

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on July 27, 2006, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0516 for Bevard East, Phase 4, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of 293 single-family detached and 100 single-family attached dwelling units in the R-L Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	Existing	Proposed
Zone	R-L	R-L
Uses	Vacant	Single-family detached Single-family attached
Acreage	195.97	195.97
Single-family detached units	0	293
Single-family attached units	0	100
Total		393

3. **Location:** This portion of the Bevard East, Phase 4, development is located on the southeast side of Piscataway Road, north of Elizabeth Ida Drive, and south of Delancy Street, in Planning Area 81B and Council District 9.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject site is bounded on its west side by the proposed public park and Mary Catherine Estates Subdivision. To the north of the subject property is vacant property zoned R-E. To the south is proposed Bevard East, Phase 2. To the southeast is Wolfe Farm, which is undeveloped but has a preliminary plan of subdivision approved for it, 4-04099.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject property has an approved Basic Plan, A-9967, approved by the District Council on March 28, 2006, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance No. 7-2006. The Planning Board approved the Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0504, on January 12, 2006. The District Council approved CDP-0504 on June 6, 2006. The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05050 was approved on February 16, 2006, by the Planning Board, prior to the final approval by the District Council of the rezoning case and prior to the final decision on the CDP.
6. **Design Features:** Phase 4 of the Bevard East development is accessed from Piscataway Road. The main access point and main spine connects to Piscataway Road and terminates at the future clubhouse. The Phase 4 road network provides access to Phases 2 and 5. Single-family detached dwellings front Piscataway Road and the main spine road. The proposed 14±-acre park flanks one

side of the spine road. A gatehouse and traffic circle are located at the first intersection traversed after entering the subdivision from Piscataway Road.

The following facilities are included within this area:

- One open play area
- One community building
- One community pool
- One soccer field (multipurpose)
- One tot-lot and one preteen lot (combined)
- Two double tennis courts
- Parking compound (approximately 47 spaces)

In addition to the recreational facilities stated above, the CDP included conditions of refinement of facilities as follows:

- b. The community building shall be shown as a minimum of 5,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.**
- c. The swimming pool shall be approximately 25 meters long and 40 feet wide with a 30-foot by 30-foot training area.**

Comment: The plans lack sufficient information for review of the central recreational area. The outline of the community building is shown on the plans but the architectural elevations and floor plans of the building have not been provided. Dimensions are not included on the plans and details and specifications are completely lacking. Even the open play area is not labeled. The staff recommends that this section of the plans be deleted, and the plans be revised to provide for rough grading of the area. Then the applicant should submit a revision of the subject specific design plan to the Planning Board for the purpose of approving a specific plan for the central recreational area in accordance with the above comprehensive design plan requirements. Included in this submittal should be the architectural elevations of the clubhouse, the floor plans, the swimming pool details, and the recreational facilities as stated above demonstrating conformance to the Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines, details and specifications of the individual facilities including cut-sheets for the equipment and landscaping. This detailed site plan revision should be submitted prior to the release of any building permits.

ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA

Architecture for the single-family detached units will be brought before the Planning Board in a separate umbrella architecture specific design plan SDP-0605 that has been recently accepted by the Development Review Division for processing.

The following architectural models for townhouse products are proposed by K Hovnanian Homes, Caruso Homes, and Ryan Homes:

Model	Base Finished Area (Sq. Ft.)*
K. Hovnanian	
Astoria I and II	1,680
Chatham	1,600
Woodford I & II	1,600
Woodley Park I	1,948
Woodley Park II	1,920
Caruso Homes	
Napa Valley	1,892
Sonoma	1,890
Ryan Homes	
Fairgate	1,600

*Base Finished Area in square feet as submitted in e-mail dated May 30, 2006. Finished floor statement forms were not submitted.

Comment: The architectural elevations for the Ryan Homes model, the Fairgate, are incomplete. The plans submitted only include the front elevation of sticks of buildings of various numbers of units. Side and rear elevations of the product have not been provided. Therefore, the staff recommends that the Ryan Homes model, the Fairgate, be deleted.

