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The Prince George’s County Planning Board is pleased to make available the Approved Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.

The approved plan contains recommendations on future land uses and development for a new Bladensburg Town Center focused on the primary commercial corridor for the town, Annapolis Road, and the adjacent supporting area. Policy guidance for this plan came from the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan. The plan is a continuation of the community efforts begun over a decade ago to encourage reinvestment and redevelopment in Bladensburg. The plan contains recommendations for future development within the town center and locally tailored design guidelines for new and infill development.

Community participation and input were vital to the development of this plan. A planning charrette process was utilized to provide the community with the opportunity to share visions and proffer feedback on planning issues. The pre-charrette held in March 2006 was an opportunity for key stakeholders to refine and define the issues and opportunities and begin developing the vision for the area. A four-day charrette was held in April to allow the community, along with the planners, designers, and elected officials, to craft a vision for the Bladensburg Town Center. The results of these efforts were presented to the community on April 26, 2006.


The Planning Board and the District Council appreciate the contributions of community members and stakeholders throughout the plan development phase and at the public hearing. We look forward to this plan providing the foundation for quality growth management and conservation policies that will benefit the Bladensburg Town Center area and Prince George’s County citizens and residents for years to come.

Sincerely,

Samuel J. Parker, Jr., AICP
Chairman
Prince George’s County Planning Board
The Vision

The Bladensburg Town Center has an active civic core closely integrated with a vibrant mix of residential, retail, and office development located along the Annapolis Road Corridor. Rehabilitated housing and residential infill development offer a diverse mix of market rate and workforce housing linked to convenient mass transit stops by an efficient and safe network of pedestrian-friendly streets and paths. The unique historic buildings and sites of the community enhance the sense of place and highlight the history of the town, drawing visitors and guests to existing and new businesses. A revitalized and rehabilitated Anacostia waterfront, closely linked to the town center, serves as a draw to the community and as an attractive western gateway, balanced by the cultural features of the town’s eastern gateway at the Publick Playhouse.

Development Pattern Recommendations

■ Create a quality civic town center, which includes a future town hall that provides municipal resources and serves as a focal point for the community of Bladensburg.

■ Establish Annapolis Road as Bladensburg’s “main street” and provide mixed-use development to support a pedestrian- and transit-oriented corridor.

■ Develop walkways and a pedestrian bridge between the town center and Bladensburg Waterfront Park to establish a strong linkage.

■ Promote mixed-use retail, office, and residential development surrounding the future town hall site to retain existing housing stock and advance economic growth within and around the town center.

■ Establish gateway elements at the Bladensburg Waterfront Park and the Publick Playhouse to define the east and west entries into Bladensburg.

Infrastructure Recommendations

■ Protect the green infrastructure network in Bladensburg, particularly the main stem of the Anacostia River, as designated by the 2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan.

■ Incorporate opportunities for an active lifestyle to support the health and well-being of all Bladensburg residents.

■ Maximize passive and active recreation opportunities in parks and open spaces.

■ Provide safe and attractive intersection crossings that encourage walking and bike riding in and around the town center.

■ Plant trees along roadways, in playgrounds, and in parks to mitigate noise, air pollution, sun glare, and heat.

■ Ensure reliable and accessible public transportation options for all residents.
Provide a fully integrated multimodal transportation network of vehicle, pedestrian, bicycle and transit/bus systems by:

- Removing the Kenilworth Avenue overpass to create an at-grade intersection with Annapolis Road.
- Upgrading the intersection of Annapolis Road and Landover Road with a roundabout.
- Upgrading Annapolis Road between 46th Street and 55th Avenue to create a pedestrian-friendly boulevard environment.
- Provide a pull-off for passenger pick-up and discharge at the Annapolis Road and Edmonston Road intersection bus stop.
- Evaluate, plan, and develop a pedestrian/bicycle loop around the perimeter of the town center.

Recommend a remodeled or new library at its present site to support the civic core.

Work with the Board of Education to evaluate school capacity needs to meet population projections.

Rehabilitate Bladensburg South Community Park, provide trail access to the Bladensburg Waterfront Park, and improve Bladensburg Elementary School’s ball field.

