

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on July 7, 2005, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0410 for Beech Tree North Village, Section 6, the Planning Board finds:

FINDINGS

Based upon the evaluation and analysis of the subject specific design plan, the Urban Design Review staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of 158 single-family attached dwelling (townhouse) units in the R-S Zone.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	Existing	Proposed
Zones	R-S	R-S
Uses	Vacant	Single-family attached (townhouse)
Acreage (in the subject SDP)	22.74	22.74
Lots	158	158

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total Parking Spaces (2.04/Unit)	324	332
Of which are Handicapped Spaces	8	8
Number of Building Sticks	-	32

3. **Location:** The larger Beech Tree project site is located on the west side of Robert Crain Highway (US 301), south of Leeland Road, in Planning Area 79 and Council District 6. The area covered by SDP-0410, North Village, Section 6, is in the north-central area of the Beech Tree development and is located around the T-intersection of Lake Forest Drive and Turleygreen Place.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject site (of SDP-0410) is located along an internal street, Lake Forest Drive, of Beech Tree development. The site is bounded to the north and west by single-family detached houses in North Village, Section 1, to the south by the single-family detached houses in North Village, Section 3, to the southeast by the future golf course; and to the northeast by a R-A-zoned property outside of the Beech Tree project.

The Beech Tree development, as a whole, is bounded on the north by Leeland Road, on the east by Robert Crain Highway (US 301); on the south and west by various residentially zoned (including R-A, Residential-Agricultural; R-E, Residential-Estate; and R-U, Residential Urban Development) properties.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site covers 158 single-family attached dwelling (townhouse) units of a larger project with a gross residential acreage of 1,194 known as Beech Tree, which was rezoned from R-A Zone to R-S (2.7-3.5) Zone through Zoning Map Amendments A-9763 and A-9763-C, for 1,765 to 2,869 dwelling units. A-9763-C was approved (Zoning Ordinance No. 61-1989) by the District Council on October 9, 1989, subject to 17 conditions and 14 considerations. On July 14, 1998, Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706 for the entire Beech Tree development was approved by the District Council, subject to 49 conditions. Following the approval of CDP-9706, three preliminary plans of subdivisions have been approved. They are 4-98063 for the golf course; 4-99026 for 458 lots and 24 parcels (PGCPB No 99-154); and 4-00010 (PGCPB No 00-127) for 1,653 lots and 46 parcels.

Two specific design plans for the entire site also have been approved for the Beech Tree development. Specific Design Plan SDP-9905, which was approved by the District Council on October 22, 2000, is a special-purpose SDP for community character. Specific Design Plan SDP-0001, which was approved by the District Council on October 30, 2000, is an umbrella approval for architecture for the entire Beech Tree development. So far, SDP-0001 has been revised three times. In addition, there are another 11 approved specific design plans for the Beech Tree development. They are SDP-9803 for the golf course; Infrastructure SDP-9907 for the East Village for 130 single-family residential lots; Infrastructure SDP-9908 for extending the sewer line from the East Village area to Parcel G; SDP-0111 for the East Village, Phase II, Section I, for 129 single-family residential lots; SDP-0112 for the East Village, Phase II, Section II, for 49 single-family residential lots; SDP-0113 for the South Village, Phase I, Sections 1, 2, and 3 for 93 single-family residential lots; SDP-0314 for 46 townhouse units on 7.3 acres of land known as East Village Section 10; SDP-0315 for 39 townhouse units on 11 acres of land known as East Village Section 4; SDP-0316 for East Village, Section 9 for 49 single-family detached residential lots; SDP-0406 for North Village, Sections 1,2 &3, for 106 single-family detached residential lots and 60 townhouse units; SDP-0409 for North Village, Sections 4 & 5, for 65 single-family detached residential lots. The subject application is the 14th SDP for the Beech Tree development.

Various types of tree conservation plans also have been approved for the above-mentioned preliminary plans of subdivision and specific design plans. This SDP has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8004950-2000-00, which covers the entire Phase 3 of the Beech Tree development.

