

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on February 24, 2005, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04040 for Waterford (formerly known as Pleasant Prospect), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for 126 single-family detached residential lots. A detailed site plan is required per conditions of the preliminary plan of subdivision. The subject application includes a site plan, landscape and tree conservation plans.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-A	R-A
Use(s)	Residential	Residential
Acreage	261.19	261.19
Net tract area	232.56	232.56
Area within 100-year floodplain	28.63	28.63
Lots	5 parcels	126 lots and 4 parcels
Dwelling Units:		
Detached	1	126
Minimum Lot Area		43,560 sq. ft.

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 74A, Council District 6. More specifically, the property is located on the south side of US 50 and on the north side of Woodmore Road, approximately 2,000 feet east of its intersection with Pleasant Prospect Road.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** A PEPCO right of way, undeveloped farmland, and large single-family lots within the Woodmore Subdivision surround the subject property.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The Prince George's County Planning Board approved the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/72/03) and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03111 for Lots 1-126 and Parcels A-D, with conditions, on March 25, 2004.
6. **Design Features:** The proposed large-lot subdivision contains floodplain, areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and wetlands. The important issues for this plan of development are the protection of Pleasant Prospect, a structure listed in the National Register of Historic Places, protecting archeology on-site, and the integration of the development with the adjacent

Woodmore Development. The plans propose a rural road section, in keeping with the large-lot development.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-A (Rural Residential) Zone. The subject site is in compliance with the requirements of Section 27-426 for the R-A Zone.
8. **Landscape Manual:** The subdivision is subject to Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements; 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets; and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses. The plans do not sufficiently demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual*.

Section 4.1 requires a minimum of four shade trees and three evergreen or ornamental trees on each lot over 40,000 square feet in size. This would apply to all the lots. The staff recommends that at least one shade tree, one evergreen, and one ornamental tree be provided in the front yard of each lot.

Section 4.6 requires the minimum of a 50-foot-wide landscape strip along the right-of-way of an arterial roadway, US 50. The plans show the area planted in afforestation; however, the plans must also demonstrate that the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* in regard to the size of plant material and the quantities of plant material are being met. There is sufficient space on the plan to provide the plant material.

In regard to Section 4.7, the property is adjacent to a public utility use, the PEPCO right-of-way that contains overhead wires. The public utility use is categorized as a medium intensity use and a "C" bufferyard is required. The plans currently show a bufferyard of afforestation and existing woodland. Where woodland does not exist, the plans must be revised to demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual* in regard to size of plant material as well as quantity. The property is also adjacent to a townhouse subdivision within the Woodmore development. The plans currently show afforestation but must also demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual*. The plans must be revised prior to signature approval to include the required schedules from the *Landscape Manual* and to show the planting materials on the plans.

9. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:**

A revised Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted and reviewed. The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there is a previously approved Type I tree conservation plan, TCPI/72/03, for this site. To date the TCPI has not been revised consistent with the conditions of approval contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-24.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of the DSP, the TCPI shall be submitted for signature approval and address all the TCPI-related revisions in Planning Board Resolution No. 04-24.

This 261.19-acre property in the R-A Zone has a net tract area of 232.56 acres and a Woodland Conservation Threshold (WCT) of 50 percent that has been reduced to 20 percent, or 31.70 acres, because the area of existing woodland on the net tract is less than the 20 percent afforestation threshold. In addition, there is a 2:1 replacement requirement of 6.68 acres for clearing woodlands below the WCT and a 1:1 replacement of 1.64 acres for woodland clearing in the 100-year floodplain and 3.00 acres of off-site clearing.

The overall site requirement of 57.83 acres is proposed to be satisfied by a combination of 8.13 acres of on-site preservation in priority retention areas, 28.02 acres of on-site afforestation, and 21.68 acres of off-site mitigation for a total of 57.83 acres.

Nine of 27 required revisions to the TCPII have yet to be addressed on the plan. These necessary revisions range from showing three stormwater management outfall easements and labeling these areas as such on Lots 61, 62, 76 and 79 of Block A; accurate references on the plan as to the timing of the installation of reforestation fencing; properly showing the necessary woodland treatment in relation to Lot 94 of Block A (adjacent to the Woodmore community) and at several other locations such as Lot 100, Block A; the provision of naturalizing the entrance area with the use of native plants and only minimal area of turf; adding a specimen tree sign detail and corresponding symbol; revising the Reforestation Inspection and Planting Narrative to delete reference to mowing in the afforestation area; removing Standard TCPII Note 6 that does not apply to this site; identifying the party responsible for field checks of the afforestation/ reforestation areas; and adjusting reference to a planting completion date.

The revised TCPII also shows more detailed information as to a proposed bridge crossing for the access road at a stream crossing and the noise barrier in relation to US 50. However, more specific information about the bridge is necessary in order for a complete review in relation to proposed impacts at the entrance road. After all these revisions have been made to the plan, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan update the revision box, sign and date it.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of the Detailed Site Plan, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

- a. Show the stormwater management outfall easements and label these areas as such on Lots 61, 62, 76 and 79 of Block A.
- b. All references to the reforestation fencing shall indicate its installation prior to the issuance of building permits.
- c. Provide additional afforestation/reforestation on Lot 94 of Block A consistent with the TCPI in the area along the western portion of the site in relation to Woodmore.

- d. Show the existing woodlands on Lot 100 of Block A on Sheet 9 as being cleared.
- e. Revise the design at the access road and entrance to provide afforestation in this area and eliminate or minimize the use of turf. Revise all details accordingly. This area shall include permanent split-rail fencing around the naturalized area to be completed prior to the issuance of the first building permit. The minimal turf area shall be limited to that required for sight distance along Woodmore Road.
- f. Provide a specimen tree sign detail and corresponding symbol in the legend and on the plan in relation to said trees that are to be saved.
- g. Adjust the Reforestation Inspection and Planting Narrative to remove reference to mowing in the afforestation areas, and state that the control of invasive species is allowed.
- h. Remove standard TCPII Note 6 as this does not apply to this site.
- i. Fill in the blank in the Afforestation/Reforestation Agreement on Sheet 14 to identify the party responsible for the annual field inspections of these woodland treatment areas.
- j. Adjust the reference to a planting completion date. All afforestation is required to be installed prior to the issuance of a building permit for the affected lots.
- k. Provide an 8 1/2- by 11-inch detail drawing of the proposed bridge location at a scale that will allow for the review of the bridge placement and proposed impacts.
- l. Revise the conceptual bridge drawing to show a design that does not have a double culvert cross-section, but rather a single, larger area beneath it for the unobstructed flow of the stream and the maximum passage of wildlife.
- m. After all required revisions have been made to the plan, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan update the revision box, sign and date it.

