



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

DETAILED SITE PLAN

DSP-04023

Application	General Data
Project Name: Glenn Dale Golf Course Property Location: On the easterly side of Prospect Hill Road, approximately 500 feet northeast of its intersection with MD 193 (Glenn Dale Boulevard) Applicant/Address: Toll Brothers, Inc. 21630 Ridgetop Circle, Suite 130 Dulles, Virginia 20166	Date Accepted: 6/29/2004
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 124.43
	Zone: R-R
	Dwelling Units: 207
	Square Footage: N/A
	Planning Area: 70
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 06
	Municipality: NA
200-Scale Base Map: 209NE10	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
To gain detailed site plan approval for a development including 206 single-family homesites and the restoration of one historic home on the subject property.	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 3/17/2004 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site: 9/20/2004

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: GROVER, RUTH	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

October 15, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board
VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor
FROM: Ruth Grover, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division
SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-04023 (TCPII/88-04)
Glenn Dale Golf Course Property

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The Detailed Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Rural Residential (R-R) Zone.
- b. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03088.
- c. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
- d. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- e. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

- 1. **Request:** The subject application requests the approval of a detailed site plan for 206 new dwelling units and the restoration of 1 historic dwelling unit on the subject site.
- 2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-R	R-R
Use(s)	Golf Course	Single-Family Residential
Acreage	124.43	124.43
Parcels	One	One
Number of Residential Units	1	207

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 70, Council District 6. More specifically, it is located at 11501 Old Prospect Hill Road, approximately 500 feet northeast of its intersection of MD 193.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is bounded to the north by residential use and some vacant land at its northeastern corner, to the east by residential, to the south by a private school and residential use, and to the west by a church and residential use.
5. **Previous Approvals:** A Preliminary Plan Resolution 4-03088 was approved for the subject property on January 29, 2004. The Planning Board approved PGCPB Resolution #4-18 on February 19, 2004, formalizing that approval. The site is also the subject of an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan approval #20124-2003-01 and TCPI/60/03.
6. **Design Features:** The proposed development would be accessed at two points from the adjacent road network. Specifically, the subdivision would be accessed by "Street H" from Hillmeade Road and by "Street A" from Glenn Dale Boulevard.

Stormwater for the proposed project would be handled in five stormwater management ponds. One of the five stormwater management ponds is located on the southerly side of the Hillmeade Road access. A second stormwater management pond is located along the northeasterly boundary of the site, north of the main recreational facilities to be provided for the subdivision, a third is located along the northerly boundary of the subdivision just west of the central part of that boundary and the fourth and fifth are located on Parcel C on the southeasterly portion of the site.

Recreational facilities proposed for Parcel D include a community building, a pool and a tennis court. In addition, a trail connection in the southeasterly corner of the site is planned to the adjacent parkland where a half basketball court is planned to be provided by the applicant.

An additional trail is shown from the northwesterly corner of the site, around the southerly side of the stormwater management pond to the cul de sac of "Street M." The trail is continued from the cul-de-sac of "Street C" past stormwater management pond 2, through Parcel D (that contains the recreational facilities) to both "Street C" and "Street H." A third trail runs from the southeasterly corner of the site, branching into two as it approaches residential Lot 126, with one portion of the trail extending northward and to stormwater pond 4. The trail then splits into two again to reach around both sides of the pond, joining up on its northwesterly side to continue out to "Street H." The other original branch of the trail extends westerly along the southerly boundary of the site to its southwest corner, then northerly to connect to the culs-de-sac of "Street F" and "Street G."

The historic site involved in the subdivision (Prospect Hill 70-25) is located centrally to the site. The subdivision is designed with most streets double loaded and, except for the two access roads to the site and "Street L," all other roads in the proposed subdivision ("Streets B, C, D, E, F, G, J, K and M") are planned to terminate in culs-de-sac.