6. **Design Features:** The SDP proposes to develop 158 townhouse units on a roughly triangular site, which is accessed from Lake Forest Drive at its intersection with Turleygreen Place. The proposed 158 townhouses are shown in 32 building sticks. Thirteen sticks sit in the middle of the site in three clusters around three interior green open spaces. The rest of the building sticks are located around

the central clusters along the main loop street, which eventually returns to Lake Forest Drive. The northeast corner of the site is largely retained as reforested wetland mitigation area.

The townhouse models included with this SDP are those approved in SDP-0134 and SDP-0315 for East Village, Sections 4 and 10, including Fairfield, Fairmount, and Hazelton townhouses by Ryan Homes and Williamson and Stevenson townhouses by the Haverford Homes. The proposed models have various options like brick facades, shutters, windows, window trim, bay windows and entrance porches. The proposed design features contribute to the overall superior quality of architecture proposed for this development. A condition of approval has been added to ensure that at least 60 percent of the total numbers of units have brick front facades. The proposed lot sizes for townhouses vary from 1,800 to 2,800 square feet. The maximum height of the townhouses is three stories and the maximum lot coverage is 40 percent. The proposed layout of the townhouses ensures that the fronts of the townhouses face the streets and there are no rear-loaded garages. Detailed information, such as types of model and specific building footprints, will be shown at time of building permit.

Since the subject development is located in the interior of a larger project, there is no entrance feature proposed with this SDP.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9763-C:** On October 9, 1989, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9763-C, subject to 17 conditions and 14 considerations. Of the considerations and conditions attached to the approval of A-9763, the following are applicable to the review of this SDP:
 7. **Build-out of residential units within the first six years shall generally be reduced to 1,500 units. After construction of the 1,500th dwelling units, all building permit applications shall be referred to the Prince George's County Public Schools to determine, prior to issuance of building permits, that adequate capacity in public school facilities is available to serve the proposed development or in the alternative, there are schools programmed and funded for construction which will accommodate the development.**

Comment: With the approval of this SDP, the total approved dwelling units through the specific design plan process will be reaching 927 units. The Urban Design staff will closely monitor the dwelling unit number in the future SDP approval and enforce this condition when the cumulative approved dwelling unit number reaches 1,500.

Condition 14. Housing prices in 1989 dollars shall not be lower than the ranges of:

Single-Family Detached:	\$225,000-500,000+
Single-Family Attached:	\$150,000-200,000+
Multifamily dwellings:	\$125,000-150,000+

Since these figures reflect 1989 dollars, construction after 1989 requires that the District Council review and approve dollar amounts for construction to be constructed at any later year. These dollar amounts shall be reflective of the dollars for the year in which the construction occurs.

Comment: This condition has been carried forward in modified form in Condition 15 of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706. The applicant has previously submitted a letter from ERR Economic Consultants (Patz to Adams, December 8, 1999) stating that the base price of the proposed 130 single-family houses to be built in the East Village will not be lower than \$225,000 in 1989 dollar values. Per the application, the similar assessment for other parts of Beech Tree will be updated annually. Since no information regarding the proposed townhouses in this SDP has been provided, the applicable parts of the above condition have been carried forward as Condition 2 of approval for this SDP.

Condition 16. The District Council shall review all Specific Design Plans for Beech Tree.

Comment: The District Council will be reviewing the subject SDP.

Consideration 3. A minimum 50-foot-wide undisturbed buffer shall be retained along all streams. This area shall be expanded to include the 100-year floodplain, wetlands, steep slopes, and areas of erodible soils.

Consideration 5. The applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed development complies with the Patuxent River Policy Plan criteria.

Comment: The subject SDP is in general compliance with the two conditions according to the review undertaken by the Environmental Planning Section.

Consideration 6. The applicant shall prepare a detailed soils study to demonstrate that the property is geologically suitable for the proposed development.

Comment: A soils study has been submitted for the development contained in this SDP. Per the review by the Environmental Planning Section, the above condition has been fulfilled. The environmental planner indicates that high-risk areas do occur on this portion of the Beech Tree site.

Consideration 12. Traditional names of the property, owner and family homes shall be considered for use within the proposed development.

Comment: The street names in the Beech Tree development are based on the traditional names of property owners and family homes.

8. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706:** Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706 as approved includes a maximum of 2,400 dwelling units, of which 1,680 are single-family detached, 480 are single-family attached, and 240 are multifamily units, on approximately 1,194 acres located on the west side of US 301, south of Leeland Road. The housing is to be organized in four distinct villages (North, South, East, and West). An 18-hole championship golf course will be integrated into the residential communities. A 30-acre lake, to be built in the Eastern Branch stream valley, will be a central focal point of the golf course and of the development as a whole. The comprehensive design plan for Beech Tree is also proposed to include the following: A club house for the golf course, a recreation center with pool and tennis courts for the homeowners, 136 acres dedicated to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for the Collington Branch stream valley park, 12.5 acres dedicated to M-NCPPC for a community park, which is located to the west of the subject site, 211 acres dedicated as homeowners' open space, 11 acres set aside for a private equestrian facility, a 35-acre site to be conveyed to the Board of Education for a middle school site, and a 17-acre site for an elementary school. None of the above amenities is included in the subject SDP. These amenities will be the subject of future SDP.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706 was approved with 49 conditions, of which the following are applicable to the subject SDP and warrant discussion as follows:

5. **Prior to approval of building or grading permits, the Natural Resources Division shall review all Technical Stormwater Management Plans approved by the Department of Environmental Resources (DER). The Natural Resources Division shall work with DER and the applicant to ensure that water quality is provided at all storm drain outfalls.**

Comment: This condition has been carried forward as a condition of approval.

6. **Every Specific Design Plan for Beech Tree shall include on the cover sheet a clearly legible overall plan of the Beech Tree project on which are shown in their correct relation to one another all phase or section numbers, all approved or submitted Specific Design Plan numbers, and all approved or submitted Tree Conservation Plan numbers for Beech Tree.**

Comment: The SDP is in compliance with this condition. However, the notes regarding the number of dwelling units approved for the Beech Tree development are not adequate (see below Finding 15(d) for a detailed discussion). A condition of approval has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report.

7. **Every Specific Design Plan for Beech Tree shall adhere to Stormwater Management Plan # 958009110 or any subsequent revisions. The applicant shall obtain separate Technical Stormwater Plan approvals from DER for each successive stage of**

development in accordance with the requirements set forth in Concept Plan # 958009110 prior to certificate approval of any SDP.

Comment: This condition has been met by the applicant with the submission of the approved stormwater management concept plan 8004950-2000-00 for this SDP.

- 14. Prior to approval of each Specific Design Plan for residential use, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board and the District Council that prices of proposed dwelling units will not be lower than the following ranges (in 1989 dollars):**

Single-Family Detached:	\$225,000-500,000+
Single-Family Attached:	\$150,000-200,000+
Multifamily dwellings:	\$125,000-150,000+

In order to ensure that the prices of proposed dwelling units are reflective of dollar values for the year in which the construction occurs, each Specific Design Plan shall include a condition requiring that, prior to approval of each building permit for a dwelling unit, the applicant shall again demonstrate that the price of the dwelling unit will not be lower than the ranges above (in 1989 dollars).

Comment: See above Finding 7 for discussion.

- 17. The District Council shall review all Specific Design Plans for Beech Tree.**

Comment: The District Council will be reviewing the subject SDP.

- 45. No grading or cutting of trees or tree removal shall occur until after approval of the Specific Design Plan by the District Council.**

Comment: This condition has been carried forward as a condition of approval.

- 48. During the SDP approval process, traditional names of the property, owners and family homes shall be considered for use within the proposed development.**

Comment: The street names in the Beech Tree development are based on the traditional names of property owners and family homes.

- 9. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-00010:** The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-00010, which covers the subject site, was approved (PGCPB No. 00-127) by the Planning Board on July 6, 2002, subject to 30 conditions. The following conditions of approval attached to 4-00010 are applicable to this specific design plan review:

- 8. As part of the submission of a Specific Design Plan (SDP) for any High Risk Area,**

the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns shall submit a geotechnical report for approval of M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section, the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, and the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources. The SDP shall show the proposed 1.5 Safety Factor Line. Adjustments to lot lines and the public rights-of-way shall be made during the review of the SDP. No residential lot shall contain any portion of unsafe land.

