

RESOLUTION

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 May 18, 2006, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0509 for Chaddsford, Sections Three through Five, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The request is for 87 single-family detached dwellings and 75 townhouses. The specific design plan includes a site plan, tree conservation plan, landscape plan and details, and architectural elevations.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-M	R-M
Use(s)	Vacant	Single-family detached and single family attached
Acreage	51.51	51.51
Lots	0	162
Dwelling Units	0	162
Detached	0	87
Attached	0	75

**ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA**

The following architectural elevations are proposed by K Hovnanian Homes:

<b>Model</b>	<b>Base Finished Area (Sq. Ft.)</b>
Adams—townhouse	1,400
Hamlin II—townhouse	1,540
Cambridge	2,565
Fairbanks	2,627
Park Hollow	2,864
Pennwood	2,499
Brentwood	3,022
James	2,402
Normandy	2,035
Orleans II	2,108

3. **Location:** Generally, the property is located east of US 301 in Prince George's County, just

north of Charles County. The site is in Planning Area 85A, Council District 9, and is located on Tax Map 154 and Grid E-2, at the southwest corner of Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard.

4. **Surroundings and Use:** The property has frontage on Chadds Ford Drive and is located directly east of an existing townhouse development known as McKendree Village. To the north of the project is undeveloped R-M-zoned land. To the south is undeveloped R-R-zoned land. To the east is R-M-zoned land in floodplain and woodland.
5. **Design Features:** The single entrance into the development will be served from existing Chadds Ford Drive and is aligned with the entrance road into Section One of the overall project. The main entrance road is lined with single-family detached dwellings and the road divides into a number of culs-de-sac. The plan proposes to add townhouses to a newly developed project known as McKendree Village and/or Brandywine Village, a project also developed by K Hovnanian Homes. The townhouses added as part of this application appear as a natural extension to the existing community. Recreational facilities are provided on-site and include one tot-lot, one preteen lot, one sitting area, and a trail system.
6. **Previous Approvals:**
  - a. Originally, the subject property was rezoned by Basic Plan application (A-8838) in November 1977 for the entire “Mattawoman” development at a total area of 277 acres. Within this 277-acre site, 212 acres were placed in the M-A-C Zone and 64.7 acres were placed in the R-M Zone. This plan is no longer applicable and has been superseded.
  - b. On November 29, 1977, the District Council adopted CR-108-1977 for the entire 277-acre Brandywine Village, placing 213.2 acres in the M-A-C Zone and 64.7 acres in the R-U Zone (A-8898). In 1987, a basic plan amendment was filed to rezone the M-A-C portion but it was unsuccessful. In 1992, another application (A-9878) was filed to rezone the property from the M-A-C to the E-I-A Zone. On September 14, 1993, the District Council adopted the sectional map amendment for Subregion V, rezoning this 212-acre site into 46 acres of E-I-A, 16.4 acres of L-A-C, and 149 acres of R-M (District Council Resolution CR-60-1993).
  - c. On February 20, 1997, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-96083 to dedicate Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard to public use and place the resultant land bays into four outlots. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/47/96) was approved for the entire area concurrently with this application.
  - d. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102 was approved by the Planning Board for the entire 212-acre parcel on October 11, 2001 (PGCPB No. 01-186). This comprehensive design plan included 11 lots on approximately six acres, approximately 4 acres of open space, approximately 4 acres for continuation of Brinton Way, and approximately 13 acres for community lake. The remaining acres were intended for future development.

- e. On January 22, 2004, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-04174, Chaddsford Section II, for 307 lots for 100.35 acres, which governs the subject application. Since that approval, the applicant has chosen to renumber the sections, nevertheless, Preliminary Plan 4-04174 applies to the subject specific design plan.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9878:** CDZ Amendment 2, Brandywine Village Zoning Application A-9878, created the E-I-A, L-A-C and R-M Zones for the 212 acres of the Brandywine Investment Associates. The R-M Zone was designated for 149 acres at 5.8 to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. Specific conditions that warrant discussion regarding conformance of this specific design plan, SDP-0509, with the basic plan are considered below:

2. **Conveyance of the stream valley of the tributary of Timothy branch to M-NCPPC as shown on Exhibit "B."**

Comment: The application shows the area of the parkland dedication on the submitted plans.