Community Development and Character Recommendations

- Diversify the existing jobs base and housing types.
- Apply appropriate and creative adaptive reuse strategies to historic resources, such as the historic Bostwick House and site.
- Incorporate urban design guidelines into the physical restructuring of the town center to create a high-quality, mixed-use, pedestrian- and transit-oriented environment.
- Adapt Bladensburg’s retail environment to changes in the ethnic makeup of local consumers to maintain a responsive retail market.

Implementation Recommendations

- Develop strategies and opportunities for investment and funding, and recommend phasing and action plans to implement the goals of the plan.
- Rezone the undesirable Commercial Miscellaneous (C-M) Zone to the Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C) Zone to intensify neighborhood retail uses and activities in the core rather than foster continued development of highway-oriented strip commercial development.
- Retain most of the existing zones in the town center in anticipation of a future mixed-use zone and rezoning applications to be filed when the market has materialized.
- Support and encourage partnerships and resource sharing within the public and private development community.
- Promote sustainable design and development practices.
Plan Purpose

On October 25, 2005, the District Council initiated the Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (SMA). This document is organized to reflect the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan. The sector plan, prepared in conjunction with the Town of Bladensburg, contains goals, policies, and strategies to guide future growth and development for the Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan area.

The principal purposes of this plan are:

- To implement the recommendations of the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan and assess its implications on the sector plan area.
- To update parts of the 1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Bladensburg–New Carrollton and Vicinity (Planning Area 69).
- To amend the zoning map, through an SMA, in order to implement the land use recommendations of this sector plan and 2002 General Plan.
- To set policies that will guide future development pertaining to urban design, historic resources, economic development, roads, trails, transit, public facilities, parks and recreation, and environmental infrastructure in the planning area.
Planning Area Boundary And Regional Setting

The sector plan area is part of Planning Area 69 (Bladensburg–New Carrollton and Vicinity) and generally comprises the properties that have frontage on either side of Annapolis Road (MD 450) from the intersection of northbound Baltimore Avenue (Alternate US 1) to the intersection of Annapolis Road and Landover Road (MD 202). The sector plan area is bounded by Upshur Street on the northernmost edge and by Quincy Street to the south. In addition, the boundaries include properties north of Annapolis Road, which are bounded on the west by Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201) on the north by Upshur Street and on the east by 51st Street.

Map 2: Regional Setting
Other Plans And Studies

Previous plans and studies established the groundwork for this sector plan and provided background information critical to the development of sound planning recommendations.

Title: 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan

Author: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Key Recommendations: The Bladensburg Town Center Sector Plan boundaries place the study area within the Developed Tier, along the MD 450/Annapolis Road Corridor and within the Port Towns Regional Center as specified by the 2002 Prince George’s County Approved General Plan.

- The Developed Tier’s policies emphasize: medium- to high-density, quality infill and redevelopment; restoration, as well as preservation and enhancement of environmental quality; transit and pedestrian facilities; and adequate public facilities to serve existing and future residents.

- Developed Tier corridors generally contain a higher intensity of residential and nonresidential land uses and a greater mix of uses that are more regional in scope than the surrounding land use. Development should occur at selected corridor nodes and be planned as transit-oriented development.

- Regional centers are locations for regionally marketed commercial and retail centers, offices, and employment areas, some higher education facilities, and possibly professional sports and recreation complexes primarily serving Prince George’s County.

Title: 1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Bladensburg–New Carrollton and Vicinity (Planning Area 69)

Author: The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Key Recommendations: The 1994 master plan recommends orderly infill development, the creation of new job opportunities through effective and efficient use of existing industrial sites, and capitalizing on the planning area’s proximity to the District of Columbia, Metro stations, and other commercial, office, and community growth areas. The 1994 master plan also recommends protecting existing natural resources, expanding and enhancing an open space system (including taking remedial actions to correct environmental deficiencies), utilizing urban design principles to guide improvements to the appearance of the community, and incorporating funding mechanisms to achieve these visions.

The master plan shows the marina and levee as M-NCPPC parkland within the Natural Reserve System. The Natural Reserve System designates lands “…which exhibit severe constraints to development or which are important to sensitive ecological systems.” The plan states: “Natural Reserve Areas must be preserved
in their natural state…this does not pre-empt so much land from development as to be unduly restrictive.” The plan recommends that the Bladensburg Marina should be incorporated into a “…comprehensive ‘main street’ revitalization program that would stimulate economic development, with the promotion and conservation of the town’s historic resources as key components.” Recommendations include renovation of the marina and needed pedestrian links between historic properties to be used to promote the commercial revitalization of Bladensburg. The parkland between the river and the CSX railroad tracks is currently zoned C-S-C (Commercial Shopping Center), with the northwest portion of the property located within the R-C-O (Resource Conservation Overlay) Zone of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area.