Comment: A geotechnical report for this portion of the Beech Tree site has been reviewed and found by the Environmental Planning Section to meet all requirements. The Environmental Planning staff have reviewed SDP-0410 and determined that high-risk areas do occur on this portion of the Beech Tree site.

10. **Special Purpose Specific Design Plan SDP-9905 for Community Character:** SDP-9905 is a special purpose specific design plan pursuant to Condition 12 of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706 that was devoted to elements of streetscape including but not limited to street trees, entry monuments, signage, special paving at important facilities and intersections, and design intentions in the neotraditional area of the East Village. The SDP also addressed utilizing distinctive landscape treatments to emphasize important focal points, intersections and trail heads, and a concentration of particular species as an identifying feature for particular neighborhoods. The SDP was approved by the Planning Board on October 14, 1999. The subject SDP is in general compliance with Special Purpose Design Plan SDP-9905 for community character.
- 11 **Infrastructure Specific Design Plan SDP-9907:** SDP-9907 is an infrastructure specific design plan for the East Village consisting of 130 single-family detached residential lots. However, SDP-9907 included, for the first time, a staging plan and the accompanying transportation improvements needed for the various development stages of Beech Tree. The Planning Board approved SDP-9907 on June 8, 2000, subject to 14 conditions, of which only the staging and transportation improvements related conditions are applicable to the review of this SDP, as follows:

11. **If in the future, the sequencing of the subsequent development phases or associated transportation improvements is proposed to be modified, the Recommended Staging Plan shall be revised and resubmitted by the applicant prior to approval of the SDP for which such a change is requested.**

Otherwise, with each subsequent SDP, the applicant shall provide evidence, in the form of a letter to the Planning Department, of (1) the aggregate number of building permit issuances for residential units, (2) the Phase within which the number of units for the proposed SDP would fall, and (3) the status of the associated transportation improvements. This letter shall be compared to the Staging Plan for transportation improvements in effect at that time in order to evaluate the adequacy of transportation facilities for report to the Planning Board.

Comment: By a letter dated March 11, 2005 (Stoves to Burton), the applicant provided the evidence to fulfill the above three specific requirements. The review by the Transportation Planning Section indicates that the proposed development will be adequately served within a reason period of time with transportation facilities.

- 12. Prior to the issuance of any residential building permit, the following improvements shall be in place, under construction, bonded (or letter of credit given to the appropriate agency for construction), 100% funded in a CIP/CTP or otherwise provided by the applicant, heirs, successors or assigns:**

Leeland Road

Widen the one-lane bridge approximately 3,500 feet west of US 301 to 22 feet of paving in accordance with DPW&T standards.

- 13. The applicant shall provide right-of-way dedication and improvements along Leeland Road as required by DPW&T.**

Comment: According to the applicant, the above-mentioned improvement is included in Phase II residential development and has been bonded with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation.

The applicant also indicates in the letter that the proposed dwelling units will be developed at Phase III residential development and will be falling into the building permit range of 132–1,000. Per the staging plan as approved with SDP-9907, the following improvements are required:

- 3. Prior to the issuance of the one hundred and thirty second (132nd) building permit for any residential unit of the development, the following improvements shall be completed by the applicant:**
- a. Widen southbound US 301 to provide three (3) exclusive through lanes from 1,000 feet north of Trade Zone to 2,000 feet south of Trade Zone Avenue.**
 - b. Construct internal site connection from Beech Tree Parkway to Leeland Road.**
 - c. Modify the existing median opening to preclude left turns from eastbound Swanson Road to northbound US 301.**

The above requirements have been incorporated into the conditions of approval for this SDP, specifically as Condition 6 in the recommendation section of this report.

12. **Umbrella Specific Design Plan SDP-0001 for Architecture:** SDP-0001 is an umbrella specific design plan for architecture for the entire Beech Tree development. The SDP was approved by the Planning Board on June 8, 2000, subject to three conditions. Original SDP-0001 was approved with 16 architectural models for the proposed single-family detached units in the East Village, but the approved models can be used in any other portions of the Beech Tree development. Since the approval of SDP-0001, three revisions to the original approval have been approved. Of the three conditions attached to the approval of SDP-0001, none is applicable to the review of this SDP because this SDP does not include any single-family detached residential units. The townhouse models used in this SDP will be chosen from the townhouse models as approved with SDP-0134 and SDP-0315 for East Village, Sections 4 and 10.