Open space parcels, to be dedicated to a homeowner's association, are distributed in the subdivision. Parcels A and B are located on either side of the Hillmeade Road access point to the subdivision from Hillmeade Road. Parcel B contains stormwater pond three. Parcel C contains stormwater management ponds 4 and 5. Parcel D contains the recreational facilities mentioned above, stormwater pond 2, and is immediately adjacent to Lot 207 on which Prospect Hill (Historic Site 70-25) is located. Parcel E is at the north central portion of the site, where stormwater management pond 1 is located.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-R Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-441, which governs permitted uses in residential zones. The proposed residential subdivision is a permitted use in the R-R Zone.
 - b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-442, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in residential zones.
8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-03088:** the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-03088 on January 29, 2004. A resolution PGCPB 04-18, formalizing that approval, was adopted on February 19, 2004. The following conditions of approval shown in bold apply to the review of the subject detailed site plan.

1. **Prior to the signature approval of the preliminary plan:**

- a. **All plans shall be revised to eliminate Lots 9, 26, 33-50, and 74 of Block A; and Lots 33, 48,49, and 58 of Block B; and the remaining areas shall be redesigned to preserve more of the environmentally sensitive areas and provide additional woodland conservation on-site.**

Comment: The Preliminary Plan has been signed. Condition 1(a) was fulfilled prior to that approval.

2. **The Type II TCP submitted with the initial submission of the detailed site plan shall address the proposed tree preservation treatments for all specimen trees whose critical root zone is within or directly adjacent to the limits of disturbance.**

Comment: Staff has included recommended conditions 2a and 2b below to ensure proper tree preservation treatments for all specimen trees with critical root zones within or directly adjacent to the limits of disturbance.

3. **The Type II TCP submitted with the initial submission of the detailed site plan shall address the treatment of the debris that exists in the woodland conservation areas. The TCPII shall contain detailed notes regarding the timing and disposal of the existing debris.**

Comment: Staff has recommended inclusion of condition 1a to ensure compliance with this condition prior to signature approval.

4. **A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved at the time of detailed site plan.**

Comment: A Type II Tree Conservation Plan is under consideration with the subject detailed site plan and the Environmental Planning Section has recommended its approval. Should the Planning Board follow that recommendation and approve the Type II tree conservation plan, this condition would be fulfilled.

5. **During the preparation and review of the detailed site plan, the locations of proposed utilities and trails shall be further evaluated to ensure that PMA impacts are minimized. The reconfiguration and restoration of the existing wet ponds shall be designed so as to reduce impacts and to create the ponds as amenities to the overall project.**

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section, in its memorandum dated October 15, 2004, has indicated that, in staff's opinion, locations of the proposed utilities and trails to ensure that PMA impacts are minimized. In addition, the Environmental Planning Section has indicated that the redesign of the two stormwater management ponds since the time of approval of the TCPI, results in less impacts to the PMA and satisfies the second part of the above condition.

6. **As part of the initial submission of the detailed site plan, a technical stormwater management plan shall be submitted to ensure that there are no conflicts between the two plans.**

Comment: This plan was submitted to and reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section. Staff stated, in their memorandum dated August 15, 2004, that there are no conflicts between the detailed site and technical stormwater management plans.

7. **A detailed site plan shall be approved prior to approval of the final plats.**

Comment: Subject detailed site plan has been submitted in fulfillment of this condition.

8. **The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*....**

Comment: The applicant is providing a pool, clubhouse, trails and tennis court for the development on-site. Staff has reviewed plans for the recreational facilities and determined that they are being constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. In addition, recommended condition 1d to ensure construction of the recreational facilities for the development will follow those guidelines.