The Caruso Homes architectural elevations depict front loaded garages consistent with the site plan. The staff recommends approval of the models proposed by Caruso Homes.

The K Hovnanian architectural elevations are complete and provide an acceptable level of design quality. The staff recommends approval of the models proposed by K. Hovnanian with a condition that the plans be revised to show a standard deck on the rear of the units, with details and specifications to be approved prior to signature approval.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9967:** This case rezoned approximately 562.85 acres of land in the R-E Zone to the R-L Zone and was approved by the District Council on March 28, 2006, in accordance with Zoning Ordinance No. 7-2006. The following conditions were attached to the approval and warrant discussion:
 1. **The basic plan shall be revised as follows, and submitted to the Office of the Zoning Hearing Examiner for inclusion in the record:**
 - **The right-of-way for A-65 as designated on the Subregion V Master Plan shall be shown. A determination shall be made at the time of preliminary plan concerning dedication, reservation, or no preservation strategy for the right-of-way for this facility within the subject property.**

- **The Basic Plan shall be revised to reflect a proposed basic plan density of 827 units and a maximum of 165 attached units (20% of the total, as provided in Section 27-514.10 of the Zoning Ordinance). With the provision of density increments, Applicant shall construct no more than 827 units.**

Comment: According to the Zoning Section, a revised basic plan has not been submitted to this office, which would then be forwarded to the ZHE to show the master plan alignment of A-65 and the density as stated above.

2. A preliminary plan of subdivision shall be required for the proposed development.

Comment: A preliminary plan of subdivision for the subject project was approved by the Planning Board on February 16, 2006, before the final approval of the rezoning case and before the final approval of the comprehensive design plan.

3. A soils study shall be submitted as part of any application for a natural resources inventory. The study shall clearly define the limits of past excavation and indicate all areas where fill has been placed. All fill areas shall include borings, test pits, and logs of the materials found. Borings and test pits in fill areas shall be deep enough to reach undisturbed ground.

Comment: A natural resources inventory (NRI) plan, NRI/40/05, has been approved by the Environmental Planning Section. The NRI includes a soils study that clearly defines the limits of past excavation and indicates all areas where fill has been placed including borings, test pits, and logs of the materials found above undisturbed ground.

5. If impacts to regulated environmental features remain after the redesign, variation requests shall be submitted as part of any application for a preliminary plan of subdivision. The variation request must have a separate justification statement for each impact or impact type, in conformance with Section 24-113 of the Subdivision Regulations, a map on 8.5 x 11 inch paper showing each impact, and noting the quantities of impacts proposed for each individual impact.

Comment: Variation requests with exhibits for 18 impacts were received on January 9, 2005, and reviewed with Preliminary Plan 4-05050. Of the 18 requests, 9 were fully approved, 7 were approved in part, and 1 was denied by the Planning Board. Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/53/04-01 was revised prior to signature to reflect the Planning Board decision. Impacts to sensitive environmental features are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

6. A Phase I noise study shall be required as part of any application for a CDP. The CDP and Type I Tree Conservation Plan ("TCPI") shall show all unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contours associated with traffic-generated noise.

Comment: The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour will be about 168 feet from the centerline of Piscataway Road in ten years. Based upon dedication of 60 feet from the centerline of existing Piscataway Road, the predicted 65 dBA Ldn contour is approximately 118 feet from the edge of the proposed right-of-way and clearly not impacting any proposed lot within this phase of the development.

- 7. The CDP shall provide for minimum 40-foot scenic easements adjacent and contiguous to the proposed 10-foot public utility easements along the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road and Thrift Road.**

Comment: The comprehensive design plan provided orchard-like planting along Piscataway Road. This application similarly provides orchard-like planting along Piscataway Road.