**Title:** 2004 *Feasibility Study for the Bladensburg Town Center Project*

**Author:** HRG Consultants, Inc., Thomas Point Associates, Inc., Paradigm Design

**Key Recommendations:** The Town of Bladensburg contracted with the consultant team to explore opportunities and options for a municipal/civic town center to spur investment and development.

The feasibility study for the proposed Bladensburg Town Center investigates the potential financial, design, and planning implications of building a civic/government complex on the Bladensburg Shopping Center site and establishing a town center master plan. The study for the town center project is the basis for a recommendation to amend the Bladensburg-New Carrollton and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA to create a mixed-use town center.

The study concludes that the transportation infrastructure of Bladensburg does not support a walkable community or a pedestrian-oriented town center. Commuter highways, high-volume traffic, and lack of building frontage along the street reflect an auto-oriented suburban environment.

The feasibility study recommends development of the existing municipal core, the adaptive reuse of the library incorporating a mix of office, retail and residential uses, and incorporation of the Bostwick House as a visual focal point of a government complex at the terminus of Edmonston Road and Annapolis Road. Annapolis Road should become Bladensburg’s “main street”; anchored by the Bladensburg Waterfront Park at the western gateway and the Publick Playhouse near the eastern boundary.

Recommendations for a future town center master plan include:

- Creating a future landscape median in selected areas of the left turn lane along Annapolis Road as a traffic-calming technique.
- Providing on-street parking along Annapolis Road during off-peak hours.
- Reducing the number of driveway entrances to accommodate on-street parking and median strips.
Providing design guidelines for buildings and streetscape elements.

Examining shared parking opportunities in redevelopment plans.

Enhancing linkages between the town center and the surrounding residential and recreational areas through a more complete street grid.

Improving public transit areas.

Establishing connections between the Anacostia River and the town center.

Title: 1997 Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Act

Author: The Maryland General Assembly

Key Recommendations: Loss of open space, decline and abandonment of older communities, the cost of supporting an increasingly dispersed population, and the deteriorating health of the Chesapeake Bay led to Maryland’s 1997 Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conservation Act. In the mid-1990s, individuals, organizations and elected officials traced these seemingly unrelated trends, at least in part, to a single, complicated source: low-density development far from existing population centers. The purpose of Smart Growth, however, is much broader than simply stopping sprawl. Smart Growth aims to give people the opportunity to live in a variety of healthy, safe communities to fit diverse healthy lifestyle choices.

In 1997, the Maryland General Assembly enacted a package of legislation collectively referred to as the Neighborhood Conservation and Smart Growth Initiative. This act is comprises five main components:

- Priority funding areas
- Rural legacy
- Live near your work
- Brownfields
- Job creation tax credits

A significant aspect of the initiative is the Smart Growth Area legislation requiring that state funding for projects in Maryland municipalities, other existing communities, and industrial and planned growth areas designated by counties will receive priority funding over other projects. The cornerstone of Smart Growth, establishment of Priority Funding Areas ensures that existing communities continue to provide a high quality of life for their residents. The act designates by law certain areas, including municipalities inside the Capital Beltway, as Priority Funding Areas.

An employer-assisted housing program, Live Near Your Work, uses state, local, and private resources to help people purchase homes in distressed communities near their place of employment. Live Near Your Work helps increase the rate of homeownership, introduces a mix of incomes into communities, and encourages people to use alternative modes of transportation for their daily commutes.
In an effort to encourage cleanup and redevelopment of abandoned or underutilized properties with contamination or the perception of contamination, the Brownfields Voluntary Cleanup and Revitalization Program streamlines the cleanup process, offers developers and lenders certain limitations on liability, and provides economic incentives for redevelopment.

Originally passed in 1996, the Jobs Creation Tax Credit Act encourages mid-sized and small businesses to invest in Priority Funding Areas by providing tax credits to targeted growth sector businesses.

Finally, the Rural Legacy program protects rural greenbelts and regions rich in natural and cultural resources from sprawl through the purchase of easements and development rights. Rural Legacy encourages jurisdictions and land trusts to develop a land preservation plan and to work across jurisdictional boundaries.