4. **The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

Comment: The application shows one sitting area, one tot-lot, one preteen lot, and an extensive trail system within the subdivision. The plans appear to include sufficient details and specifications for proper implementation.

6. **Sensitive natural features shall be preserved as amenities that help to define the pattern of neighborhoods.**

Comment: The Type I tree conservation plan and Type II tree conservation plan show the preservation of sensitive environmental features in a manner that helps to define the pattern of neighborhoods.

7. **Single-family attached residential areas shall include a variety of building styles including townhouse, duplex, triplex, quadplex, z-lot and zero lot line units.**

Comment: The CDP was approved showing only townhouse units. The preliminary plan was also approved showing only townhouse units. This is the first specific design plan submitted for the overall development with townhouses. Staff recommends that the plan be revised to incorporate 22- or 24-foot-wide end units with two-car garages in order to provide some variety in the townhouse products.

- 8. There should be a mix of housing types to accommodate different life styles and household income levels; an appropriate segment should be affordable for seniors, and young adults starting out.**

Comment: Section One of the overall development provided for detached units of a smaller size than would normally be approved and that section provided affordability for seniors and young adults starting out. Sections Three through Five include townhouses and single-family detached dwellings. This section should minimally provide for a step up from the previously approved Section One. Staff recommends that the Normandy and the Orleans III be deleted or the minimum finished living area above grade be expanded to 2,200 square feet.

#### **Considerations**

- 1. The applicant shall work with the Police Department to determine if a Community Oriented Police Office is warranted within the proposed community.**
- 2. The applicant shall employ the use of audible alarm, fencing and private security to prevent crimes during the construction phase of the project.**
- 3. The applicant shall establish a Neighborhood Watch Program which has mandatory membership for all residents.**

Comment: These conditions should be carried over to the approval of this plan. In addition, staff recommends that the applicant provide a report to the Planning Board prior to the review of future specific design plans as to the status of the requirements above.

- 8. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01:** This specific design plan was reviewed against the approved comprehensive design plan and was found to conform to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0102/01. Specific conditions that warrant discussion regarding conformance (besides those previously discussed relative to the basic plan conditions) are considered below:

- 1. Prior to certificate approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan,**
  - a. The following revisions shall be made to the plans or information shall be provided:**
    - (1) A minimum lot width of 40 feet (at the street line, unless indicated otherwise) for the proposed lots in the development. No more than 25 percent of the total number of single-family lots in the development may be less than 50 feet in width. The rest of the lots shall be 50 feet or more in width, with no less than 25 percent of the total number of lots at least 60 feet in width. (On cul-de-sacs the lot width may be measured at the building line).**

Comment: The applicant has provided evidence that this application, as well as the previously approved specific design plan and the recently approved preliminary plan for Chaddsford, Section 2, 4-4174, have complied with the condition above. The following chart demonstrates conformance:

Chaddsford Cumulative Lot-Size Table for Single-Family Detached Units							
Lot Percentages Tracking Chart	Percent Required Per CDP Condition 1A	SDP-0109 Plat 195-91	Section 1 SDP-0407	Preliminary Plan 4-04174		Total Lots	Cumulative Percentages of Individual Plans
				Section 3, 4, & 5	Future Sections 2, 6, & 7		
36' and 40' Street Frontage	Maximum 25%	0	79	0	0	79	18%
50' Street Frontage	-----	0	40	52	16	108	24%
60' Street Frontage	Minimum 25%	11	12	35	66	124	28%
Single-Family Attached	Maximum 30%	0	0	75	58	133	30%
Total	100%	11	131	162	140	444	100%

**(2) A minimum side setback of five feet for all lots.**

Comment: This is the minimum side yard setback shown on the specific design plan.