Consideration:

- 1. At the time of Comprehensive Design Plan review specific acreage of parkland dedication shall be determined. The dedicated parkland should be of sufficient acreage to accommodate a baseball field, soccer field, a parking lot with a minimum of 100 parking spaces, a playground, picnic shelter, basketball court, trail and stormwater management pond. The dedicated parkland shall be located along Piscataway Road.**

Comment: The CDP provided for the information above and this condition has no impact on the subject application

- 2. At the time of Comprehensive Design Plan review any recreational facilities to be constructed by Applicant shall be constructed on dedicated parkland. The recreational facilities package shall be reviewed and approved by appropriate M-NCPPC staff.**

Comment: The CDP provided for the information above and this condition has no impact on the subject application

- 3. As a public benefit feature, Applicant shall contribute \$2 million to the construction of a community center to be located at Cosca Regional Park.**

Comment: The comprehensive design plan approved a timing mechanism for the collection of the money and the same condition is included in the recommendation section of this report

- 4. At the time of Comprehensive Design Plan review, Applicant and Staff should address the feasibility of installing traffic calming measures and pedestrian crosswalks at the following intersections:**

- **Piscataway Road/Windbrook Drive;**
- **Piscataway Road/Mary Catherine Drive;**
- **Piscataway Road/entrance to Bevard North; and**
- **Piscataway Road/entrance to Bevard East**

Comment: Crosswalks and/or traffic calming is feasible at each location. Please note that the entrance to Bevard East from MD 223 has been moved from the location shown on the basic plan and is now coincident with the entrance to Bevard North from MD 223. Although information has been received from the applicant, such information would have to be reviewed by the appropriate operating agency, either SHA (for MD 223) or DPW&T (for all other facilities).

As a means of ensuring that the condition is met, the following condition should be attached to each SDP:

Prior to signature approval of this SDP, the feasibility of installing traffic calming measures and crosswalks at the following locations shall be determined in consultation between the applicant and the appropriate transportation agency, either SHA or DPW&T:

MD 223/Windbrook Drive
MD 223/Mary Catherine Drive
MD 223/entrance to Bevard North/Bevard East

The applicant shall be required to install any traffic calming measures and crosswalks that are deemed to be feasible and appropriate by the operating agencies. The result of such discussions shall be provided to planning staff in writing, and any required improvements shall be added as a note on any final plat.

8. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504:** Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504 was approved by the Planning Board on January 12, 2006. The CDP was approved by the District Council on June 6, 2006. The following conditions of approval warrant discussion:

1. **The applicant shall dedicate to M-NCPPC 14± acres of developable land for future parkland as generally shown on attached Exhibit "A" at the time of the first final plat of subdivision.**

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

3. **The land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be subject to the conditions of the attached Exhibit B.**

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

- 4. Construction drawings for the recreational facilities on public parkland shall be reviewed and approved by the Park Planning and Development staff prior to certificate approval of the first specific design plan.**

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

- 5. Prior to submission of any final plats of subdivision, the applicant shall enter into a public Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA) with M-NCPPC for the construction of recreation facilities on parkland. The applicant shall submit three original executed RFAs to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for their approval three weeks prior to the submission of the final plats. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County.**

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

- 6. The applicant shall submit to DPR a performance bond, a letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, for the construction of the public recreation facilities in the amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of grading permits.**

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

- 7. The recreational facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed prior to issuance of the 50th building permit.**

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

- 8. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall make a monetary contribution of a minimum \$2,000,000 toward the construction of the Southern Region Community Center in three phases:**
 - a. \$200,000.00 for the design and engineering of the community center shall be paid prior to the issuance of the 50th building permit.**
 - b. \$ 900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 200th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).**
 - c. \$ 900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 400th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).**

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

10. Prior to acceptance of the applicable specific design plans, the following shall be shown on the plans:

- a. The APA designation area shall be shown.**

Comment: This phase is within APA zones 3 and 6, and the APA designation is shown on the coversheet of the plans.

- b. The community building shall be shown as a minimum of 5,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.**

Comment: The community building is shown on the plans; however, the architectural elevations and floor plan have not been provided.