In 2000, Maryland passed Smart Codes legislation that makes it easier to rehabilitate buildings, build in existing communities, and create new communities that emulate the characteristics of our most vibrant communities, providing guidelines for infill development and “smart neighborhoods.”

Public Participation Program

Public participation is fundamental to the creation of a community-vested vision plan. Multiple efforts were undertaken in Bladensburg to ensure that a broad cross-section of residents and citizens was included in all plan making and that the process was open and transparent. A pre-charrette was held mid-March, 2006, as a stakeholder invitation event. Councilman David Harrington, State Delegate Victor Ramirez, Bladensburg Mayor Walter Lee James, Jr., members of the Bladensburg Town Council, and other elected officials attended the pre-charrette and provided valuable input. Community business partners, local organizations, public officials, and church and social groups were also in attendance. The pre-charrette was designed to define and refine threats and opportunities to redevelopment as well as enumerate goals and objectives for the vision plan.
The four-day charrette, held on April 6, 7, 10 and 11, 2006, was open to the public and invitations were sent to over 800 households in the sector plan area. A charrette is a multiple-day event of meetings and workshops to brainstorm for ideas, issues, opportunities, concepts, and plans. It is a venue to bring all the interested and vested parties to the table to meet with the planning team and work on a vision for the community. Public workshops were held on the first and last evenings culminating in an agreed upon vision for the sector plan area in Bladensburg. Several stakeholder interview sessions were also held during the charrette to garner feedback from public and private individuals and groups to help establish common goals and partnerships.

At the post-charrette gathering held at the Publick Playhouse on April 26, 2006, final concepts, plan refinements, and implementation strategies were presented. Attendance was good and the event received significant interest and positive feedback.

Planning/Retail Market Area Profile

For this analysis, the market area for the Town of Bladensburg consists of the Town of Bladensburg and nearby separately incorporated and unincorporated areas. It includes the following tracts of the 1990 and 2000 U.S. Census: 8039, 8040.01, 8040.02, 8043, 8044, and 8063.

In 2000, the Town of Bladensburg was a modestly sized municipality of 7,661 residents with an average household size of 2.45 persons. These households were almost as likely to consist of unrelated individuals as they were of family members. The market area, of which the town is a part, had 19,450 residents and nearly two-thirds of its households were families. This mirrored the proportion of family households in the county but contrasted with the 55 percent of town households that are families.¹

POPULATION AND HOUSEHOLDS

In 2000, the market area had a distinctive ethnic composition: 59.1 percent of the residents were African-American compared to 62.7 percent in the county and 70.9 percent in the Town of Bladensburg. The market area was also home to a sizable Hispanic community. Nearly one in five (18.8 percent) of the market area residents, regardless of race, identified themselves as ethnically Hispanic compared to 7.1 percent in the county and 13.1 percent in the Town of Bladensburg and 8.8 percent in the Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA).² The white, Asian, and other ethnic populations in the planning area were greater than those in the town, smaller than those in the county, and well below corresponding numbers for the PMSA.

¹ 2000 U.S. Census

² The Washington, D.C. Primary Metropolitan Statistical Area (PMSA) includes the District of Columbia and the counties of Calvert, Charles, Frederick, Montgomery, and Prince George’s in Maryland; the counties of Arlington, Clark, Culpeper, Fairfax, Fauquier, King George, Loudon, Prince William, Spotsylvania, Stafford, and Warren in Virginia; the cities of Alexandria, Fairfax, Falls Church, Fredericksburg, Manassas, and Manassas Park in Virginia; and the counties of Berkeley and Jefferson in West Virginia.
Map 3: Market Area
In 2000, market area residents were twice as likely to have been born outside the United States and its territories as were county and PMSA residents. Immigrant residents from Africa and Latin America were most prominent in the market area, where they represent much larger proportions of the population than was true across the broader geographies. The largest number of African immigrants in the market area arrived from Nigeria and Sierra Leone, while the nations of Mexico, El Salvador, and Jamaica are representative of those from Latin America and the Caribbean.

In 2000, 41.8 percent of the households in the market area were homeowners compared to 61.8 percent in the county, 26.8 percent in the Town of Bladensburg and 64.0 percent in the PMSA. On average, renter households had lived in the market area for two years. By comparison, the average homeowner had lived in the same home for nine years in the market area, the Town of Bladensburg, and the county, and eight years in the PMSA.