**(3) Notwithstanding Condition 1 above, no more than twenty 36-foot-wide lots for the total development shall be allowed, but only if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board prior to approval of the first specific design plan that the proposed houses on those lots have a superior architectural design. In the absence of such a finding by the Planning Board, all 36-foot-wide lots shall be increased to at least 40 feet wide and shall be subject to the 25 percent limit in Condition 1.a.(1) above.**

Comment: None of the lots within this section is proposed to be less than 40 feet wide.

**3. In conjunction with submission of the second Specific Design Plan, the applicant shall: Develop construction drawings for the trail construction on parkland in**

**accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

Comment: This information was shown appropriately on the plans for Section One.

- 4. All residential structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with the National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George's County laws in order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services.**

Comment: This condition should be carried over to the approval of this plan.

- 8. 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 approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan

- 11. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 135<sup>th</sup> unit in the development, the applicant shall submit to the Department of Parks and Recreation a performance bond, a letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, for the construction of the of public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland in the amount to be determined by DPR.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan. Even though the number of units proposed is only 131, these units contribute to an overall project number of approximately 450 dwelling units in the R-M Zone.

- 13. Prior to issuance of the building permits for 290th unit in the development, all public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan. Even though the number of units proposed is only 131, these units contribute to an overall project number of approximately 450 dwelling units in the R-M Zone.

- 14. The portion of the master planned trail in the General Lafayette Boulevard right-of-way shall be constructed in conjunction with the construction of the roadway.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan

- 9. Preliminary Plan for Subdivision 4-04174:** The Chaddsford preliminary plan was reviewed and approved on January 13, 2005, by the Planning Board, which included the following relevant conditions:

**2. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved with the Specific Design Plan.**

Comment: The revised Type II tree conservation plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-05, conforms to TCPI/46/97-04.

**3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the Stormwater Management Concept Plan, # 21274-2003-00, and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: A revised Stormwater Management Concept Plan, CSD 21274-2003-01, was approved by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources on July 19, 2004, and expires on April 1, 2007.

**13. The review of the SDP shall include the following:**

- a. Improve the road connections as in CDP-0102/01, especially to the townhouses and along General Lafayette Boulevard. The connections to the townhouses are not explained, so if the traffic circle is eliminated, show how the townhouses will connect to Chadds Ford Road and/or connect to townhouses off of Court C, Parcel A. A continuous public road connection that eliminates Court C may also connect the townhouses to Chadds Ford Road. A private road connection to Court C was shown in the CPD Illustrative Lotting Plan but this is not acceptable and will be further evaluated at the time of review of the SDP.**

Comment: In letter dated January 25, 2006 the applicant provided the following responses to the requirement above:

“The road connections to General Lafayette Boulevard are not part of this SDP. The intent of the current design is for the townhouses within Chaddsford adjacent to Brandywine Village to be blended into and become part of the townhouse community of Brandywine Village. Both areas are owned and constructed by the same builder and are intended to be treated as one community from a homeowners association and sharing of amenities perspective. The road connections shown on the CDP were reviewed at time of Preliminary Plan approval to eliminate the circle off Roadway A in favor of an open space and trail connection. In turn, the 30 townhouses in the eastern area will be accessed as part of the existing townhouse community off of Chadds Ford Drive. The 24 townhouses in the western area will also be accessed as part of the townhouse community farther west, also from Chadds Ford Drive. There was never any intent to interconnect the 30 townhouse area to the 24 townhouse area due to interim wetlands between the two development pods. The potential connection from the 24 townhouse area to court C was eliminate at time of Preliminary Plan due to public/private road requirements and the desire on the part of the owner to create a cohesive townhouse community. Instead, a trail connection in a significant open space

corridor was provided to tie together the open space and recreational areas between the single family and townhouse areas.

“The 8 townhouses at the end of Chadds Ford Drive are likewise accessed from the Brandywine Village townhouse community, off of Chadds Ford Drive. There was never an indication or intent to access these directly to Chadds Ford Drive but to access them through the townhouse community so they would be incorporated into the larger community.”

Comment: Staff agrees with the applicant’s discussion above.