- c. The swimming pool shall be approximately 25 meters long and 40 feet wide with a 30-foot by 30-foot training area.**

Comment: The swimming pool is shown on the plans; however, dimensions are not provided on the plans and the details and specifications have not been provided.

11. On the appropriate specific design plan, the applicant shall provide the following:

- e. A wide asphalt shoulder along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 223 in order to safely accommodate bicycle traffic, unless modified by SHA.**

Comment: The plans do not reflect the information alone and should be changed prior to signature approval.

- f. Standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**

Comment: This is shown on the plans.

- c. The plan shall be revised to indicate the APA 3M and APA 6.**

Comment: This requirement applies to Phases 4 and 5. This SDP should be revised to indicate the APA 3M and 6.

- e. The plans shall be revised to add lots along the main entrance road, across from the park, to be sized in the medium lot size category, have a minimum 80-foot width at the front street line and be served by an alley. Further, the**

lots continuing along the main road to the first intersection shall be enlarged to the medium lot size and the same 80-foot width at the front street line.

- f. The green area formed at the intersection of lots on the northwest side of the first circle along the main entrance road shall be designated as a buildable lot.

Comment: The plans have been revised to conform to the two requirements above.

- 19. The recreational facilities shall be bonded and constructed in accordance with the following schedule:

PHASING OF AMENITIES		
FACILITY	BOND	FINISH CONSTRUCTION
Public Park	Prior to the issuance of any building permits	Complete by 50th building permit overall
Recreation center Outdoor recreation facilities	Prior to the issuance of the 200th building permit overall	Complete by 400th building permit overall
Recreation Center Building and pool	Prior to the issuance of the 200th building permit overall	Complete before the 400th building permit overall
Pocket Parks (including Playgrounds) within each phase	Prior to the issuance of any building permits for that phase	Complete before 50% of the building permits are issued in that phase
Trail system Within each phase	Prior to the issuance of any building permits for that phase	Complete before 50% of the building permits are issued in that phase
<p>It is occasionally necessary to adjust the precise timing of the construction of recreational facilities as more details concerning grading and construction details become available. Phasing of the recreational facilities may be adjusted by written permission of the Planning Board or its designee under certain circumstances, such as the need to modify construction sequence due to exact location of sediment ponds or utilities, or other engineering necessity. The number of permits allowed to be released prior to construction of any given facility shall not be increased by more than 25%, and an adequate number of permits shall be withheld to assure completion of all of the facilities prior to completion of all the dwelling units.</p>		

Comment: The requirements above should be finalized in an executed RFA prior to approval of any final plats for the development to assure that the recreational facilities are constructed in a timely manner.

- 20. Prior to the approval of a specific design plan for architectural elevations, the

following shall be demonstrated:

- a. The most visible side elevations of single-family detached or attached units on corner lots and other lots whose side elevation is highly visible to significant amounts of passing traffic shall have a minimum of three architectural features such as windows, doors and masonry fireplace chimneys, and these features shall form a reasonably balanced and harmonious composition.**

Comment: The staff recommends that the site plan coversheet be revised to indicate that dwellings on corner lots be required to have a minimum of three architectural features on the end walls and these features should form a balanced composition.

- b. All single-family detached dwellings shall not be less than 2,200 square feet of finished living area.**

Comment: The architectural elevations for the single-family detached units will be reviewed under SDP-0605, an umbrella architecture specific design plan for the overall project.

- c. No two houses directly adjacent to each other or across the street from one another should have the same elevation.**

Comment: The architectural elevations for the single-family detached units will be reviewed under SDP-0605, an umbrella architecture specific design plan for the overall project. However, this condition should be carried over to the approval of this plan.

- d. Brick end walls shall be used on highly visible end units of townhouses, to be determined at the time of the specific design plan.**

Comment: The staff recommends that the site plan coversheet be revised to indicate that all townhouse dwellings on corner lots be required to have brick end walls.

