP-04056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-1 to C-S-C</td>
<td>5.04 acres</td>
<td>155-A3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**: East of US 301/MD 5, one-third mile north of Timothy Branch Drive; including 7800 Matapeake Drive, used for a golf cart rental business.

**Discussion**: The concept maps for the Brandywine Community Center similarly designate this site for mixed-use, transit and pedestrian-oriented development given that it is at the junctures of US 302/A-55/MC-503 and comprises the core of the Brandywine Community Center. Properties at this location are similarly designated mixed-use on the Future Land Use map. A future transit line is proposed along US 301/MD 5 with a transit station recommended on this site. With thoughtfully designed development, C-S-C Zone development may be consistent with the land use concept. The potential exists for achieving a horizontal mixed-use environment at this location, taking into consideration the proximity of other properties in the M-X-T, I-1, and R-M zones. In those zones, Detailed Site Plans should ensure conformance with the master plan policies and recommendations, and coordinate with the surrounding future development.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I-1 to M-X-T</td>
<td>41.87 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>155-A3</td>
<td>3652120, 3652112, 3652096, 3652088, 3652104</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, SE-3272, SE-3272, 4-97124, DSP-00053, DSP-05073, DSP-06077, DSP-06086, DSP-04056</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

Generally, these properties are located east of Matapeake Business Drive, with one property straddling it; north and east of the Brandywine Crossing Shopping Center and south of the Villages at Timothy Branch development proposal. These properties are partially cleared and undeveloped, except for 7651 Matapeake Business Drive, occupied by dentist offices.

**Discussion**

This site is classified as mixed-use on the Future Land Use map. The concept maps for the Brandywine Community Center similarly classify this site at the junctures of US 301/A-55/MC-503 as mixed-use and within the core of the community center. A future transit line is proposed along US 301/MD 5 with a transit station recommended near these properties. The M-X-T Zone is flexible and will allow development over time that is consistent with the long-term land use policy, planning vision, and goals for this area. A mix of employment and residential is suitable at this location, with an emphasis on employment. Abutting properties are in the C-S-C, R-S, I-1 and I-2 zones. With the M-X-T Zone, flexible land use options are available and required site plan review enables better implementation of the master plan goals and policies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>R-R to C-M</td>
<td>3.26 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>144-F3</td>
<td>1138593</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, A-9959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

13709 Old Brandywine Road, undeveloped, partially cleared site abutting the northbound lanes of MD 5.

**Discussion**

Residential development is not desirable at this location due to the noise from MD 5 and US 301. This site is designated commercial on the Future Land Use map. C-M zoning is consistent with the designated land use.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16b</td>
<td>I-1 to R-O-S</td>
<td>4.57 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>145-B2, 145-C2</td>
<td>p/o 4002762 (formerly 3713856)</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c</td>
<td>R-O-S to M-X-T</td>
<td>.79 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>145-C3</td>
<td>3985041</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

Located east of US 301, north of Brandywine Road, and west of Missouri Avenue. The site is undeveloped.

**Discussion**

This site is the subject of pending applications to develop Stephen’s Crossing, a proposal to develop 1,245 – 1,390 residential dwelling units consisting of 425-440 townhouse units, 120-150 two-over-two attached units, 700-800 multifamily units, and commercial development: 100,000-square feet of office; and 100,000-200,000 square feet of retail. Due to the development applications pending and approved in compliance with the M-X-T Zone, it is reasonable to rezone the site from I-1 to M-X-T and to rezone the corresponding 4.57 and .79 acre land swap associated with SMA changes 16b and 16c that occurred coincident with the previous rezoning from I-1 to M-X-T in 2009.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>R-R to C-S-C</td>
<td>.5 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>145-D3</td>
<td>1148246</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

14100 Brandywine Road, at the intersection of Brandywine Road and Missouri Avenue. This site is occupied by a former post office building used by a charitable organization that delivers groceries to homebound residents.

**Discussion**

Rezoning this site to a commercial zoning category eliminates a nonconforming use. The existing use is appropriate at this location and complies with the zoning ordinance provisions of the C-S-C Zone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>R-R to C-O</td>
<td>26.85 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>144-E2, 144-F2</td>
<td>1133131, 1142850, 1175439, 1156090, 1138411, 1138395, 1138403</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

This area is located west of MD 5 (Branch Avenue) and north of MD 381 (Brandywine Road), between other C-O zoned land, R-R zoned land and R-R zoned land to the west. The rezoned area consists of three single-family detached houses, a place of worship, and undeveloped parcels.

**Discussion**

This zoning change is consistent with the 2002 General Plan’s designation of the Brandywine area as a future community center. The 2002 General Plan states: “The vision for the Centers and Corridors is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development.” In addition, quality economic development is one of the primary goals of the 2002 General Plan and adding more commercially zoned acreage for office development in a designated future Community Center is consistent with this goal. The Brandywine concept plan recommends this area as a mix of commercial and institutional uses as part of a transit node along the MD 5 corridor. The future land use map designates these properties as commercial and the C-O Zone is consistent with this designation. (Note that in the approved plan the boundaries of the Brandywine Community Center were made smaller and do not include these properties.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>R-R to M-X-T</td>
<td>73.29 acres</td>
<td>85A</td>
<td>134-E3</td>
<td>p/o 1189224</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location and Use
This property is located between Brandywine Road and MD 5, north of Moore’s Road and south of Burch Hill Road; it is wooded.