- b. Combine public space/parks especially with SWM open space at the end of Court C. Create more natural looking SWM ponds at Road A at Chadds Ford Drive by eliminating straight lines and using a shallower (less slope) embankment. The Storm Drainage and Stormwater Management Design Manual has guidelines for landscaping SWM facilities, and Guidelines will be considered at the time of review of the SDP.**

Comment: In letter dated January 25,2006 the applicant provided the following responses to the requirement above:

“The park area at the end of Court C, Recreation Area 1, was enlarged at time of Preliminary Plan by eliminating the private road connection to Court D and utilizing this land to provide an open space connection between the natural wetland area to the west and structured play area/trail system. In this way, both the townhouse communities and single family neighborhoods have access to the trail system, recreational facilities, and natural areas. The SWM pond has also been reshaped from that shown on the preliminary plan to create a more naturalistic facility that blends harmoniously with the adjoining wetlands area.

“The pond at Road A (Pond 2) has been designed shallower than shown on the preliminary plan. Landscaping and flattening of some slopes have also been used to create a more natural looking pond, while still meeting requirements of the Stormwater Concept.”

Comment: Staff agrees with the applicant’s discussion above.

- c. Provide more open space between the rear of townhouses (separate townhouses with 50-60 feet of open space) along General Lafayette Boulevard to allow more space between road access points; this will be further evaluated at the time of review of the SDP and could result in a loss of lots.**

Comment: This condition does not apply to this SDP.



- d. Continue the buffer concept and provide open space (30–40 feet wide) for street tree plantings along Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard as indicated in the original CDP concepts under Landscape and Recreation Design Standards.**

Comment: This SDP provides a 40-foot landscaped buffer between Chadds Ford Drive and both townhouse and single-family lots. General Lafayette Boulevard is not part of this SDP.

- e. Separate the rear of townhouses from single-family homes by buffer space (50 feet) and tree planting along Road A. Townhouses are too close to the single-family lots and will be further evaluated at the time of review of the SDP.**

Comment: This SDP provides a 50- to 55-foot buffer between the townhouse lots and the single-family lots, which is sufficient.

- f. Preserve more existing woodland adjacent to the existing drainage patterns at the end of Court H by changing lot dimensions.**

Comment: Court H is not part of this SDP.

- g. Court K should be pulled back away from General Lafayette Boulevard (at least 75 feet) to improve the look from General Lafayette Boulevard. Open space (30–40 feet) is needed along General Lafayette Boulevard to plant street trees.**

Comment: Court K is not part of this SDP.

- h. Single-family corner lots along General Lafayette Boulevard must be larger to account for setback from streets with open space to allow street tree plantings along the boulevard as in the CDP concepts under Landscape and Recreation Design Standards. Larger lots will also allow screening at the rear of houses and will be further evaluated at the time of review of the SDP.**

Comment: Not part of this SDP.

- i. A determination if a revision is required to SDP-0108 (SDP for the lake).**

Comment: A revision is required and is currently under review for Chaddsford, Section Two.

- 18. At time of Specific Design Plan review, the impacts proposed for stormwater management pond #3 shall be reevaluated and the impacts to the stream buffers on both sides shall be reduced to the fullest extent possible.**

Comment: Stormwater management pond 3 is not included in this application.

- 21. At time of Specific Design Plan review all proposed easements shall be shown on the Type II Tree Conservation Plan. No woodland conservation shall be shown within these easements and the easements shall not be placed in areas that are required to be preserved.**

Comment: The revised Type II tree conservation plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-05, provides all woodland conservation areas outside of all utility easements.

- 24. The DPR staff shall review and approve the location and design of the storm water management facilities and outfalls on dedicated parkland at the time of the Specific Design Plan review if any are proposed within parkland.**

Comment: The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) staff has reviewed the submitted specific design plan and made the following findings. The subject project includes the area to be dedicated to M-NCPPC. The applicant proposes construction of the SWM Pond 2 next to the parkland. Stormdrain outfall is proposed on dedicated parkland. Condition 12e of the approved Preliminary Plan 4-04174 states: Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC, DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.