**Recommended Condition:** The TCPII shall be approved prior to final plat. All approved afforestation areas shall be placed in conservation easements at time of final plat.

**Recommended Condition:** All afforestation/reforestation and associated fencing on common areas shall be installed prior to the issuance of the first building permit. All afforestation/reforestation and associated fencing on lots shall be installed prior to the issuance of a building permit for that lot. A certification prepared by a qualified professional may be used to provide verification that the afforestation/reforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation/reforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the

photos were taken.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03111:**

The detailed site plan is generally in conformance with approved Preliminary Plan 4-03096. The following conditions warrant discussion.

2. **A limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board prior to approval of the final plats to address:**

- a. **Lots 7 through 13, to address the siting and size of the proposed houses and landscaping buffers for compatibility with the existing homes along Spriggs Request Road in Woodmore.**

**Comment:** The lots above have been renumbered and sited such that the front façade is facing Spriggs Request Road. A note has been placed on the plans stating that the lots above will have a minimum living space of 4,000 square feet. The staff recommends a condition that includes four-sided masonry or brick work and cedar shake or slate roofing as well, for compatibility purposes.

- b. **All flag-shaped lots.**

**Comment:** The Planning Board raised concerns at the preliminary plan review about the flag-shaped lots, even though these are not technically flag lots. The Planning Board was concerned that flag-shaped lots might impact individual privacy. The staff recommends additional landscaping be added to Lots 25, 28, 31, 34 and 98 to provide privacy for the rear yards.

- c. **The possibility of reducing the length of the cul-de-sac that extends toward Spriggs Request Road and reconfiguring the lots at its end to be more compatible with existing lots along Spriggs Request Road.**

**Comment:** The length of the cul-de-sac was reduced and the lots reconfigured to be more compatible with lots along Spriggs Request. Additional landscaping on Lot 98 will also contribute to screening the cul-de-sac from the views from Spriggs Request.

- d. **A Phase I Archeological Study, prepared by the applicant, to identify any remnants of slave activity on the property, and to identify any possible slave burials on the site.**

**Comment:** The Planning Board has issued a directive that the possible existence of slave quarters and slave graves, as well as archeological evidence of the presence of Native American peoples, must be considered in the review of development applications, and that potential means for preservation of these resources should be considered. The applicant has provided a Phase I/II archeological study for the subject property. The investigation was conducted by a qualified archeologist who followed the *Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Schaffer and Cole: 1994).

Historic Preservation staff received and reviewed this Phase I/II report of the Pleasant Prospect property. The goals, methodology, and findings of the survey are clearly and thoroughly described and are accompanied by photographs. No slave burials were found.

The survey identified two historic archeological sites. The Phase II evaluation was conducted on both of these sites. Site 18PR706 has been determined to “not retain integrity, and is not likely to yield significant information, and is recommended as ineligible for inclusion in the NRHP. No further archaeological investigation of site 18PR706 is recommended.” Site 18PR705 has been determined to retain “integrity as evidenced by the presence of features below the plowzone. In addition, patterns are evident in the special distribution of artifacts across the site. Site 18PR705 has potential to yield significant information about eighteenth-century life and the early occupation of Pleasant Prospect. The site is recommended for inclusion in the NRHP. It is recommended that the site be preserved in place and avoided by the proposed construction.” (URS Corporation, Inc. Phase I and II Archaeological Investigation of the Pleasant Prospect Plantation Property, December 2004) Based on the conclusions of the Phase I/II archeological report, to preserve Site 18PR705 in place, the applicant should remove lots and provide a plan for the protection of the site. The URS Corporation, Inc. Phase III Archaeological Data Recovery Plan of the Pleasant Prospect Plantation Property, January 2005, states the following:

“Site 18PR705 is an historic house site dating to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. It was determined to be eligible for inclusion on the NRHP based on its potential to yield information important to understanding history (NRHP Criterion D). Site 18PR705 appears to represent a house site that was the precursor to Pleasant Prospect Plantation, an adjacent NRHP-listed property.

“In total, 2,040 historic artifacts were recovered during the Phase I and Phase II investigations of 18PR705. Artifacts date from the early eighteenth through the mid-nineteenth century, although the majority of the diagnostics are from the mid- to late eighteenth century. Artifacts include architectural, kitchen, faunal, floral, hardware, household, personal, arms, and other miscellaneous materials. With the exception of one sherd of pearlware, which may date as late as the early nineteenth century, all of the artifacts recovered from the features date to the eighteenth century. Cultural features were identified at the site, including brick foundations, a cellar, pit features, and a brick rubble feature (Figure 2).

“The presence of a substantial brick foundation, large quantity of artifacts, and predominance of expensive wares, such as white salt-glazed stoneware, in contrast to less expensive wares, such as redware, all suggest that the occupants of 18PR705 were of high economic status. The site seems to have been occupied initially in the mid-eighteenth century and largely abandoned around the turn of the nineteenth century, although some occupation may have continued into the early nineteenth century. Site 18PR705 is not shown on any historic maps and is not specifically mentioned in any of the known historic records.

“Historic records, however, suggest that a predecessor to the extant Pleasant Prospect

house existed on the property. While no known records or surveys indicate the presence of buildings on the tract when Thomas Sprigg, Jr. sold the land to Isaac Duckett in 1788, census records state that Isaac Duckett was living on the property by 1790. The extant Pleasant Prospect house, however, is not mentioned until 1798, when tax records describe it as ‘a new Two story Brick dwelling.’ Therefore, an earlier house was apparently present prior to 1798 and may be associated with site 18PR705.

“Based on artifact dates, 18PR705 may have been built by Thomas Sprigg, Jr. prior to the sale of the property in 1788 to Isaac Duckett. Because historic records indicate that the Duckett family was accompanied by enslaved individuals as well as possible indentured servants, 18PR705 may include both the main house and slave or servant quarters. This is supported by the fact that artifact and feature distributions suggest that several buildings were present. Because some early nineteenth century artifacts were recovered from 18PR705, it is likely that the buildings continued to be used after the Duckett family moved into Pleasant Prospect in 1798, possibly as servant, tenant or slave quarters.