 13. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject SDP is in general compliance with the applicable requirements of Zoning Ordinance as follows:
 - a. The proposed 158 single-family attached dwelling (townhouse) units are part of a larger project known as Beech Tree, which is the subject of numerous approvals. Therefore, the subject SDP is in general compliance with the requirements of the R-S Zone as stated in Sections 27-511, 512, 513 and 514 with regards to permitted uses and other regulations such as general standards and minimum size of property.

 - b. The proposed single-family attached portion of this application will use townhouse models approved under Specific Design Plans SDP-0314 and 0315. For the general layout and other design considerations, the subject specific design plan must conform to the following design guidelines for townhouses in the Zoning Ordinance. Section 27-274(a)(1)(B), Design Guidelines, of the Zoning Ordinance states that the plan shall be designed in accordance with the following guidelines:
 - (B) **The applicant shall provide justification for, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, the reasons for noncompliance with any of the design guidelines for townhouses and three-family dwellings set forth in paragraph (11), below.**
- (11) Townhouses and three-family dwellings.**
- (A) **Open space areas, particularly areas separating the rears of buildings containing townhouses, should retain, to the extent possible, single or small groups of mature trees. In areas where trees are not proposed to be retained, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council, as applicable, that specific site conditions warrant the clearing of the area. Preservation of individual trees should take into account the viability of the trees after the development of the site.**

Comment: Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH/49/98-07 recommends preservation of the existing wooded areas only along the perimeter of the site, specifically along the site's western and southern boundaries and part of the eastern boundary. No woodland preservation area has been shown within the subject site due to the poor quality of the woodland. The subject SDP is consistent with Type II Tree Conservation Plan.

- (B) **Groups of townhouses should not be arranged on curving streets in long, linear strips. Where feasible, groups of townhouses should be at right angles to each other, and should facilitate a courtyard design. In a more urban environment, consideration should be given to fronting the units on roadways.**

Comment: All the townhouse units are fronting on the internal streets. The 158 townhouses are distributed in 32 buildings. The layout is acceptable and generally conforms with this requirement.

- (C) **Recreational facilities should be separated from dwelling units through techniques such as buffering, differences in grade, or preservation of existing trees. The rears of buildings, in particular, should be buffered from recreational facilities.**

Comment: The recreational facilities are not located immediately adjacent to the proposed townhouses but are within walking distance of the townhouses.

- (D) **To convey the individuality of each unit, the design of abutting units should avoid the use of repetitive architectural elements and should employ a variety of architectural features and designs such as roofline, window and door treatments, projections, colors, and materials. In lieu of this individuality guideline, creative or innovative product design may be utilized.**

Comment: The designs of the abutting units to the extent possible avoid using repetitive architectural elements. A variety of architectural features and design treatments such as rooflines, window and door treatments, projections, colors, and materials have been employed in the elevation designs.

- (E) **To the extent feasible, the rears of townhouses should be buffered from public rights-of-way and parking lots. Each application shall include a visual mitigation plan that**

identifies effective buffers between the rears of townhouses abutting public rights-of-way and parking lots. Where there are no existing trees, or the retention of existing vegetation is not practicable, landscaping, berming, fencing, or a combination of these techniques may be used. Alternatively, the applicant may consider designing the rears of townhouse buildings such that they have similar features to the fronts, such as reverse gables, bay windows, shutters, or trim.

Comment: The above requirement is not readily applicable to this SDP because there are no parking lots or public rights-of-way adjacent to the rears of the proposed townhouse units. The layout of the townhouses ensures that the fronts of the townhouses face the streets; the rears back up to the floodplain and the park to the extent possible.

(F) Attention should be given to the aesthetic appearance of the offsets of buildings.

Comment: Various design elements like bay windows, trims, building projections, and porches have been used to create offsets for the buildings and to give them an aesthetically pleasing appearance.