The DPR staff has concerns about adverse impacts of the stormdrain planned outfall on environmentally sensitive areas of the stream valley. The information submitted with the SDP is insufficient to determine the effect of runoff on the park property.

The Park Planning and Development Division staff recommends that the following stipulation be required of the applicant, his successors and/or assignees as a condition of approval:

Prior to grading permit the stormwater management plan, including any improvements on dedicated parkland, shall be submitted to DPR for review and approval. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are existing woodlands and previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans. The original CDP, preliminary plan, and TCPIs were approved so that permits could be issued for the construction of sewer and water lines from US 301 to Phase I of "Brandywine Village" along McKendree Road. At that time, TCPI/47/96 was reviewed and was found to satisfy the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/47/96-01, was approved with CDP-0102; a revision, TCPI/47/96-02, was approved with

CDP-0102/01, a further revision, TCPI/47/96-03, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080, and the most recent revision, TCPI/47/96-04, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-04174.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98, was approved for the entire project to allow the installation of water and sewer lines. The Type II tree conservation plan is revised with each SDP. The revised Type II tree conservation plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-05, conforms to TCPI/46/97-04.

The design of the woodland conservation areas encumbers no lots, protects the sensitive environmental features on the site and avoids fragmentation of the forest. No further action regarding woodland conservation is required with regard to this specific design plan review.

11. Section 27-274(a)(11) requires that the design of townhouses must meet certain criteria for development. The following addresses each of the requirements:
- (A) In this case, the preservation of existing trees between townhome groups is not possible. In some areas trees do not exist and in others the landscape is such that the proposed grading is not conducive to the preservation of existing trees.
  - (B) The siting of townhouses are such that they appear to be a natural continuation of McKendree Village/Brandywine Village. This has been achieved by using techniques such as siting the building sticks at right angles to the previously approved building siting for that development and the continuation of grid patterns where possible.
  - (C) The relationship of the townhouses to recreational facilities provides for the buffering of the rear of units and the staff is recommending additional fencing where needed.
  - (D) The plans indicate a variety of model types sufficient to define each of the units individually as required by this section of the code, through the use of bay windows, variation in roofline, and window and door treatment.
  - (E) The plan provides for buffering of the rear of units from public rights-of-ways, except where the staff is recommending the addition of a fence around the rear yards of Lots 34-47.
  - (F) The plan is proposing a two-foot offset of the units, which is typical of townhouse development.

Sections 27-433(d), Dwellings, and 27-480, General Development Regulations for the Comprehensive Design Zones, include requirements for the development of townhouses. The plan demonstrates conformance to these sections by proposing to meet the minimum lot sizes of 1,800 square feet, proposing not more than six units in a row, proposing that units are a minimum of 20 feet in width, by providing a minimum of two end wall features, by providing the finishing of above-grade foundation walls in a proper manner, and by exceeding the minimum finished living area of 1,250 square feet. This section also requires that 60 percent of the units must have

brick, stone or stucco. Staff recommends that at the time of the issuance of the building permits, a minimum of 60 percent of the townhouse units shall have a full brick front.

12. **Referral Responses:**

- a. The **Transportation Planning Section** had the following comments:

**Basic Plan A-9878:**

Condition 13: This condition requires that the development participate in a road club to assist in funding the transportation improvements required for adequacy in the area. This lengthy condition sets the amount of payment for each type of land use. The condition also specifies a long list of improvements that are needed for adequacy in the area. The condition states that “the applicant’s sole funding responsibility toward the construction of these off-site transportation improvements shall be the payment” of the appropriate road club fee. For single-family detached residences, the fee is set at \$1,472, and for townhouses, the fee is set at \$1,338 (with the fees to be adjusted for inflation). The applicant has indicated a willingness to pay the appropriate road club fees at the time of building permit, and that is the time at which this condition will be enforced.

Condition 14: This condition sets a trip cap on the site. Between this application, SDP-0109, and pending subdivision 4-04174, a total of 467 residences would be approved within the site, which is well within the residential trip cap.

Conditions 15 and 16: These conditions require that adequate dedication be shown along certain master plan facilities within and adjacent to the site. The current plan shows that adequate dedication exists where needed.