“Alternatively, 18PR705 may have been built by the Contee family during the mid-eighteenth century. According to the Contee family history, Richard Alexander Contee was born at Pleasant Prospect in 1753 and Lieutenant John Contee was born at Pleasant Prospect in 1794 (Bowie 1899:438, 440). No other documentation of the early Contee ownership of Pleasant Prospect was found. It is possible that the Contee tract was originally separate from the Sprigg tract, but that the two properties were melded into the larger Pleasant Prospect property after the marriage of Isaac Duckett’s daughter, Eliza, to Lieutenant John Contee in 1813. Additional research on the Contees and Ducketts is necessary to determine any other possible associations between Pleasant Prospect and site 18PR705.

“Site 18PR705 retains integrity as evidenced by the presence of features below the plowzone. In addition, patterns are evident in the spatial distribution of artifacts across the site. Based upon the Phase I and II data, three loci are present within the site:

- “• Locus 1: the largest of the loci, it has the brick foundations, cellar, and two pit features. The artifacts date primarily to the eighteenth century and were found in relatively high densities. Artifact classes suggest (as well as the foundations) that this was the location of an eighteenth century domestic residence. Other activity areas may also be present within the locus.
- “• Locus 2: two features—one refuse pit and one undefined brick rubble feature—were identified within this locus. Lower artifact densities were noted in this locus. The artifact distributions and classes in this locus differ from Locus 1, suggesting different function/activity areas. This locus may represent an outbuilding location.
- “• Locus 3: the smallest of the loci, Locus 3 contained no features and only light artifact densities. The presence of bricks in this locus could suggest it was the

location of an outbuilding.

“In summary, all three loci likely relate to one occupation- a house with multiple outbuildings and/or activity areas. The site pre-dates Pleasant Prospect mansion and may be the earlier domestic site associated with the plantation. Possible tenant and slave components may also be present.”

The Historic Preservation Commission recommended that the applicant be required to delete Lots 17 and 22 or to provide a separate parcel to avoid Archeological Site 18PR705. However, prior to the Planning Board hearing, the staff revised their recommendation to reflect the Maryland Historic Trust negotiations with the applicant regarding Phase III data recovery plan.

**Comment:** Since the applicant has not demonstrated on the detailed site plan the design intent in regard to the preservation of the archeology on site, the staff recommends that a number of the lots within the development be withheld from the approval of this detailed site plan so that an appropriate layout and design can be incorporated into the plans. This issue appears to impact a number of lots and may result in the loss of one or two lots, or even more. Therefore, the staff recommends that all the lots surrounding the cul-de-sac, including Lots 15-23, shown as Street F on the plans be removed from detailed site plan approval. In order for development to proceed forward from this point, the applicant must file a new detailed site plan prior to final plat of any of the lots within the subdivision to address this issue. The revised detailed site plan shall show the site as homeowners association space and shall provide a focal point and a gathering place for the residents of the community.

**e. Screening and buffering of the entrance road from the adjoining lots in Woodmore.**

**Comment:** The plan indicates a mix of Cyptomeria evergreen trees and Ilex shrubs along the street edge. Staff recommends another selection of evergreen trees, to be agreed upon by the staff and applicant.

**3. Prior to final plat approval, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to address:**

- a. The layout, placement and aesthetics of bridges associated with the access road.**
- b. The placement and construction methods to be used for Impact Area #2 (road crossing).**

**Comment:** The road crossing has been reviewed extensively by representatives from the Corps of Engineers, Maryland Department of the Environment, and Maryland Department of Natural



Resources. All agreed that a bridge design would result in the least amount of impacts. The plans submitted show the provision of a double culvert design and not a bridge. Revised plans are

recommended to show the bridge and to provide a detailed view of the construction area of the bridge. No new PMA impacts are proposed on the Type II Tree Conservation Plan.

Recommended conditions below state that the double culvert design is to be replaced with a bridge design per the approval conditions of the preliminary plan.

- c. **The possibility of extending one of the three cul-de-sacs to the PEPCO right-of-way to the east to provide a possible second access point for the property.**

**Comment:** This is shown as Parcel E on Sheet 10 of the limited detailed site plan. This would provide for an extension of Street D to the PEPCO right-of-way. The right-of-way width of Street D is 50 feet; Parcel E would extend this to the PEPCO right-of-way.

Staff recommends that Street D be extended to the PEPCO right-of-way and be built as a stub road rather than a cul-de-sac as shown on Sheet 10. This portion of Street D should also be dedicated as a public right-of-way. If required by DPW&T it should be constructed to the PEPCO right-of-way during the development of the subject property (Pleasant Prospect). Street D would provide a future connection and access point to the adjoining property.

- d. **Any other PMA impacts necessary for the installation of necessary utilities associated with the proposed development.**

**Comment:** See comment above on a. and d.

- e. **Lots 16, and 89 through 91, to address the siting and size of the proposed houses and landscaping buffers for compatibility with the Historic Site. Some Federal-style architectural elements (such as pediment entrances, fanlights, flat-arch brick lintels and shutters) should be incorporated into the design of these houses.**

**Comment:** See Finding 11.h. of the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section recommendation.

- 4. **A limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee prior to approval of building permits for Lots 27-33 and 46-53 to address noise mitigation measures, including the location and design of the noise barrier along the south side of US 50, and the building shell design shall be approved by the Planning Board. A Phase II Noise Study shall be included as part of the DSP application submittal package and shall include specific noise attenuation measures based on the site's topography and the proposed locations of houses.**

**Comment:** Condition 4 has two parts regarding noise issues to be addressed at DSP review. Submittal of the subject DSP addresses part one of Condition 4. Since the preliminary plan approval, the lot numbers found in this condition were revised. The lots along US 50 are now shown on the TCPII as Lots 56-62 and 75-80 of Block A. The TCPII does not show a design/elevation detail for the proposed noise barrier. The location of the noise barrier is shown on the TCPII, and the height of it will vary depending on the topography and the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. In most areas parallel to US 50 the height of the barrier will be at least six feet; in other areas it will be higher to provide effective mitigation. Some areas of the noise barrier are shown as located on berms to meet acceptable exterior noise levels in the rear yards of lots along US 50.

In the November 17, 2004, referral memo to Urban Design, several additional noise mitigation requirements were stipulated. These included demonstrating that the rear yards of Lots 56 and 57 provided a usable rear yard area of at least 40 feet between the proposed house locations and the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour and showing the proposed house pads to accurately reflect typical house pads, as currently marketed on lots of this size. In addition, a rear building restriction line of 40 feet is required to be shown south of the final mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour.

The second part of this condition has been partially addressed with the submittal of the outdoor noise analysis prepared by Wyle Laboratories dated December 16, 2004. Figure 3 in the analysis is a bird's eye view of the proposed noise barrier; however, a design/elevation detail is not included. The design/elevation detail must include specific information as to the construction materials of the noise barrier (i.e., board-on-board or batton fence, concrete or brick masonry).