Between 1990 and 2000, the market area’s overall population grew slightly, gaining 229 residents (0.1 percent annual growth rate), despite the decline of the Town of Bladensburg’s total population by more than 400 residents (-0.5 percent). This growth rate lagged well behind that of the county (0.9 percent) and the PMSA (2.3 percent) for the same period. The market area lost nearly 250 households and the average household size in the market area grew from 2.69 persons in 1990 to 2.80 persons in 2000. The market area’s average household size was substantially higher than that of the county (2.74 persons), the Town of Bladensburg (2.45 persons) and the PMSA (2.61 persons). The average household size of the county and the PMSA declined over the 1990s, while the Town of Bladensburg’s household size remained constant. The market area’s proportion of single-person households was 21.9 percent.

**AGE DISTRIBUTION**

In 2000, 28.8 percent of the market area’s population was under the age of 18 years. In the market area, 7.5 percent of the residents were over the age of 65 years compared to 9.3 percent in the Town of Bladensburg, 7.7 percent in the county, and 9.0 percent in the PMSA. The relatively large proportion of elderly residents in the Town of Bladensburg contributed to its smaller average household size. The market area’s larger households were directly related to its large number of children and fewer elderly residents. Not surprisingly, the market area’s median age of 31.2 years was less than that of the Town of Bladensburg (31.9 years), and was well below the county’s (33.3 years) and the PMSA’s (31.0 years). The age distribution among householders (as opposed to residents) in the market area paralleled that of the county and the PMSA, while the Town of Bladensburg had many young householders and a large number of elderly, with a relatively small proportion of households headed by middle-aged persons.
HOUSEHOLD INCOME DISTRIBUTION

The market area’s 1999 average median household income of $39,912 was higher than that of the Town of Bladensburg ($34,966), but lagged well behind that of the county ($55,256) and the PMSA ($62,647). Based on 2005 income estimates from Claritas Inc., the gap between the market area and other geographies continues to increase. While the median household income of the market area grew to an estimated $41,338 in 2005, at an average annual rate of 1.4 percent, this growth was outstripped by the county ($62,358 at a rate of 2.4 percent per year) and the PMSA ($72,176 at a rate of 2.8 percent per year).

Data from the 2000 census details household income by the age of the householder. The relatively modest incomes in the market area and the Town of Bladensburg highlight those householders age 65 and over. In the Town of Bladensburg, 56.5 percent of householders age 65 and over fell into the lowest income brackets with incomes below $15,000 in 1999. In the market area, 60.1 percent of householders age 65 and over had incomes below $25,000 compared with 74.8 percent of Town of Bladensburg householders age 65 and older. By contrast, 30.5 percent of these households (and only 17.2 percent of the elderly households in the county) within the PMSA earned less than $25,000. In fact, a large portion of these households (38.8 percent) in the county had 1999 incomes greater than $75,000, compared to less than six percent of such households in the market area.

EMPLOYED RESIDENTS AND JOURNEY TO WORK

Paralleling national economic trends, unemployment in the county peaked in 2002 at 4.8 percent and has gradually declined each year, reaching 4.5 percent in 2005. As the national economy recovered from the slowdown associated with the “dot com bust” in the opening years of the century, unemployment figures for the region and the county improved accordingly. It should be noted, however, that the county’s 2005 civilian labor force of over 440,000 residents is still slightly smaller than it was in 2001, and unemployed persons in 2005 outnumbered those of four years prior by more than 2,300. Though unemployment figures for the market area are unavailable, one rough means of comparison is the percent of total residents that held a job. In 2000, 63 percent of market area residents did so, while 66 percent of all county residents were working (while the unemployment rate was 3.8 percent), and 67 percent of all PMSA residents found employment. These figures account for all residents of a particular geography over age 16, and include populations that are not actively in the labor market (i.e., the elderly and the disabled).

The occupations of market area residents and the industries in which they work reflect the employment patterns of the Town of Bladensburg residents. The exception was the construction industry and its related occupations. While only 6 percent of employed Town of Bladensburg residents found employment in the construction industry in 2000, more than 9 percent of the workforce living within the broader market area held jobs in this industry. A corresponding difference highlighted with 8 percent of employed Town of Bladensburg residents working in construction occupations, when compared with the 11 percent for the market area. Proportional employment among town and market area residents is identical, or very nearly so,
for the full gamut of other occupations and industries ranging from manufacturing to information to retail. In 2000, a large portion of market area residents held service occupations (23 percent), as compared with residents of the county (15 percent) and the PMSA (13 percent). Market area residents were much less likely to hold management or professional occupations (22 percent of residents did so in 2000) than were county residents (39 percent) or PMSA residents (49 percent).