Condition 17: This condition requires that the applicant provide needed signalization at the US 301/MD 5 and Chadds Ford Drive intersection. This condition was addressed by the recommended conditions of approval on the preliminary plan.

Condition 18: This condition provides for the potential future closure of the site’s access to US 301/MD 5 in the event that (a) other street connections are available and (b) SHA requests removal of the traffic signal at US 301/MD 5 and Chadds Ford Drive. This condition would be enforced at a later time and has no bearing on the current case.

Condition 19: This condition requires that three street connections shown on the basic plan be retained. All three street connections were present on the CDP, and none are compromised by the current plan.

Condition 25: This condition requires that street connections to properties north and south of the subject site be shown on the CDP. This is discussed further under Condition 3 of the preliminary plan.

**Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01:**

This approval was reviewed concurrently with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04174 and included no unique transportation-related conditions.

**Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04174:**

Condition 13(a): This condition requires that street connections into the townhouse areas be better explored at the time of specific design plan. The street connections to the three townhouse areas shown on this plan have been reviewed, and they are acceptable and consistent with the preliminary plan.

Condition 15: This condition is identical to Condition 13 of the basic plan, and the required pro-rata payments will be made to DPW&T at the time of building permit.

Condition 16: This condition requires physical and signalization improvements at the US 301/MD 5/Chadds Ford Drive intersection. It appears that the physical improvements are in place. The status of possible signalization should be confirmed with the applicant.

Condition 17: This condition repeats Condition 18 of the basic plan, which provides for the potential future closure of the site's access to US 301/MD 5 under certain conditions. Once again, this condition has no bearing on the current case.

Access and circulation is acceptable, and it is consistent with the preliminary plan.

It appears that the street names in this subdivision incorporate the names of military heroes that had an impact on early American history. It is requested, therefore, that the name on the site plan for the main roadway in Section 3 be revised to show the name "Pulaski" Road and not "Polaski." The intent is apparent because the general's first name, Casimir, is used correctly on the roadway leading into Sections 4 and 5. General Pulaski fought in the Revolutionary War for the independence of the United States. He was killed in action during the British siege of Savannah. The word "polaski" resembles a derogatory term for persons of Polish descent.

The subject property is required to make roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 2005 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04174 and in consideration of the findings and conditions associated with Basic Plan A-9878. These findings were supported by a traffic study submitted in 2003. Insofar as the basis for the findings is still valid, and in consideration of the scope of this application, the transportation staff can make a finding that the subject property is in general conformance with the approved preliminary, comprehensive design, and basic plans. The Transportation Planning Section also finds that the subject application will be served by adequate transportation facilities within a reasonable period of time.

- b. The **Transportation Planning Section** trails planner had the following comments:

One master plan trail impacts the subject site. The Subregion V master plan recommends a stream valley trail within DPR parkland along the tributary of the Timothy Branch. This stream valley trail will ultimately connect to the Timothy Branch Trail to the south and the planned trail along A-55 to the north. In addition to providing recreational opportunities for the residents of the subject site, the trail will also connect to a future library, elementary school, and park and ride within the Brandywine Special Study Area.

Due to the density of the subject application (4,000 and 5,000-square-foot lots), standard sidewalks are recommended along both sides of all internal roads. Condition 10 of CDP-0102/01 requires the provision of these sidewalks, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of issuance of street construction permits. These sidewalks are reflected on the submitted plan.

Basic Plan A-9878 requires the construction of the eight-foot-wide hiker/biker stream valley trail from the northern to the southern edge of the subject property by the applicant. Staff supports the alignment of the trail as agreed to by DPR and the applicant. This trail will provide the north/south stream valley trail envisioned in the master plan. The provision of the HOA trail on the opposite side of the lake will also provide the opportunity for a loop trail within the community. Conditions 11 and 12 of CDP-0102/01 require the construction of six-foot-wide, asphalt feeder trails from the ends of the two southernmost culs-de-sac to the stream valley trail. These trail connections are reflected on the submitted SDP from the end of Gilmore Greens and Chadsey Lane and fulfill the intent of these recommendations.