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

- a. Provide a design/elevation detail for the proposed noise barrier.
- b. Include specific information as to the construction materials of the noise barrier in the design/elevation detail.
- c. Ensure that there is sufficient construction area planned to allow for the installation of the wall and future maintenance.

**Recommended Condition:** The following note shall be placed on the final plat:

“All lots in Waterford that back up to US 50 are provided noise mitigation through the construction of berms and a noise barrier. Maintenance of the berms and noise barriers on these individual lots shall be the sole responsibility of each property owner.”

5. **Prior to the Planning Board approval of the limited detailed site plan, all species identified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Natural Heritage Program as rare, threatened or endangered that are found to occur on the**

**site shall be surveyed and accurately located according to DNR protocol. The DSP shall be designed to eliminate and/or minimize any impacts to specific habitats and/or populations.**

**Comment:** In the November 17, 2004, Environmental Planning Section referral memo to Urban Design, mention was made of an e-mail communication from DNR. In the e-mail it was confirmed that a survey by the environmental consultant was reviewed and was found to be acceptable. The conclusion of the survey was that the American brook lamprey (a type of fresh water fish) was not found to occur within the limits of this application.

In the same November memo a staff comment was made regarding the Wetlands of Special State Concern. In the initial review of the TCPII, it was determined that the extent of the wetlands at the site, including the Wetlands of Special State Concern, were not accurately delineated on the plan. A copy of the approved wetland delineation plan signed by DNR on December 16, 2004, has been submitted.

**Comment:** The areas of wetlands, including the Wetlands of Special State Concern, have been shown on the TCPII consistent with the delineation plan signed by DNR. This condition has been addressed and no further information regarding this topic area is required.

- 6. Prior to submittal of the limited detailed site plan, the applicant shall consult with the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program about the alternative road alignments and the proposed wetland, stream and interior forest habitat impacts. The DSP application submittal shall reflect comments from MDE and DNR with respect to the alternative road alignments.**

**Comment:** The submittal of the DSP included correspondence from the applicant's engineer as to the status of alternative road alignments at the entrance on Woodmore Road. This information only partially addresses this condition. A letter dated January 3, 2005, from Brian Berkowicz, P.E., of Dewberry and Davis LLC to the Environmental Planning Section, stated that the second of two road alignments has been selected because it will have less overall impacts to sensitive natural features at the site, especially the Wetlands of Special State Concern.

The January 3, 2005, letter only partially addresses this condition because these are not comments from MDE. A representative from Dewberry-Davis stated that the proposed road alignment #2 plans have not been submitted to MDE because these plans have only recently been finalized due to further revisions necessary to proposed off-site road improvements for a traffic circle at the Church/Woodmore Roads intersection. The alternative road alignment plans are to be submitted to MDE the week of January 31, 2005. The applicant states that the review and comment period by MDE will take at least one year because of the extent of the Wetlands of Special State Concern that will be impacted by proposed alternative road alignment #2.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that plans' approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.

**11. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate right-of-way along Woodmore Road of 75 feet from the centerline of the existing pavement.**

**Comment:** Right-of-way dedication is shown on Sheet 13 of the limited detailed site plan. Dedication of 75 feet from the centerline of Woodmore Road was required; this appears to be shown correctly. The Bowie Collington Mitchellville and vicinity master plan (1991) designates Woodmore Road as A-26, a four- to six-lane arterial roadway with a 150-foot right-of-way. Sheet 13 also shows a new roundabout at the intersection of Street A and Woodmore Road. The roundabout will require additional dedication on the south side of Woodmore Road. The roundabout will require DPW&T approval.

The original preliminary plan approval was based, in part, on a traffic study for the Walker Property, dated January 23, 2004. Based on total traffic conditions, the traffic study revealed intersection delays exceeding 50.0 seconds at the intersection of Woodmore Road/Church Road. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic conditions. The applicant was therefore required to contribute to the CIP project mentioned above, which is an off-site improvement. This was cited in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-24.

Regarding the site access point on Woodmore Road, the traffic analysis assumed an unsignalized and stop-controlled intersection. The amount of vehicle delay at this intersection met the requirements of the guidelines. This occurred during both peak hours under total traffic conditions. The traffic study did not include an optional roundabout at the site access point. The level of service and amount of delay with a roundabout was not part of the traffic study, and until the roundabout is analyzed by the applicant, transportation staff cannot comment on the service level at the site entrance.

The roundabout was shown on the subsequent detailed site plan (DSP-04040). Transportation Planning Section staff provided comments on the roundabout in a December 23, 2004, memo to the Urban Design Section indicating that it would require DPW&T approval and may require additional right-of-way on the south side of Woodmore Road.

Staff also noted that the roundabout would be an interim transportation improvement in lieu of the fact that Woodmore Road is listed in the Bowie Collington Mitchellville and vicinity master plan as a four- to six-lane arterial roadway. As proposed, it will serve approximately 125 residential units from the north while forcing motorists on Woodmore Road to negotiate the traffic circle. Roundabouts in suburban or rural settings are normally provided at high accident locations and/or where higher volumes of traffic are expected, facilitating movements through an intersection and reducing vehicular delay caused by stopped vehicles.

Although staff did not receive a traffic analysis on the proposed roundabout from the applicant, the roundabout is viewed as an access or frontage traffic control improvement requiring DPW&T approval. As such, while the Planning Board may advise DPW&T on the nature of improvements or traffic controls to be placed within the public right-of-way, DPW&T has the final authority in this regard.

- 12. The applicant shall provide for any necessary turn lanes and frontage improvements as required by DPW&T. These may include turn lanes for deceleration and acceleration of vehicles at the site as well as left turn lanes and/or bypass lanes on both approaches of Woodmore Road. Additional right-of-way dedication to DPW&T may be required for these improvements.**

**Comment:** The limited detailed site plan shows a roundabout at the site entrance along Woodmore Road. This eliminates the need for various turn lanes but the applicant will be responsible for construction of the roundabout and any additional right-of-way requirements.