These occupational disparities reflect the differences in educational attainment. In the market area, slightly more than two-thirds of residents over the age of 25 years held a high school diploma or General Educational Development (GED) in 2000. By contrast, nearly 85 percent of county residents graduated from high school, as did a slightly higher proportion of PMSA residents. Consequently, the percentage of market area residents who possessed at least a bachelor’s degree (12.3 percent) was lower than the county’s (27.2 percent), and much lower than that of the PMSA (41.8 percent).

Another notable difference between the employed market area residents and those of the broader region is the sector in which they are employed. Even though the Town of Bladensburg is an inner-ring suburb of the nation’s capital, only 10.3 percent of market area residents and 9.7 percent of Town of Bladensburg residents worked for the federal government in 2000. This is well below the 14.3 percent figure for the PMSA, and just over half of the county’s 18.5 percent share. In fact, public sector (government) workers at all levels comprised fewer than one in five employed market area residents, while nearly one-third of those county residents working in 2000 held government jobs. Self-employment is also comparatively rare in the market area. In 2000, 3.6 percent of employed market area residents and 3.0 percent of working town residents were self-employed. Both the county (4.0 percent) and the PMSA (5.4 percent) were home to a greater proportion of entrepreneurs.

On average, market area residents travel longer to get to work than do residents of metropolitan Washington. In 2000, 57 percent of workers living in the market area and 58 percent living in the Town of Bladensburg commuted 30 minutes or more to their place of employment. While this was not surprising, given the county’s 59 percent of workers commuting at least 30 minutes, only 51 percent of PMSA residents had to commute as long to get to work. Providing a sharper contrast is the percentage of market area residents commuting an hour or more (19 percent), as compared to PMSA residents (13 percent) with similar commute durations. A significant factor in this disparity is that more than 20 percent of households in the market area and the Town of Bladensburg have no access to an automobile and must rely on public transportation (largely bus service, since there is no Metro or commuter rail station in the market area). This proportion is twice that of the county and PMSA.

**HOUSING STOCK**

The housing stock of the Town of Bladensburg and surrounding market area differs considerably from the county as a whole and the metropolitan area. In 2000, multifamily housing was a much greater share of the market area (53.9 percent of total units) and the Town of Bladensburg (75.7 percent) than in the county (33.5...
percent) or the PMSA (31.6 percent). Single-family detached homes were a less prevalent segment of the housing stock in the market area, and especially within the town limits, than the broader area. Single-family attached dwellings (townhomes, duplexes, etc.) are also comparatively rare in the Town of Bladensburg where they made up 3.0 percent of housing units compared to 4.1 percent in the market area. By contrast, the PMSA sheltered 19.0 percent of its households in attached single-family structures.

Although no reliable data exists for residential units constructed in the Town of Bladensburg since the most recent census, an analysis of building permits issued by Prince George’s County provides some insight into how the recent strong home-building market has affected the county’s housing stock. From 2000 to 2005, the county granted building permits for over 16,000 residential units. Although this is certainly a substantial number of homes, the total is actually 22 percent less than the number of permits issued in the preceding six-year period (1994-1999). Furthermore, the number and proportion of multifamily units plummeted from one period to the next. Units in multifamily structures, either apartments or condominiums, represented only 4.4 percent of all permitted units in the county from 2000 to 2005, down from 12.2 percent over the prior six years.

The Town of Bladensburg possesses an aging housing stock. In the year 2000, one-third of all residential structures in the town were built before 1960, as were nearly half of those in the market area. Comparatively, just over 25 percent of the county’s housing was that old. Vacant housing is often a characteristic of aging communities. In the Town of Bladensburg, however, vacancy rates in 2000 were only slightly higher than they were in surrounding jurisdictions. The town’s 9.4 percent vacancy rate in 2000 was balanced somewhat by lower rates in nearby neighborhoods to bring the market area’s rate to 7.8 percent.
The Illustrative Vision Plan is only one possible scenario to demonstrate how development could occur following the sector plan and land use plan shown on Map 23.