Construction of the trail on M-NCPPC parkland is addressed in CDP-0102/01. Condition 3 states, "In conjunction with submission of the second specific design plan, the applicant shall: Develop construction drawings for the trail construction on parkland in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*." This condition appears to be fulfilled with the provision of a trail cross section in the submitted SDP. This should be adequate, unless additional details are required by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

- c. The **Permit Review Section** had several questions and comments, which have been addressed except for the following:

A timing mechanism must be in place for completion of the proposed recreation facilities.

Comment: The recreational facilities, including the sitting area and the preteen lot, should be constructed prior to 75 percent of build-out or the 98<sup>th</sup> building permit.

- d. The **Department of Environmental Resources** stated “Chaddsford Sections 3-5, SDP-0509, is consistent with approved stormwater concept #21274-2003.”
- e. The **Environmental Planning Section** recommends approval of SDP-0509 and TCPII/126/98-05. The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site for a Basic Plan (A-9878), a Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-9202), a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-96083), TCPI/47/96, TCPII/126/98, a new Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-0102), a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-01045), Specific Design Plans for two portions of the site (SDP-0108 and SDP-0109) and a revision to the Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-0102/01). A revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/47/96-01, was approved with CDP-0102; a revision, TCPI/47/96-02, was approved with CDP-0102/01, a further revision, TCPI/47/96-03 was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080, and the most recent revision, TCPI/47/96-04, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-04174. The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-04174, including variation requests for impacts to sensitive environmental features. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98, was approved for the entire project to allow the installation of water and sewer lines. The Type II tree conservation plan is revised with each SDP.

There are extensive areas of woodlands, streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes, and severe slopes on the Chaddsford property. The principal stream on the site is a tributary of Mattawoman Creek in the Potomac River watershed. According to the “Prince George’s County Soil Survey,” the soils found on the property include Bibb silt loam, Beltsville silt loam, Galestown gravelly loam, Keyport silt loam and Sassafras gravelly sandy loam. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication entitled “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 lot. Although this property does not abut McKendree Road, the proposed lots will be accessed via McKendree Road that is a designated historic road. Traffic-generated noise from US 301 may impact portions of the property. The property is in the Developing Tier according to the adopted General Plan.

### **Environmental Review**

1. A detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was reviewed in conjunction with Preliminary Plan 4-96083. That FSD was resubmitted with CDP-0102 and was found to address the requirements for an FSD in accordance with the “Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.” No further action regarding the forest stand delineation is required with regard to this specific design plan review.
2. Streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, and associated buffers are found throughout this property. The 100-year floodplain is shown on record plats VJ

186-63 and VJ 186-64. Streams, wetlands and associated buffers are correctly shown on the plans submitted with this application.

- . During the review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96083, variations to Section 24-129 and Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations were approved for the proposed impacts to streams, stream buffers, 100-year floodplain, wetlands and wetland buffers associated with road crossings for Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard. However, no variation associated with the proposed lake was requested or approved with 4-96083. The lake design was studied in detail during the review and approval of SDP-0108. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01045 created the parcel containing the lake and also approved variation requests for impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers. Impacts for the installation of sewer lines, outfalls for stormwater management ponds, and at least one street crossing were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080. Impacts for the installation of sewer lines, outfalls for stormwater management ponds, and at least one street crossing were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-04174. The impacts shown on SDP-0509 are consistent with those previously approved. No further information regarding sensitive environmental features is required for the review of this specific design plan.
3. Although McKendree Road is identified as a historic road, this application proposes no impacts within 600 feet of McKendree Road. No further information regarding historic or scenic roads is required for the review of this specific design plan.
4. Traffic-generated noise may impact portions of the property. US 301 is the eastern boundary of the subject property. The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the 65dBA noise contour is 531 feet from the centerline of US 301. This noise corridor will impact the L-A-C and E-I-A portions of the site but not the R-M-zoned portion currently under review. General Lafayette Boulevard is designed as a master plan collector roadway and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. Chadds Ford Drive is designed as a 70-foot access road and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. No further action regarding noise is required with regard to this specific design plan review.
- f. The **Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section** was sent a copy of the application to determine adequacy of public facilities, but no response has been provided at this time. This information will be provided at the time of the public hearing.
- g. The **Community Planning Division** stated there are no General Plan or master plan issues related to this specific design plan. The 2002 General Plan identifies this application as being located in the Developing Tier and in the area identified as a possible future center for Brandywine. The site is recommended in the 1993 Approved Subregion V Master Plan and SMA for high-suburban residential land use with up to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. A public stream valley park is also planned as part of a larger community