- 13. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, one of the following options for road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T:**

**Option A:**

- a. Realign the intersections of Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads with Church Road to create a new four-way intersection. This improvement shall also include any signage and pavement marking modifications and additions to be determined by DPW&T.**
- b. Install a traffic signal at the new four-way intersection, if warranted, with any needed traffic signal warrant analysis to be submitted at the time of building permit or detailed site plan, if required. (The need for a study may be waived by DPW&T if sufficient studies are available to determine warrants.)**
- c. Provide two-lane approaches on each leg of the new four-way intersection.**
- d. All of the improvements on Church Road shall also include any additional signal, signage, and pavement markings to be determined by DPW&T.**

**Option B:**

- a. Install interconnected traffic signals at the existing**

**Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads intersections with Church Road, if warranted, with any needed traffic signal warrant analysis to be submitted at the time of building permit or detailed site plan, if required. (The need for a study may be waived by DPW&T if sufficient studies are available to determine warrants.)**

**b. Provide upgrades and improvements at both intersections to include:**

**(1) Two lanes along southbound Church Road approaching Mount Oak Road.**

**(2) Two lanes along northbound Church Road approaching Woodmore Road.**

**(3) Two lanes along eastbound Woodmore Road approaching Church Road.**

**(4) Two lanes along westbound Mount Oak Road approaching Church Road.**

**(5) A four-lane section along Church Road between Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads.**

**c. These improvements shall also include any additional signal, signage, and pavement markings to be determined by DPW&T.**

**Comment:** These road improvements involved off-site transportation improvements in the vicinity of Woodmore Road and Mount Oak Road/Church Road. Since they are off-site improvements they are enforceable at the time of building permit and are not addressed in the limited detailed site plan review.

**16. If the improvements noted in Condition 13 are fully funded in the county's CIP with developer contributions, then the applicant shall pay a pro-rata share of those improvements in lieu of Condition 13. The amount of the pro-rata share shall be determined at the detailed site plan stage.**

**Comment:** Condition 16 states that the applicant's pro-rata share shall be determined at the detailed site plan stage. Previous developments within the Church Road corridor, such as approved preliminary plan 4-02063 (Collingbrook), used a base critical lane volume of 1,276 originally developed at the time of the Franklin property preliminary plan (4-88266).

The Mount Oak Road/Church Road/Woodmore Road improvement project (Prince George's County FY 2005–2010 Approved Capital Improvement Program, CIP Project No. FD669921)

provides for intersection and roadway improvements, including the realignment of Woodmore Road. The \$3 million project first appeared in the FY 2002 CIP. Two million dollars of this amount is listed under developer contributions in the funding schedule.

The subject property is located in the Developing Tier as identified in the 2002 General Plan. The standard for transportation adequacy in this tier is Level-of-Service D (LOS D). Under the Planning Board's *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, signalized intersections cannot have a critical lane volume above 1,450 vehicles per hour (vph) under the LOS D standard.

Staff recommends the use of the following formula to determine an equitable contribution for the Mount Oak Road/Church Road/Woodmore Road improvement project, CIP Project No. FD669921.

Pro-rata = **Number of PM peak-hour trips/ 1,450-1,276 x \$2,000,000**  
\$2,000,000 = Developer contributions to the CIP Project No. FD669921  
1,276 = PM base volumes (vph) within the study area from the  
Franklin traffic study (See preliminary plan 4-88266 and resolution 89-158)

Using this formula, the subject property's pro-rata share would be:

Pro-rata = 22 PM peak-hour trips/ 1,450-1,276 x \$2,000,000 = **\$252,873.40**

The fee listed below is based on a pro-rata contribution of \$252,873.40 divided by 126 proposed dwelling units, or \$2,006.93 per residence.

### **Recommended Condition**

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall pay to Prince George's County the following share of costs for improvements to the Church Road/Mount Oak Road/Woodmore Road realigned intersection:

A fee calculated as \$2,006.93/residence x (*Engineering News-Record Highway Construction Cost Index at time of payment*)/*Engineering News-Record Highway Construction Cost Index for November 1991*).

- 17. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 7 through 13, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board to address the materials, elevations and architecture of proposed houses on these lots.**

**Comment:** This detailed site plan for architecture only will be required prior to the issuance of building permit and is modified as Condition 19 of this approval.

- 18. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 16 and 89 through 91, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to address**

**the materials, elevations and architecture of proposed houses on these lots.**

**Comment:** This detailed site plan for architecture only will be required prior to the issuance of building permit and is modified as Condition 14 of this approval.

11. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments follow:
    2. a. The Community Planning Division found the proposed limited detailed site plan application in the R-A Zone conforms to the recommendations of the master plan for large-lot residential land use. The property is also located in APA-6 of the Aviation Policy Area defined by the Zoning Ordinance around Freeway Airport. Properties in this area are required to disclose to prospective purchasers information regarding their proximity to Freeway Airport and an acknowledgment of the potential nuisances associated with this location. Further, street light design and placement is an issue to be addressed at some point pursuant to Sec. 27-548.38(d)(3): "In all APA's, uses of land should, to the extent possible, not: . . . (D) Make it difficult for pilots to distinguish between airport lights and other lights, or impair pilot or ground operator visibility in the vicinity of an airport." All street lights located within the development should have cut-off type lighting fixtures to direct glare downward. The Department of Public Works and Transportation should be consulted regarding acceptable street light designs that comply with this regulation.
    - b. Transportation Planning Section: Only one access point is shown serving the site with the possibility of a future connection to the PEPCO right-of-way as shown on Sheet 10. As recommended above, Street D should be constructed as a stub road to the PEPCO right-of-way and dedicated for public use. If required by DPW&T it should be constructed during the development of the property, otherwise it would be shown as public right-of-way and tied into the adjoining property to the east when development takes place.
- Staff recommended that Street A have a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet, with an entrance right-of-way of 80 feet. Right-of-way widths of 50 feet were recommended for the internal residential streets. Staff was under the assumption at the preliminary plan stage that the subdivision streets would be built using the Urban Primary Residential Road and Urban Secondary Residential Road standards requiring right-of-way widths of 60 feet and 50 feet respectively. The roundabout was also not proposed at the preliminary plan stage.
- The limited detailed site plan shows right-of-way widths of 50 feet throughout all of the residential streets, with pavement widths of 22 feet, with the exception of Street A between Woodmore Road and Street C with a pavement width of 24 feet.



Staff recommends that Street A have a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet. This is DPW&T's Rural Primary Residential Road standard. The other internal subdivision streets should also have a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet. This is a requirement of DPW&T's Rural Secondary Residential Road standard. The DPW&T road standard for rural open section subdivision streets is a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet.

c. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed revised plans for detailed site plan DSP-04040 and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/152/04, stamped as received on January 10, 2005. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the DSP and the TCP II with conditions.

The area included in this application was previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with the review of pre-preliminary plan of subdivision P-03011 and in the approvals of preliminary plan of subdivision 4-03111 and the Type I tree conservation plan, TCPI/72/03. The Planning Board's action of approval of preliminary plan 4-03111 is found in resolution. 04-24.