Discussion
There had been a development Node indicated on the 2002 County Approved General Plan map at the intersection of planned A-65 and MD 5 which was removed from the General Plan as an amendment with the approval of the Subregion 5 Master Plan. Public Hearing (4/11/13) Exhibit 725 requested the zoning and land use be changed to mixed-use. District Council resolution CR-81-2013, Revision Four, directed that the zoning of this site be changed from R-R to M-X-T.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>C-S-C to R-80</td>
<td>.79 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>116-E3</td>
<td>p/o 0903864</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993 SE-3270</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**

9106 Pineview Lane, located south of MD 223, west of MD 5. The site is developed with an assisted living facility.

**Discussion**

This property was split-zoned, and placing it entirely into one zoning classification alleviates difficulties in obtaining building permits and other approvals. The predominant zoning of this property is R-80; therefore, it is appropriate to unify the property under this one zoning category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>C-1 and R-80 to C-S-C</td>
<td>1.30 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>116-C1</td>
<td>0965129 0965137</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use:** 8307-8319 Old Branch Avenue; west side of Old Branch Avenue, opposite Farmview Court. A strip commercial shopping center and partially wooded, cleared, undeveloped land.

**Discussion:** This property is located within the boundaries of the 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (CBA) and designated therein as Commercial – Neighborhood, a land use corridor that is intended for areas where small-scale neighborhood-oriented retail and services are desired to serve the surrounding residential neighborhood. This SMA strives to update the zoning of properties in obsolete zoning categories, such as the C-1 Zone. The C-S-C Zone will allow for the type of development intended in the CBA sector plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C-2 to R-80</td>
<td>0.68 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>116-E3</td>
<td>0917245</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**: 9218 Stuart Lane, west of MD 5. This property is used as a contractor’s office.

**Discussion**: The C-2 Zone is an obsolete zoning classification. The property is surrounded on all sides by residually zoned land, primarily single-family residential zones, and the existing contractor’s office and interior storage is located within a converted single-family structure. The 2013 Approved Central Branch Avenue Corridor Revitalization Sector Plan (CBA) plan recommends a Residential Low land use classification for the property, consistent with the predominate uses in the area. While the current business may continue as a nonconforming use, in the long term this property should convert to residential use. This zoning change eliminates an obsolete commercial zone and is consistent with the long term plan for the property.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>R-80 to R-O-S</td>
<td>42.9 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>116-C4, 125-A2, A3, B1, C1</td>
<td>0975292, 0942409, 0870154, 0909002, 0870162</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-2 to R-O-S</td>
<td>50.0 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C-M to R-O-S</td>
<td>4.0 acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
West of Brandywine Road, south of its intersection with MD 223 and east of Cosca Regional Park.

**Discussion**
These properties are owned by The Prince George's County Community College Board of Trustees and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. This zoning change to the R-O-S (Reserved Open Space) Zone is consistent with the county's Public Lands Policy that places publicly owned land in the lowest intensity zoning category, which is the R-O-S Zone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C-S-C to R-T</td>
<td>6.7 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>125-E2</td>
<td>3079944</td>
<td>3079951, SMA, 9/14/1993, 4-93072, DSP-05107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
West side of MD 5 (Branch Avenue) south of its intersection with Surratts Road. Undeveloped land.

**Discussion**
Access to this site through a residential subdivision makes the site undesirable for commercial development. Rezoning this property to the R-T (Residential Townhouse) Zone allows townhouse development that is compatible with the adjacent built community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>R-R to C-O</td>
<td>1.0 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>125-F1</td>
<td>0945667</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
7512 Surratts Road, northeast quadrant of MD 5/Surratts Road; north side of Surratts Road, opposite Southern Maryland Hospital Center, developed with a one-family detached house.

**Discussion**
The future light rail or Bus Rapid Transit preferred alignment passes close to the subject property. When the interchange and road improvements are completed at MD 5/Surratts Road, the subject property will not be well-suited for residential use. Surrounding land uses are a hospital, a convenience store, and a nursing home. Commercial development at this location is in keeping with the planning objectives for a mix of land use along the MD 5 corridor, in particular at intersections along MD 5 where transit stops are planned.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>R-R to I-4</td>
<td>18.31 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>107-F4, 108-A4, 16-F1, 117-A1</td>
<td>0945113, 0945121, 0979989, 0979963, 0979971, 0945576, 0918623, 0945030, 0945022, 0945048, 0945056, 0945592, 0945097, 3922465, 4021176, 0885228, 0975979, 3017993, 3018256, 0945600</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use:**
South side of Old Alexandria Ferry Road, north of its intersection with Woodyard Road (MD 223); developed with ten one-family detached houses.