9. **A site plan for off-site recreational facilities shall be reviewed and approved with the initial submission of the detailed site plan. It shall include a grading plan and show limit of disturbance and construction details.**

Comment: The applicant is also providing an off-site trail and a half basketball court in an adjacent M-NCPPC park. In recommended condition 1c below, the Department of Parks and Recreation will review and approve the plans prior to signature approval to ensure that they are designed and constructed in accordance with *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

10. **At the time of detailed site plan, changes may be made to the plan to make the layout more efficient. These changes must still accomplish the goals of saving the large tree stand in the northeast portion of the site, incorporating the open space into the community, and minimizing impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area. At the detailed site plan stage, up to four additional lots (for a total of 206) may be created.**

Comment: In a memorandum dated October 15, 2004, The Environmental Planning Section has stated that the applicant had changed the layout in satisfaction of this condition. Please note that Lot 207, the site of the existing historic dwelling on the property, is by convention not counted in the “new lot” total (206).

11. An approved 100-year floodplain study shall be submitted with the submission of the detailed site plan.

Comment: Such a study has been submitted and forwarded to the Environmental Planning Section. Therefore, the applicant has complied with Condition 3 of the Planning Board’s approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.

9. **Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1.b., 4.1.c. Residential Requirements, 4.3.c. Parking Lot Requirements—Interior Requirements, 4.6 Buffering Residential Development from Streets of the *Landscape Manual* and 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses of the *Landscape Manual*.

The Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed landscape plan and found that the submittals are in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the entire site is more than 40,000 square feet in area, more than 5,000 square feet of woodland was disturbed, and has a previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/60/03), and a Type II Tree Conservation Plan.

Staff, not having received comment from the Environmental Planning Section regarding the submitted TCPII/88/04 cannot say if the proposed project is in general compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

11. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In a memorandum dated August 27, 2004, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated that the Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the subject application at its September 21, 2004, meeting and voted unanimously to forward recommendations to the Planning Board. They have been included in the recommended conditions below. Please note, however, that a draft of the Phase I archaeological report has not been submitted. Therefore, staff has suggested recommended Condition 1e to ensure that an acceptable Phase I architectural report will be submitted prior to signature approval.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated August 16, 2004, the Community Planning Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and that the application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1993 *Approved Glenn Dale-Seabrook-Lanham and Vicinity Master Plan*.

Transportation—In a memorandum dated August 16, 2004, the Transportation Planning Section stated that Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03088 requires right-of-way dedication along Prospect Hill Road and Hillmeade Road of 40 feet from the center of pavement and provided details as to how that dedication could be best accomplished. The Transportation Planning Section also stated that the required northbound right turn lane on Prospect Hill Road at the site access point was

correctly shown on the plans. Further, they noted that sidewalks were not shown on Prospect Hill Road but might be required by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). They noted that the site access point at “Street H” and Hillmeade Road and the curb, gutter and sidewalks on either side of “Street H” at Hillmeade Road were either not shown or not depicted accurately. Finally, they noted that right-of-way and street widths were depicted accurately and there is no vehicular access to Prospect Hill Road from the development. The Transportation Planning Section’s concerns are reflected in the recommended conditions below.

Subdivision—In a memorandum dated August 10, 2004, the Subdivision Section stated that the Planning Board approved the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for the property #4-03088 on January 29, 2004. The resolution, PGCPB 04-18, was adopted on February 19, 2004, containing 31 conditions. They further noted that conditions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 14 and 30 apply at detailed site plan stage. Please see discussion *infra*. under Finding 8 of this report Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02103.

The Subdivision Section also stated that the detailed site plan is dramatically different than the Preliminary Plan that was before the Planning Board. The road configuration has been changed, several lots have been deleted, and much more of the open space is accessible to the community. These changes all reflect compliance with the Preliminary Plan conditions of approval. No flag lots are now proposed, and the clubhouse area has been moved to take advantage of the open space network and one of the largest stands of trees on the property. Although the numbers assigned to the lots are significantly different than those shown on the Preliminary Plan (because many lots have been eliminated), all of the lots identified in Condition 1.a have been deleted.