- c. The proposed 158 townhouse units are in general compliance with the requirements of Section 27-480, General development regulations. The proposed townhouses are shown in five or six units per building stick. The proposed minimum width of the internal dwellings is 24 feet, which is well above the required 20 feet for internal dwellings. The minimum base finished area for each townhouse unit is 1,920 square feet, which is also much larger than the required 1,250 square feet. All the townhouse units have a full front façade of brick.

In addition, Section 27-480 requires a minimum of 60 percent of all townhouse units in a development shall have a full front facade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors) of brick, stone, or stucco. Per the applicant, the models to be used in this SDP are those models approved previously. However, since no elevations have been provided with this SDP, a condition of approval has been added to ensure that a minimum of 60 percent of the total number of units has a brick front façade.

- d. Section 27-528, requires the following findings for approval of a specific design plan:

(a) Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:

(1) The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual.

Comment: As stated in Findings 8 and 14, the proposed specific design plan conforms to the approved comprehensive design plan and the applicable standards of the *Landscape Manual*.

- (2) **The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development.**

Comment: Findings for adequate public facilities including fire rescue, police, and transportation have been normally made in conjunction with the preliminary plan of subdivision. In this case, a complete staging plan and the accompanying transportation improvements for the entire Beech Tree development were not approved until the Planning Board approved SDP-9907 on June 8, 2000. Per a review by the Transportation Planning Section (June 7, 2005, Burton to Zhang), the subject SDP proposal is consistent with the previous transportation adequacy findings. The staff finds that the subject site will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with nearby transportation facilities existing and planned to be completed in the near future.

- (3) **Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.**

Comment: The Department of Environmental Resources has stated that the proposal is consistent with approved stormwater management concept plan 008004950. Therefore, adequate provision has been made for draining surface water and ensuring that there are no adverse effects on the subject property or adjacent properties.

- (4) **The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.**

Comment: As indicated in Finding 15 below, Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/49/98-07 has been submitted with this SDP. TCPII/49/98-07 has been found to meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance according to the review by the Environmental Planning Section. The Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of the subject SDP and TCPII/49/98-07 subject to three conditions that have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.

14. ***Landscape Manual:*** The proposed construction of single-family detached and attached houses in R-S Zone is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and not subject to Section 4.7,

Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*. But the *Landscape Manual* should be used as a guide to appropriate standards in the Comprehensive Design Zone.

- a. The subject SDP includes 158 townhouse units. Per Section 4.1(f), a minimum of 1.5 major shade trees and one ornamental or evergreen tree per dwelling unit are required to be either planted on individual lots or in common open space. The landscape plan provides 237 shade trees, 158 ornamental trees and evergreen trees and thus complies with the *Landscape Manual*.
 - b. The proposed townhouse units are adjacent to the west and to the south to the rear yards of single-family detached houses in other sections of the North Village. But per Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, the regulations to buffer incompatible uses are not applicable to this SDP. The landscape plan proposes a mixture of a landscaped strip and existing woodland along the aforementioned boundary lines with the plant units based on the requirements of a Type B bufferyard, which is a 20-foot-wide landscaped strip with 80 plant units per each 100 linear feet of the property line, of Section 4.7. The proposed landscaped treatment is equal to the minimum requirements of Section 4.7. However, the landscape plan should be revised to graphically label the landscaped strip and to delete any reference to Section 4.7. A condition of approval has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report.
15. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on site, and there is a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan, TCP I/73/97.
- a. The detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was previously reviewed with the approval of CDP-9407 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP I/73/97, and was found to address the criteria for an FSD in accordance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual. No further information is required with respect to the FSD at this time.
 - b. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCP II/49/98, was initially approved with SDP-9803 for the golf course, which covers the entire site. As each specific design plan is approved for the Beech Tree development, TCP II/49/98 will be revised. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCP II/49/98-07, submitted with this application has been reviewed and was found to be in compliance with the previously approved Type I tree conservation plan and to address the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, subject to certain conditions.
16. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
- a. The Community Planning Division (Foster to Zhang, May 27, 2005) has stated that there

are no master plan or General Plan issues related to this specific design plan. General Plan and master plan issues were addressed during the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision application.