### **Site Description**

The 261.19-acre site is in the R-A Zone and is located on the north side of Woodmore Road immediately east of Woodmore. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes are found to occur within the limits of this application. Many of the wetlands found on this property have been identified by the State of Maryland as Wetlands of Special State Concern, which require a 100-foot wetland buffer. John Hanson Highway, US 50, has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator that will impact some of the proposed lots on this site. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey include Bibb silt loam, Collington fine sandy loam, Monmouth fine sandy loam, Mixed alluvial land, and Shrewsbury fine sandy loam. These soils generally have no limitations that would affect the proposed application with the exception of the mixed alluvial that are associated with the stream and wetland areas. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. According to information from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. The site is located in the Northeast Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin and the Developing Tier as reflected in the 2002 adopted General Plan.

- (1) The detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) submitted with the preliminary plan of subdivision, 4-03111, and date stamped received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004, was found to address the requirements for an FSD in accordance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Because the

site conditions have not changed since the submittal and review of that FSD, no additional information is required.

**Discussion:** No further information is required regarding the FSD.

- (2) The Subdivision Ordinance provides for the protection of streams, 50-foot stream buffers, wetlands, 25-foot wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, adjacent areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent, adjacent areas of slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils, and areas of rare or sensitive habitat. These features comprise the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA), which is shown correctly on the plans date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 10, 2005. The buffer associated with Wetlands of Special State Concern is shown as being 100 feet in width, not the 25 feet wide typically associated with wetlands.

**Recommended Condition:** At the time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all of the Patuxent River Primary Management Area except for areas of approved impacts and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”

- (3) A copy of the stormwater management concept plan and the approved 100-year floodplain study date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004, were reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision application and have been found to be consistent with the TCPII as submitted.

**Discussion:** No further information is required regarding stormwater management.

- (4) The roadway entrance is designed to provide a traffic circle in Woodmore Road. This roadway design is an acceptable alternative to the provision of acceleration lanes and deceleration lanes, from an environmental perspective. The provision of the circle provides for a reduction to the overall impacts to sensitive environmental features at this location of the site.

**Discussion:** No further information is required regarding the proposed traffic circle in Woodmore Road.

- d. The Department of Public Works and Transportation was sent a referral on this case but the staff has not received their comments as of the writing of this report.
- e. The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed this case at its January 25, 2005, meeting and forwards the following findings and recommendations to the Planning Board.

This detailed site plan is for 261.19 acres (Tax Maps 54/A3, B3; 61/B1), which is zoned R-A. The proposed development will surround Historic Site 74A-6, Pleasant Prospect.

Pleasant Prospect is a 2½-story, brick plantation house built in 1798 for Dr. Isaac Duckett. The walls of the building are laid in Flemish bond, and there is a side passage and kitchen wing. The interior exhibits particularly fine Federal-style decorative detail. A pyramidal-roof log meat house stands on the immediate grounds. After the Civil War, Jonathan T. Walker, who undertook major Victorian renovations, owned Pleasant Prospect. The Walker family farm was divided during the twentieth century, creating and setting apart a five-acre lot for the historic house and immediate grounds. The house has recently been restored to its original appearance and is an outstanding and important example of Federal-style domestic architecture. Pleasant Prospect and a setting of five acres is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

Pleasant Prospect is located on part of the 500-acre tract of land originally patented to Thomas Sprigg in 1698 and known as Sprigg's Request. On his death it was left to his son, Thomas Sprigg. In 1788 the land was sold to Isaac Duckett. The 1798 Federal Direct Tax records describe Isaac Duckett's property as containing "a new Two story Brick dwelling, very elegantly furnished with passage 20 by 16, kitchen 19 by 14, all of Brick; a Frame Meat House 14 feet square, Milk House 14 feet square, Lumber House 20 by 16, all new and very well furnished." The plantation continued to thrive, and in 1800, 47 slaves worked on the property. In 1809, Isaac Duckett repatented his lands under the new name of Pleasant Prospect. Duckett was a wealthy and respected planter in the area. The primary crop of his plantation appears to have been tobacco, based on the number of slaves and notices in the *National Intelligencer*. After his death in 1823 Pleasant Prospect was left to his son-in-law, John Contee. The total personal property of John Contee, Jr. was \$65,000, produced a total of 100,000 bushels of tobacco and 81 slaves worked the plantation (1860 Population Census, 1860 Slave Schedule and 1860 Agricultural Census). In 1868, Pleasant Prospect, containing 562 acres and described as being an active farm growing tobacco, wheat, corn and hay, was sold at equity sale to Jonathan T. Walker. Members of the Walker family continued to reside at Pleasant Prospect into the late 1970s. Pleasant Prospect has until recently been surrounded by hundreds of acres of farm fields and pastureland, in a landscape which had changed very little in the last 50 years.

For many generations tobacco barns have been central to the economy of the region and a defining architectural characteristic of the region's rural landscape. These air-cure tobacco barns are unique to Maryland and provide a view into 400 years of the area's complex

agricultural and economic history.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation has, since 1988, listed the 11 Most Endangered Historic Places. This list has been one of the most effective tools in the fight to save America's irreplaceable architectural, cultural and natural heritage. Some of the sites are well known; others are less famous but just as important, because they also represent preservation challenges facing many communities across the country. In 2002, Congress created the Historic Barn Preservation Program to identify and promote practical solutions for the continued use of older and historic barns. In 2004 the tobacco barns of southern Maryland were put on this list. The National Trust's BARN AGAIN! Program encourages preservation and provides technical assistance for adapting historic barns and may also help to save these important buildings. The first direct result of the 11 Most Endangered listing was a Maryland Tobacco Barn Summit, held in November 2004 in Huntingtown, Maryland. The goals of this summit were to discuss the issues and provide insight on the solutions for barn re-use and the impact of the barns on land preservation.

#### **Historic Preservation Findings**

- (1) The Environmental Setting of the Pleasant Prospect Historic Site is the 5.001-acre Parcel 10 on which the historic buildings stand. Although there are mature trees on the immediate grounds of Pleasant Prospect, the grounds are essentially open, and there is a clear view both to and from the Historic Site. The plans submitted note Pleasant Prospect Historic Site 74A-6 and delineate its five-acre environmental setting.
- (2) The proposed residential development will have an enormous impact on the setting of Pleasant Prospect. Several houses have recently been built on large lots immediately to the south and southwest, but the area to the east and north presently consists of open pastureland, and farm buildings are still standing directly west of the historic property. Access to Pleasant Prospect is presently by an unpaved lane from Woodmore Road (more than one-half mile to the south). Future access to Pleasant Prospect, assuming development of this proposed large subdivision, would depend upon one of the subdivision roads.
- (3) Preliminary plat 4-03111 (Planning Board Resolution 04-24), Condition 3.e. states that prior to final plat approval, a limited detailed site plan shall address:  
  
"Lots 16, and 89 through 91, to address the siting and size of the proposed houses and landscaping buffers for compatibility with the Historic Site. Some Federal-style architectural elements (such as pediment entrances, fanlights, flat-arch brick lintels and shutters) should be incorporated into the design of these houses."
- (4) The detailed site plan shows that existing buildings, including tobacco barns and

other barns throughout the development, are to be removed.