The Subdivision Section recommended close coordination with the Environmental Planning Section. The Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with the Preliminary Plan as approved by the Planning Board, and a revised Preliminary Plan has been submitted for signature approval. Staff has been informed that the Preliminary Plan, together with the TCPI, are in the process of gaining signature approval.

Trails—In a memorandum dated August 30, 2004, the senior trails planner stated that two master plan trail/bike facilities impact the subject property. Prospect Hill Road and Hillmeade Road are designated as Class III bikeways in the master plan. He suggested the placement of “Share the Road” bikeway signs. The trails planner’s suggestions are included in the recommended conditions below.

Parks—In a memorandum dated October 5, 2004, the Department of Parks and Recreation stated that since the required site plan for off-site recreational facilities was not included in the DSP package, they would suggest that a condition be attached to the approval that the plan be required to be submitted, reviewed and approved (by DPR staff) prior to signature approval. Such a condition has been included in the recommended conditions below.

Permits—In a memorandum dated September 3, 2004, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

Public Facilities— In a memorandum dated August 6, 2004, the Public Facilities Section concluded that fire engine, ambulance and paramedic services for the proposed project were all within the established travel time guidelines and that the police facility for the proposed project (Police District II-Bowie) will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed project. Please note that these determinations are offered for informational purposes only and are not a required finding.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated August 17, 2004, the Environmental Planning Section had a number of concerns regarding the submitted TCPII and the detailed site plan. Their concerns were addressed, however, by revisions to the plans and in the recommended conditions below.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)—In revised comments made October 2, 2004, DER stated that the site plan for the Glenn Dale Golf Course property, DSP-04023, is consistent with approved stormwater concept 20124-2003-02.

Prince George's County Fire Department—In a memorandum dated August 12, 2004, the Prince George's County Fire Department offered comments regarding access, road design, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated September 2, 2004, DPW&T stated that all improvements within the public right-of-way are to be completed in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T's Specifications and Standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act. In addition, they stated that coordination with Maryland State Highway Administration would be required for all off-site improvements required by M-NCPPC Resolution No. 4-03088. Further, they said that Prospect Hill Road would require the installation of curbs and gutters, sidewalks, and street trees and lights along the site frontage, as well as pavement milling and overlay to the centerline. With respect to Hillmeade Road, they stated that it would require curbs, gutters, sidewalks, street trees and lights as well as full-width pavement milling and overlay. They also said that sufficient entrance sight distance must be provided at the proposed entrance on Hillmeade Road and that removal of existing trees along the frontage would be necessary to provide that sight distance. Lastly, they stated that all storm drainage systems and facilities must be designed in accordance with DPW&T's and DER's requirements, that conformance with street tree and lighting standards is required and that coordination may be necessary with the various utility companies to relocate and/or adjust existing utilities. Please note the DPW&T's requirements are implemented through their separate permitting process.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—In a memorandum dated August 3, 2004, WSSC stated that Project #DA3883Z04 is an approved project within the limits of this proposed site and that realignment of the proposed sewer traversing through Parcel E may be required during the design phase of the project. Also, WSSC mentioned that a 15-foot separation should be maintained between the proposed house on Lot 6 and outer dimension of proposed sewer. Please note the WSSC's requirements are enforced through their separate permitting process.

Maryland State Highway Administration—As of the time of this writing, staff has not received comment on the proposed project.

Enterprise Road Corridor—At the time of this writing, staff has not received comment on the proposed project.

City of Bowie—At the time of this writing, staff has not received comment from the City of Bowie.

12. Architecture for the proposed project includes the following model types. Each is listed together with its base square footage. Staff has reviewed the plans for the proposed models and would recommend that they be approved together with the subject detailed site plan.