- b. The Transportation Planning Section (Burton to Zhang, June 7, 2005) has listed all the required transportation improvements accompanying the staging plan for the entire Beech Tree project as approved with Infrastructure Specific Design Plan SDP-9907. The transportation planner concludes that the subject development as proposed in SDP-0410 will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time. The transportation improvements that are applicable to the subject SDP have been identified and incorporated into the conditions of approval of this SDP.

In a separate memorandum (Shaffer to Zhang, May 31, 2005) on specific design plan review for master plan trail compliance, the Transportation Planning Section has noted that there are no master plan trails issues with this case because no trails are included in this SDP proposal. The sidewalks, as reflected on the site plan along both sides of all internal streets, should accommodate internal pedestrian movement through the North Village and to the nearby internal trails and master plan trail.

- c. The Environmental Planning Section (Stasz to Zhang, May 3, 2005) has provided a comprehensive review of both the larger Beech Tree project and the subject SDP. The planner has recommended approval of Specific Design Plan SDP-0410 and TCP II/49/98-07 subject to three conditions, which have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.
- d. The Subdivision Section (Chellis to Zhang, April 26, 2005) has indicated that the property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-00010 and listed the conditions of approval that are applicable to this SDP. See above Finding 9 for a discussion on the conditions attached to the approval of 4-00010 that are applicable to the review of this SDP. The Subdivision reviewer also has a discussion on the total dwelling units and unit mix of the Beech Tree project.

Comment: On October 9, 1989, the Prince George's County District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9763-C and accompanying basic plan for the subject site (Zoning Ordinance 61-1989) with 17 conditions and 14 considerations, and with the following land use quantities and dwelling unit distribution:

Land Use Quantities*

Gross Residential Acreage:	1,194 acres
Less Half-floodplain Acreage:	<u>91 acres</u>
Base Residential Acreage:	1,103 acres
Base Residential Intensity (1,103 x 1.6)	1,765 units

Max. Residential Intensity (1,103 x 2.6) 2,869 units

(*Detailed surveys of the northern portion of the site have resulted in a more accurate determination of the amount of floodplain along the Collington Branch. The applicant has now determined that there are 220 total acres of flood plain in the R-S Zone. Thus, half of the floodplain acreage would amount to 110 acres, and the base residential acreage would be 1,194-110=1,084 acres, not 1,103 acres. Similarly, the base residential intensity would be 1,734 dwelling units and the maximum residential intensity would be 2,818 dwelling units.)

Dwelling Unit Percentages*

Minimum Single Family Detached:	37%
Maximum Townhouses (Attached):	37%
Maximum Multifamily:	26%

(*The percentage distribution of different dwelling unit types described above is no longer allowed by the Zoning Ordinance. CB-56-1996 revised Section 27-515 of the Zoning Ordinance to require the following distribution in the R-S Zone, which is codified in Section 27-515(b) Footnote 29: Townhouses—no more than 20 percent; Multifamily—no more than 10 percent; Single-Family Detached—no less than 70 percent.)

At the time of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9706 approval, the applicant proposed a total of 2,400 dwelling units with the following unit mix:

Single-family detached	1,680 units	70%
Single-family attached (townhouse)	480 units	20%
Multifamily	240 units	10%

So far three preliminary plans of subdivision have been approved with a total of 2,351 units, of which 240 are multifamily units, 377 are single-family attached (townhouses), and 1,734 are single-family detached units. Based on the SDP notes on the subject SDP provided with this application and the Development Review Division Beech Tree record, a total of 624 single-family detached and 145 single-family attached (townhouses) units have been approved. With the approval of 158 townhouse units as proposed in the subject SDP, the total of townhouse units will be 303, and total of the approved units for the Beech Tree Project will be 927. The site plan notes regarding the approved dwelling units for the Beech Tree Project are inadequate. A condition of approval has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report.

- e. The Permit Section (Stone to Zhang, April 27, 2005) has made five comments on the subject SDP regarding the plan's compliance with the Zoning Ordinance. The relevant comments have been incorporated into the conditions of approval of this SDP.