**Discussion:**
This zoning change is to ensure that future land use and development is compatible with the noise and accident potential associated with Joint Base Andrews and to add and retain employment-producing zones where they are appropriate. The Future Land Use map designates this area for industrial development and the I-4 Zone is consistent with this designation.
### Change Number | Zoning Change | Area of Change | Planning Area | Tax Map and Grid | Tax Account | Prior Zoning Approval(s)
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
27 | C-2 to C-M | 9.4 acres | 81A | 107-E4 | 3463304, 3463312, 3463320, 3463346, 3463338 | SMA, 9/14/1993 SE-2647, 4-09012, 4-98018

**Location and Use**
7808 Ferry Avenue, east side and south of Old Alexandria Ferry Road. Undeveloped land.

**Discussion**
This rezoning is consistent with the policy of replacing obsolete zoning categories with the equivalent current zoning categories.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>O-S to R-O-S</td>
<td>18.17 acres</td>
<td>81A</td>
<td>210SE07</td>
<td>p/o 0849166</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p/o 0849174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0933879</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p/o 0849158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location and Use South of Joint Base Andrews, at the end of Bellefonte Lane. The site consists of fields, woods and Piscataway Creek.

Discussion Placing land owned by the United States government in the R-O-S (Reserved Open Space) Zone is consistent with the county’s Public Lands Policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>R-R to C-S-C</td>
<td>0.46 acres</td>
<td>81B</td>
<td>124SE2D2</td>
<td>0867465</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Location and Use: At the northeast corner of the intersection of MD 223 (Piscataway Road) and Tippett Road. The site was developed with a building that is used as a retail store.

Discussion: This rezoning avoids re-creating a non-conforming use since the site was rezoned to the C-S-C Zone in 2009 to make conforming an existing retail commercial establishment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30a           | E-I-A to R-E (2013)  
| 30b           | R-E to R-S     | 31 acres  | 81B | 115-D4, 115-E4, 124-D1 | 0865121 | SMA, 9/14/1993 |
| 30c           | R-E to L-A-C   | 30 acres  | 81B | 115-E4, 124-D1, 124-E1 | 0865121 | SMA, 9/14/1993 |

**Location and Use**
At the southwest corner of the intersection of MD 223 (Piscataway Road) and Steed Road. The site is developed with runways and maintenance shops and has been mined for sand and gravel.

**Discussion**
The subject property has been in the E-I-A (Employment-Institutional-Area) Zone for over 20 years and has not been a viable zoning category at this location. The sand and gravel mining operation that has been ongoing on this site is now completed. It is anticipated that the general aviation airport, also operating on this site, will not continue when development occurs. The surrounding land is zoned or developed residentially, and nearby are a horse farm, agricultural uses and additional sand and gravel operations. The planned future land use is Residential-Low (residential areas up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre, primarily single-family detached dwellings.) The R-E Zone is the predominant zoning category in this area and is an appropriate zoning category for the subject property given the master plan’s future land use recommendation and surrounding development.

*30a: The Prince “George’s County Circuit Court for Case Number CAL13-24972, issued a Court Order dated December 18, 2015, that changed the zoning of this property (Hyde Field) from the E-I-A Zone and the R-E Zone to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone and R-S (Residential-Suburban) Zone, subject to CR-61-2009, pertaining to this property only, and an Agreement attached to the Court Order.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>E-I-A to R-E</td>
<td>103 acres</td>
<td>81B</td>
<td>124-B3, 124-B4</td>
<td>0310904, p/o 0323055</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
West of MD 223 (Piscataway Road), north of its intersection with DeLancey Street. The site is used agriculturally.

**Discussion**
The subject property has been in the E-I-A (Employment-Institutional-Area) Zone for over 20 years and has not been a desirable zoning category at this location. The planned future land use is Residential-Low (residential areas up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre, primarily single-family detached dwellings.) The R-E Zone is the predominant zoning category in this area and is an appropriate zoning category for the subject property given the master plan’s future land use recommendation and surrounding development. This zoning change was included in the preliminary SMA as an attachment to the errata sheet that accompanied the plan.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change Number</th>
<th>Zoning Change</th>
<th>Area of Change</th>
<th>Planning Area</th>
<th>Tax Map and Grid</th>
<th>Tax Account</th>
<th>Prior Zoning Approval(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>R-L to R-E</td>
<td>491.98 acres</td>
<td>81B</td>
<td>125-F1</td>
<td>(see Appendix 6, CR-81-2013, Attachment A)</td>
<td>SMA, 9/14/1993, A-9967, CDP-0504, 4-05050, SDP-0504, SDP-0514, SDP-0516, SDP-0517</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location and Use**
East of MD 223 (Piscataway Road), south of its intersection with Tippett Road. The site is undeveloped land comprised of woodland and pasture.

**Discussion**
The subject property has been in the R-L (Residential Low) Zone since 2006 when it was rezoned from the R-E Zone via Zoning Map Amendment A-9967. The planned future land use is Residential-Low (residential areas up to 3.5 dwelling units per acre, primarily single-family detached dwellings.) Revision Two in CR-81-2013 directed that the land subject to A-9967 be rezoned from the R-L to the R-E Zone. The R-E Zone is the predominant zoning category in this area and is an appropriate zoning category for the subject property given the master plan’s future land use recommendation and surrounding development and zoning.