Model:	Langley
Elevations:	Federal, Provincial, Colonial, Williamsburg
Square Footage:	3,716–3,821
Model:	Regency
Elevations:	Federal, Provincial, Colonial, New England
Square Footage:	3,176–3,198
Model:	Duke
Elevations:	Federal, Provincial, Colonial, New England, Lexington
Square Footage:	3,588–3,651
Model:	Harvard
Elevations:	Federal, Provincial, Chateau, Williamsburg, Brougham, Lexington, Heritage
Square Footage:	3,362–3,575
Model:	Malvern
Elevations:	Heritage, Williamsburg, Versailles, Classic
Square Footage:	4,900–4,936
Model:	Columbia
Elevations:	Williamsburg, Chateau, Heritage, Versailles, Traditional, Manor, Colonial, Federal, Savannah, Lexington, Gettysburg
Square Footage:	3,122–3,209
Model:	Elkins
Elevations:	Versailles, Heritage, Williamsburg, Federal, Provincial, Chateau, Colonial, Manor, Georgian, Savannah, Gettysburg
Square Footage:	3,385–3,483
Model:	Somerset
Elevations:	Williamsburg Chateau, Federal, Heritage, Savannah, Versailles, Brougham
Square Footage:	3,624–3,760
Model:	Devon
Elevations:	Federal, Provincial, Colonial, New England
Square Footage:	3,126–3,212
Model:	Stratford
Elevations:	Williamsburg, Chateau, Federal, Provincial, Colonial, Heritage, Versailles, Traditional, Savannah, Lexington
Square Footage:	4,031–4,162
Model:	Preston
Elevations:	Traditional, Federal, Versailles, Classix, Manor, Country Manor
Square Footage:	3,171–3,233

Model: Waterford
Elevations: Provincial, Federal, Heritage, Manor, Traditional, Chateau, Country Manor, Williamsburg, Versailles, Georgian
Square Footage: 2,921–2,990

Model: Monroe
Elevations: Heritage, Williamsburg, Federal, Versailles, Savannah, Traditional, Classic, Tara, Provincial
Square Footage: 3,637–3,827

In addition, staff has reviewed the architectural elevations proposed for the clubhouse to be included in the subject subdivision and would recommend that they be approved also, together with the subject detailed site plan.

13. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George’s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-04023, Glenn Dale Golf Course property and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/88-04 to develop the Glenn Dale Golf Course property into a 207-lot subdivision subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the plans for the proposed project shall be revised or items approved as follows:
 - a. A note shall be added to the detailed site plan stating that all debris occurring in woodland conservation areas shall be removed by hand and properly disposed of prior to the issuance of a grading permit.
 - b. Plans for the five proposed stormwater management ponds shall be submitted to and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board to ensure that the ponds will be a visual amenity to the subdivision through creative use of elements such as attractive landscaping, berming and the inclusion of passive recreational facilities such as benches, birdbaths and fountains.
 - c. The applicant shall have detailed construction drawings for the off-site recreational facilities approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation. The detailed construction drawings shall include proposed grading, limits of disturbance and a metes and bounds description of the location of the trail and all construction details.
 - d. A note shall be added to the general notes on page one of the plan stating that all recreational facilities on the subject site shall be designed and constructed in accordance with Department of Parks and Recreation guidelines.
 - e. Applicant shall identify archaeological resources in the project area by conducting Phase I archaeological investigations, in accordance with staff recommendations.