- f. The Department of Environmental Resources (Nicol to Zhang, May 5, 2005) has stated that the site plan for Beech Tree, North Village, Section 6, SDP-0410 is consistent with approved stormwater concept plan 4004-2005.
- g. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) (Asan to Zhang, 2005) has recommended four conditions of approval that have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.
- h. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (Harrell and Izzo to Zhang, June 14, 2005) has reviewed the subject SDP for adequacy of public facilities and found that the existing fire engine and ambulance service are beyond the respective response time guidelines. In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate services listed, the planners recommend one condition that has been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.

The planners also have reviewed the existing police facilities and concluded that the police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed development.

- i. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) (Hijazi to Zhang, May 4, 2005) has provided a standard referral commenting on street trees, lighting, sidewalks, frontage improvement, storm drainage system and soil investigation for public streets. The requirements of DPW&T will be enforced at time of road permits review by the DPW&T.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type 11 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP11/49/98-07), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0410 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certificate approval of this specific design plan, the applicant shall
 - a. Revise site plans and landscape plans as follows:
 - (1) Provide parking calculations including all garages, on-street parking spaces, and parking for the physically handicapped; and dimensions of all types of parking spaces.
 - (2) Revise the cover sheet of the plan to correctly state that the total number of the proposed townhouse units in this SDP is 158.
 - (3) Label the parking space(s) for the physically handicapped on the site plans.

- (4) Add a site plan note as follows:

“At least 60 percent of the total number of units shall have brick or other masonry front facades.”
 - (5) Label PUE on all applicable site plan sheets.
 - (6) Delete any reference to Section 4.7 bufferyards and the respective schedules from the landscape plan.
 - (7) Revise the site plan notes to provide the most recent information regarding total cumulative approved dwelling units on specific design plans for Beech Tree.
 - (8) Add a brick elevation tracking table to the site plan.
- b. Revise Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/49/98-07, as follows:
- (1) Replace the worksheet on sheet 46 with a TCPII phased worksheet that shows the acreage of each phase.
 - (2) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
2. Prior to approval of each building permit for a dwelling unit, the applicant shall again demonstrate that the price of the dwelling unit will not be lower than \$150,000.00 for a single-family attached house (in 1989 dollars).
 3. Prior to approval of building or grading permits, the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section shall review all technical stormwater management plans approved by the Department of Environmental Resources (DER). The Environmental Planning Section shall work with DER and the applicant to ensure that the plan is consistent with the Habitat Management Program and that water quality is provided at all stormdrain outfalls. If revisions to the TCPII are required due to changes to the technical stormwater management plans, the revisions shall be handled at the staff level if the changes result in less than 20,000 square feet of additional woodland cleared.
 4. Prior to issuance of any building permit, a soils report addressing specific remedies and their locations in all areas where Marlboro clay presents development problems shall be reviewed and approved by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section and the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources. The report shall include a map showing all borehole locations, logs of all of the boreholes, and shall identify individual lots where Marlboro clay poses a problem.
 5. At the time of building permit, exact building footprints shall be shown on the site plan and height information for each townhouse model also shall be provided on the building elevations.

6. Prior to issuance of the 132nd building permit for any residential unit of the development, the following improvements shall be completed by the applicant:
 - a. Widen southbound US 301 to provide three exclusive through lanes from 1,000 feet north of Trade Zone Avenue to 2,000 feet south of Trade Zone Avenue.
 - b. Construct internal site connection from Beech Tree Parkway to Leeland Road.
 - c. Modify the existing median opening to preclude left turns from eastbound Swanson Road to northbound US 301.
7. Prior to issuance of any permits for Beech Tree, the applicant shall demonstrate to the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section that all applicable conditions of the state wetland permit have been addressed.
8. At time of issuance of building permit, the applicant shall pay the fair share of \$201.65 per unit for ambulance service for 158 units in this SDP to the Treasury of Prince George's County toward the provision of the Leeland Road Fire Station and ambulance services to alleviate the existing inadequacy of services.
9. No grading or cutting of trees or tree removal on the site (covered by SDP-0410) shall occur until after approval of the specific design plan by the District Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Eley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Eley, Vaughns, Squire and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 7, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 28th day of July 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:HZ:mas