21. The following standards shall apply to the development:

Bevard East Standards Proposed

	SFA	SFD		
Lot Size	1,800 sf	6,000-10,000 sf	10,000-19,999 sf	20,000+ sf

Minimum width at front street R-O-W***	N/A	50 feet*	60 feet*	70 feet*
Minimum frontage on cul-de-sacs	N/A	30 feet*	30 feet*	35 feet*
Maximum lot coverage	400 sf yard area**	60%	50%	40%
Minimum front setback from R-O-W	15 feet	20 feet	25 feet****	25 feet
Minimum side setback	None	5 feet	17/8 feet	17/8 feet
Minimum rear setback	None	20 feet	25 feet	25 feet
Minimum corner setback to side street R-O-W	10 feet	15 feet	15 feet	15 feet
Maximum residential building height	40 feet	35 feet	35 feet	35 feet
Approximate percentage of total lots	20 percent	60 percent	10 percent	10 percent

Variations to the standards may be permitted on a case-by-case basis by the Planning Board at the time of specific design plan if circumstances warrant.

*Except minimum lot frontage for flag lot configurations shall be 25 feet.

**Except that the yard area may be reduced to 300 sf for decks.

***Except that the minimum lot width at the front street line shall be no less than 80 feet for the lots adjacent to Piscataway Road, the main entrance drive from Piscataway Road to the first intersection, and along the secondary entrance from Tippet Road to the second intersection.

****Except that on the lots across from the park, the front yard setback shall be no less than 30 feet.

Comment: These requirements are appropriately shown on the cover sheet and will be enforced at the time of building permits. However, the coversheet should be revised to include all of the information within the chart above.

22. Every specific design plan shall include on the cover sheet a clearly legible overall plan of the project on which are shown in their correct relation to one another all phase or section numbers, all approved or submitted specific design plan numbers, all approved or submitted tree conservation plan numbers, and the number and percentage.

Comment: The specific design plan coversheet contains a clearly legible overall plan of the project. The coversheet does not have the corresponding TCPII numbers because tree

conservation plan numbers are assigned only after applications have been submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the SDP, the coversheet shall be amended to include the TCPII numbers for each companion SDP: SDP-0504, TCPII/71/06; SDP-0514, TCPII/72/06; SDP-0515, TCPII/73/06; SDP-0516, TCPII/74/06 and SDP-0517, TCPII/75/06.

- 24. Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan within the subject property, the applicant shall submit a revised acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and/or DPW&T for signalization at the intersection of MD 223 and Floral Park Road. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the operating agencies. If a signal is deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by that agency. Installation shall include the modification of the southbound approach to provide exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes, and the modification of the eastbound approach to provide exclusive through and left-turn lanes. If it is determined at the time of Specific Design Plan review that certain geometric modifications are not needed for adequacy, the requirement may be waived by the Planning Board during approval of the Specific Design Plan.**

Comment: This condition requires the submittal of a revised traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of MD 223 and Floral Park Road prior to approval of the specific design plan. This has been done.

- 25. Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan within the subject property, the applicant shall submit a revised acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and/or DPW&T for signalization at the intersection of MD 223 and Windbrook Drive. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the operating agencies. If a signal is deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by that agency.**

Comment: This condition requires the submittal of a revised traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of MD 223 and Windbrook Drive prior to approval of the specific design plan. This has been done.

- 26. Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan within the subject property, the applicant shall submit a revised acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and/or DPW&T for signalization at the intersection of MD 223 and the site entrance. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of**

the operating agencies. If a signal is deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by that agency. Installation shall include the construction of the minor street approaches to include exclusive right-turn and shared through/left-turn lanes on each, and the modification of the eastbound approach to provide exclusive through and left-turn lanes along with a second through lane that can be shared with right turns. If it is determined at the time of Specific Design Plan review that the second eastbound through lane is not needed for adequacy, the requirement may be waived by the Planning Board during approval of the Specific Design Plan.