- (5) The applicant shall consult with the Historic Preservation staff to develop street names that are reflective of more significant aspects of the history of the Pleasant Prospect property.

#### **Historic Preservation Conclusions**

- (1) Pleasant Prospect, Historic Site 74A-6, and its Environmental Setting should be noted on all appropriate sheets.
- (2) Access to the Historic Site will be through Parcel D, to be conveyed by the applicant to the Historic Site owners. Actual construction of any new access drive should be the responsibility of the applicant; details should be negotiated between these two parties, and an agreement in writing should be prepared.
- (3) With the development of this subdivision, the Environmental Setting of Pleasant Prospect will be adjoined on the north and west sides by developing lots. Buffering will be required, according to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, on all lots that adjoin the boundaries of the Environmental Setting, Lots 95 through 100. The land immediately south of the Historic Site and its Environmental Setting is shown to be conveyed to the owners of the Historic Site for access to the public right-of-way.
- (4) Houses on Lots 4, 17, 18 and 19 will be visible from the Historic Site and will have great visual impact on it. The northern and western boundaries of the Environmental Setting are proposed to be planted with the required 40-foot landscaped bufferyard, which is proposed to have 75 percent opacity achieved through the use of evergreen plantings. The houses on the adjoining Lots 94-100 and 19 (formerly 8-13 and 16 and 80) should not be visible from the Historic Site.
- (5) The historic house at Pleasant Prospect is an outstanding and important example of Federal-style domestic architecture. At the time of its construction in the 1790s, it was one the four most substantial brick plantation houses in central Prince George's County, and its prominence, materials and decorative features should be reflected in the buildings that will be built around it.
- (6) Based on the conclusions of the Phase I/II archeological report, to preserve Site 18PR705 in place, the applicant should remove lots and provide a plan for the protection of the site.
- (7) The applicant should submit a condition assessment report on all of the buildings to be removed. The information submitted should include approximate dates, condition, character as well as digital photographs to Historic Preservation staff so that it can be determined if these structures are historic barns/buildings. If the

barns are in good condition the applicant should explore incorporating them into the new lots as accessory buildings.

### **Historic Preservation Commission Recommendations**

- (1) Pleasant Prospect, Historic Site 74A-6, and the limits of its Environmental Setting have been noted and defined on all appropriate sheets.
- (2) Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide a written agreement to the Planning Board or its designee regarding the details of construction of an access drive from the new subdivision street to the Historic Site. This agreement shall specify the applicant's responsibility for and timing of the construction of the access drive.
- (3) Prior to release of building permits for Lots 95 through 100, the applicant shall plant a 40-foot-deep bufferyard on all of these developing lots. Care shall be taken to plant the appropriate species of evergreen plants and numbers of plants to afford the desired screening effect for the historic property.
- (4) Prior to the release of building permits, a limited detailed site plan for the siting, size, materials, elevations (especially the elevations that face the historic house) and architectural elements of the proposed houses on Lots 4, 17, 18 and 19 shall be required. The houses on Lots 4 and 17 have been reoriented either further to the back of the lot or turned to face the road perpendicularly. In order to provide compatibility with the Historic Site and to enhance the appearance of the houses that will be built around it, all these new houses that will be visible from the Historic Site shall be of brick, with brick chimneys. Some Federal-style architectural elements (such as pedimented entrances, fanlights, flat-arch brick lintels and shutters) shall be incorporated into the design of these houses. Prior to release of building permits, the applicant shall submit plans for these designs to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or its designee.
- (5) The applicant may be required to delete Lots 17 and 22 or to provide a separate parcel to avoid Archeological Site 18PR705. A plan to preserve the site in place shall be submitted to the Planning Board or its designee, so the site may be preserved in place and not disturbed during construction.
- (6) Prior to the approval of any building permits, the applicant shall work with staff from the Department of Parks and Recreation and determine if material from barns that will be razed can be reused and if so it should be offered to the Department of Parks and Recreation, or to the Newel Post, the county's architectural salvage depot.
- (7) The applicant shall consult with the staff of the Historic Preservation and Public

Facilities Planning Section to develop street names that are more reflective of significant aspects of the history of the Pleasant Prospect property.

**Comment:** These conditions are included in the staff recommendation but have been modified slightly where appropriate to correspond to general practices and procedures.

- f. The application was sent to the City of Bowie and the city responded without comment.
  - g. The Department of Environmental Resources found that the site plan is consistent with approved stormwater concept plan 202-2004.
12. In an attached letter dated January 31, 2005 (Charlene Gatewood, President, Woodmore HOA to Susan Lareuse), the Woodmore Homeowners Association (HOA) provided opinions on the proposed detailed site plan. These opinions include the following topics:
- a. Concerns about the traffic circle (roundabout) on Woodmore Road.
  - b. Screening/buffering issues.
  - c. Stormwater outfall issues.
  - d. Siting and building compatibility with Spriggs Request Way:
  - e. Denying access to Springs Request.
  - f. All flag-shaped lots.
  - g. Reducing the length of the cul-de-sac that extends towards Spriggs Request Road.
13. As required by Section 27-285(b), 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 for the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/152/04) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04040 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the applicant shall pay to Prince George's County the following share of costs for improvements to the Church Road/Mount Oak Road/Woodmore Road realigned intersection:

A fee calculated as \$2,006.93/residence x (*Engineering News-Record Highway Construction Cost Index at time of payment*)/*Engineering News-Record Highway Construction Cost Index for November 1991*).