- (1) A qualified archeologist shall conduct all investigations and follow *The Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Shaffer and Cole, 1994). These investigations shall be presented in a draft report following the same guidelines. Following approval of the draft report, four copies of the final report shall be submitted to M-NCPPC Historic Preservation staff. Evidence of M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to certification of the development application.
 - (2) The design of a Phase I archaeological methodology shall be appropriate to identify slave dwellings and burials. Documentary research shall include an examination of known slave burials and dwellings in the surrounding area, their physical locations as related to known structures, as well as their cultural interrelationships. The field investigations shall include a pedestrian survey to locate attributes such as surface depressions, fieldstones, and vegetation common in burial/cemetery environs.
 - (3) If it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, the applicant shall provide a plan for:
 - (a) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or
 - (b) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place
- f. The plans shall be revised to correctly show the dedication of right-of-way along Prospect Hill Road and Hillmeade Road of 40 feet from centerline of pavement and a note shall be added at these two locations (Sheet 12 of submitted plans under review) stating “To Be Dedicated to Public Use.” In addition, this note shall be added to the 10- foot- wide section along Hillmeade Road marked “EX Slope Esmt.” as this provides 40 feet from centerline. Compliance with this condition shall be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Planning Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - g. The site access point at “Street H” and Hillmeade Road including curbs, gutters, sidewalks and a terminal point and connection to Hillmeade Road shall be shown clearly. Compliance with this condition shall be reviewed and approved by the Transportation Planning Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - h. Sidewalks shall be shown along the property’s street frontage on Prospect Hill Road and Hillmeade Road, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - i. A note shall be added to the plans that if road frontage improvements are required that wide asphalt shoulders shall be provided to accommodate bicycle traffic, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - j. A note shall be added to the plans that the internal trail network shall be placed within a public-use trail easement and such easements shall be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan.
 - k. Standard sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.

1. Applicant shall indicate a Section 4.6 Landscape Buffer for Lots 1 through 4, 206, 201, 200, 199, 184, 183, 182 and a portion of Lot 185 along Prospect Hill Road, and it shall be recorded in the land records for those portions of the bufferyard that are located on individual lots. Proof of it shall be submitted to the Urban Design Section as designee for the Planning Board.
 - m. A Section 4.7 Type C Landscape Buffer shall be shown for the community building. The corresponding landscape schedule shall be included on Sheet 15 – Detail Sheet of the submitted plans.
 - n. A Section 4.2 Perimeter Landscape Strip shall be shown for the parking lot for the community building. The corresponding landscape schedule shall be included on Sheet 15—Detail Sheet of the submitted plans.
 - o. The plans shall be modified to include entrance signs and attractive year round landscaping at the base of the entry features. Such signs and landscaping shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - p. Applicant shall demonstrate that 500 linear foot sight lines in all directions of travel have been provided by the entry features and a note to that effect shall be included in the general notes on page 1 of the submitted plans.
 - q. A note shall be added to the plans that a maintenance agreement between the Homeowners Association or other designated responsible person and the Department of Environmental Resources shall be submitted and approved before building permits are issued for the entry features.
 - r. Plans shall be revised so that building footprints do not encroach into the building restriction lines.
 - s. Uses on Parcel 123 and Lot 1 shall be indicated.
 - t. Right-of-way widths for Prospect Hill Road or the maximum size of the right of way shall be indicated on the plans.
 - u. The rear yards of corner Lots 169, 139 and 140 shall have their rear yards located correctly.
 - v. Applicant shall provide information to staff documenting that the height of all retaining walls with safety rail fences is less than six feet.
2. Prior to signature approval of the TCPII, the plans shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Show the specimen tree sign locations and provide a signage detail for the proposed specimen trees to be saved.
 - b. Revise the specimen tree table using the same numbering system to add a column to show “trees not located on the subject property.” These include specimen trees 21, 22, 23, 25, 33, 34, and 40.
 3. Prior to building permit issuance for the relevant lots, elevation drawings for the facades for Lots 34, 35, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160 (as shown on sheets 6 and 7 of 15 submitted with this DSP with

revision date of 9/23/04) shall be provided to the Historic Preservation staff as designee of the Planning Board for review and approval for architectural compatibility with Prospect Hill Historic Site (70-25). Elevations for Lots 34 and 35 shall also include side and rear facades, as these are the views to the Prospect Hill Historic Site (70-25).

4. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the project, due to its classification as a Class III bikeway, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$420.00 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of "Share the Road" signs along Prospect Hill and Hillmeade Roads. A note shall be placed on the final record plat to ensure payment before the first building permit is issued for the project.