development concept in the Brandywine Special Study Area (BSSA). The SMA classifies the site in the R-M Zone per application A-9878. This application proposes to build 75 attached dwelling units and 87 detached dwelling units, for a total of 162 dwelling units on 51.5 acres. General Plan and master plan issues for this application were addressed in rezoning application A-9878, preliminary subdivision application 4-04174 and comprehensive design plan application CDP-0102/01.

13. The plan conforms to the *Landscape Manual*; however, the plans should be revised to remove the notes relating to section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* because comprehensive design plans are exempt from that section of the ordinance.
14. As evidenced in Findings Number 10(b) and (f), the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development.
15. Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties as evidenced with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 21274-2003-00.

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/126/98-05), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0509 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall submit a report for Planning Board review on the status of the considerations below, for review concurrent with the next specific design plan review:
  - a. The applicant shall work with the Police Department to determine if a Community-Oriented Police Office is warranted within the proposed community.
  - b. The applicant shall employ the use of an audible alarm, fencing, and private security to prevent crimes during the construction phase of the project.
  - c. The applicant shall establish a Neighborhood Watch Program that has mandatory membership for all residents.
2. All residential structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with the National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George's County laws in order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services.
3. Prior to signature approval of the specific design plan, the following revisions shall be made to the plans:
  - a. Fencing with gates shall be added to all of the rear yards of lots 34-47 to screen the rear

- yards from the public street and the front yards of adjacent single-family detached lots.
- b. Additional landscaping shall be added around the stormwater management pond located at the end of Bennetts Run Court.
  - c. The plans shall be revised to incorporate 13 two-car garages with side entrances on the end units.
  - d. *Landscape Manual* schedules for Section 4.7 shall be removed from the plans.
  - e. The Normandy and Orleans III models shall either be deleted from the architectural package or the minimum finished living area above grade shall be expanded to 2,200 square feet.
  - f. The roof pitch for all of the units shall be no less than 7:12.
  - g. The architectural elevations shall be revised to incorporate a minimum of two end wall features for all of the units. On highly visible lots, a minimum of three end wall features shall be provided in a balanced or symmetrical design.
4. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit, DPR staff shall review and approve the location and design of the stormwater management facilities and outfalls on dedicated parkland, if any are proposed within parkland. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement if there is any impact to parkland.
  5. Prior to signature approval of the specific design plan the following landscape improvements will be provided on the plans:
    - a. At a minimum, each front yard shall have either one shade tree or one ornamental tree to enhance the appearance of streets. At least 50 percent of the front yards shall have a shade tree.
    - b. Ornamental trees (minimum groupings of three) and shrubs will be used at intersections, where space and line-of-sight allow, to enhance the housing at all intersections.
  6. Prior to the issuance of any permits that 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 approved conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
  7. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 135<sup>th</sup> unit in the overall development as shown on CDP-0102/01, the applicant shall submit to the Department of Parks and Recreation a performance bond, a letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of the master plan trail on dedicated parkland in the amount to be determined by DPR.

8. Prior to issuance of the building permits for the 290th unit in the development as shown on CDP-0102/01, all public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed.
9. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 121st unit in the subject application, the private recreational facilities including the sitting area, tot-lot, the preteen lot, and the trails shall be completed.
10. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the plans shall be revised to add a tracking chart to demonstrate that 60 percent of the units will have brick fronts.

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 Clark, with Commissioners Eley, Clark, Squire, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 18, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 8th day of June 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:bjs