2. Prior to certification of the DSP, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Provide details and specifications for the proposed structural noise barrier.
  - b. Include an elevation view of the berm and structural noise barrier, including dimensions and materials.
3. The following note shall be placed on the final plat:

“All lots in Waterford that back up to US 50 are provided noise mitigation through the construction of berms and a noise barrier. Maintenance of the berms and noise barriers on these individual lots shall be the sole responsibility of each property owner.”
4. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that plan approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
5. Prior to certificate approval of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Show the stormwater management outfall easements and label these areas as such on Lots 61, 62, 76 and 79 of Block A.
  - b. All references to the reforestation fencing shall indicate its installation prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 1–9, 13–16, 22, 24–26, the two acres on Lot 27 outside the limits of disturbance, 56–62, 75–80, 83–87, 89–91, 94 in Blocks A and B.
  - c. Provide additional afforestation/reforestation on Lot 94 of Block A consistent with the TCPI in the area along the western portion of the site in relation to Woodmore. Lot 94 may be expanded to provide more buildable area by adjusting the east property line.
  - d. Show the existing woodlands on Lot 100 of Block A on Sheet 9 as being cleared.
  - e. Revise the design at the access road and entrance to provide limited afforestation in this area and eliminate or minimize the use of turf. Revise all details accordingly. This area shall include permanent split-rail fencing or stone or horse fence around the afforested area to be completed prior to the issuance of the tenth building permit.
  - f. Provide a specimen tree sign detail and corresponding symbol in the legend and on the plan in relation to said trees that are to be saved.



- g. Adjust the Reforestation Inspection and Planting Narrative to remove reference to mowing in the afforestation areas, and state that the control of invasive species is allowed.
  - h. Remove Standard TCPII Note 6, as this does not apply to this site.
  - i. Fill in the blank in the Afforestation/Reforestation Agreement on Sheet 14 to identify the party responsible for the five required annual field inspections of these woodland treatment areas.
  - j. Adjust the reference to a planting completion date. All afforestation is required to be installed prior to the issuance of a building permit for Lots 1–9, 13–16, 22, 24–26, the two acres on Lot 27 outside the limits of disturbance, 56–62, 75–80, 83– 87, 89, 90, 91, 94 in Blocks A and B.
  - k. Provide details and specifications on the plans of the proposed bridge location at 1”=10’ scale to allow for the review of the bridge placement and proposed impacts.
  - l. Revise the conceptual bridge drawing to show a design that does not have a double culvert cross-section, but rather a single, larger area beneath it for the unobstructed flow of the stream and the maximum passage of wildlife.
  - m. After all required revisions have been made to the plan, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan update the revision box, sign and date it.
6. The TCPII shall be approved prior to final plat. All approved afforestation areas shall be placed in conservation easements at time of final plat.
7. All afforestation/reforestation and associated fencing on common areas shall be installed prior to the issuance of the building permits for Lots 1–9, 13–16, 22, 24–26, the two acres on Lot 27 outside the limits of disturbance, 56–62, 75–80, 83–87, 89–91, 94 in Blocks A and B. A certification prepared by a qualified professional may be used to provide verification that the afforestation/reforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation/reforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken.
8. At the time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all of the Patuxent River Primary Management Area except for areas of approved impacts and all afforestation/reforestation areas shown on the TCPII, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written

consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”

9. Prior to signature approval, Street A shall be revised to indicate a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet, and all other public residential streets shall have a minimum right-of-way width of 60 feet (based on DPW&T’s road standards for Rural Residential Roads). Alternatively, the applicant may submit evidence that the Department of Public Works and Transportation has approved an alternate width of right-of-way.
10. Prior to signature approval, the outparcel connecting Street D to the Pepco right-of-way shall be in an easement sized to meet the Department of Public Works and Transportation’s (DPW&T) requirements for access. The easement shall contain language that expressly requires the homeowner’s association to dedicate said parcel to DPW&T for construction of the road connection to the east at the request of DPW&T. The easement shall be reviewed prior to final plat approval for the lots abutting the parcel and cul-de-sac with express notice to said lot owners.
11. Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide a written agreement to the Planning Board or its designee regarding the details of construction of an access drive from the new subdivision street to the Historic Site. This agreement shall specify the applicant’s responsibility for and timing of the construction of the access drive.
12. Prior to release of building permits for Lots 95 through 100, the applicant shall provide evidence that the 40-foot-deep bufferyard along the Historic Site on each of these has been planted.
13. Prior to the issuance of building permit, a limited detailed site plan to be approved by the Planning Board or its designee, for architecture for the proposed houses on Lots 4, 17, 18 and 19 shall be required. Particular attention shall be given to the siting of the houses on Lots 4 and 17 for compatibility to the Historic Site. The architectural elevations shall indicate brick on front and side facades, and some Federal-style architectural elements (such as pedimented entrances, fanlights, flat-arch brick lintels and shutters) shall be incorporated into the design of these houses.
14. Prior to certificate of approval, a full Phase III data recovery research design shall be approved by the Historic Preservation staff, in collaboration with the Maryland Historical Trust. The research design shall include a more comprehensive documentation of the African-American presence at the site and their relationships to other plantations in the area. The research design shall include an expanded public interpretation plan and a schedule for its implementation.
15. Prior to grading permit within 50 feet of Archeological Site 18PR705, or a larger setback if required by the Maryland Historic Trust, the Phase III data recovery shall be completed in the field.
16. Prior to the approval of any permits, the applicant shall work with staff from the Department of Parks and Recreation and determine if the exterior finish material from barns that will be razed can be reused, and if so, it should be offered to the Department of Parks and Recreation or to the Newel Post, the county’s architectural salvage depot.

17. Prior to final plat, the applicant shall consult with the staff of the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section to develop street names that are more reflective of significant aspects of the history of the Pleasant Prospect property.
18. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 94, 98, 99 and 100, a detailed site plan for review of the architectural elevations shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to address the materials, elevations and architecture of proposed houses on these lots for compatibility with the Woodmore Development. The plans shall demonstrate a minimum of 4,000 square feet of finished living area above ground, four-sided brick or stone, and cedar shake, slate or slate-like roofing.
19. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to provide the following information:
  - a. Additional landscaping shall be added to lots 25, 28, 31, 34, and 98 to provide privacy for the rear yards.
  - b. The evergreen trees located along the entrance road shall be revised with a selection to be agreed upon by staff and the applicant.
  - c. The plans shall be revised to indicate a street light detail having cut-off-type lighting fixtures to direct glare downward.
  - d. The plans shall be revised to demonstrate conformance to Sections 4.1, 4.6, and 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* in accordance with Finding 8.
  - e. At least one shade tree, one evergreen tree, and one ornamental tree shall be provided in the front yard of each lot.
20. All prospective purchasers' information shall include the property's proximity to Freeway Airport and an acknowledgement of the potential nuisances associated with this location.

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 Harley, with Commissioners Eley, Harley, Squire and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Vaughns absent, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 24, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of March 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:wrc