Comment: This condition requires the submittal of a revised traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of MD 223 and the site entrance (i.e., Old Fort Road Extended) prior to approval of the specific design plan. This has been done.

- 27. This Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0504, shall be modified to note that the A-65 facility, as shown on the Subregion V Master Plan, crosses the subject property.**
- a. The CDP shall have a note, which note shall be included on all preliminary plans of subdivision and all specific design plans for the Bevard East property, reciting all points of this condition.**
 - b. Prior to final approval of the record plat for the area of SDP-0516, or any other specific design plan for the property that would contain any right-of-way for A-65, the applicant or successors or assigns shall dedicate all right-of-way necessary for A-65, as negotiated with the M-NCPPC and DPW&T on the Bevard East property. SDP-0516 shall be revised to show this dedication.**
 - c. The applicant or successors or assigns will be required to construct all or a portion of the A-65 highway on the Bevard East property, as determined by DPW&T.**

Comment: As noted above, this plan was approved with wording that plans reflect the A-65 facility through the site. There are currently active discussions to preserve a right-of-way for A-65 between MD 223 and Brandywine Road, and these discussions were not occurring when the preliminary plan was under review. A right-of-way is currently shown on the Villages of Savannah detailed site plan (a.k.a. Saddle Creek), DSP-05036. Also, discussions have occurred with representatives of the Wolfe Farm, Preliminary Plan Of Subdivision 4-04099, and there is agreement between Wolfe Farm and DPW&T on a location for A-65 that will follow the eastern boundary of Wolfe Farm and end in a roundabout bulb, allowing either a curved or a sharp-angled transition onto the Bevard East site.

The submitted plan shows an alignment for the A-65 facility as required by Condition 27 of approved CDP-0504. The following comments are offered:

- a. The alignment shown on the plan is 100 feet in width.
- b. Residences planned to front on this facility would receive driveway access from the rears of the lots. In other words, no individual driveways would access this roadway.
- c. The proposed A-65 alignment would stub into the adjacent Lloyd/Demarr property, Parcel 101, at a location very close to the location shown on the master plan. It enters the property 180 feet south of the master plan location in order to avoid an environmental feature.

In reviewing the A-65 alignment shown on this plan, the Transportation Planning Section finds the following:

- a. The Subregion V Master Plan designates A-65 within Subregion V as “a four- to six-lane divided roadway on a new alignment from the end of the existing road [Old Fort Road] to MD 5.” The plan continues by stating that “the portion of this facility between MD 223 and MD 5 is needed primarily to serve traffic generated by Employment Area H” as designated in the plan.
- b. Employment Area H (also known as Hyde Field), as designated in the Subregion V Master Plan, is to contain over 7,000 jobs. This is well within the range of 6,000 to 9,100 jobs that was assumed as a part of the transportation analysis that was done for the plan. However, the 2002 *General Plan for Prince George’s County* did not designate Employment Area H as either a current or a future center. Therefore, the type of employment density and concentration anticipated by the Subregion V Master Plan would presumably not occur under current countywide policies.
- c. Given the concentration of employment within Employment Area H assumed in the Subregion V Master Plan, the following daily traffic volumes were forecast along the A-65 facility (these are documented in the Transportation Technical Bulletin for the Subregion V Master Plan):

A-65 east of Brandywine Road	28,600
A-65 at Piscataway Creek	23,800
A-65 south of MD 223	22,400
A-65 crossing Tinkers Creek	27,700
A-65 north of Old Fort Road South	27,500

A longstanding table has been used by the Transportation Planning Section for the purpose of determining service levels based upon daily volumes for different types of roadways. This table is provided as Attachment A, and it is page 13 from the *Mellwood Community Traffic Study* done in April 1988. Based on the information in this table compared with the traffic volumes above, the recommendation for A-65 when the

Subregion V Master Plan was prepared would have been for the 120-foot arterial facility. Clearly, the six-lane divided facility would not be needed over most of its length, and projected traffic could be served adequately by a four-lane divided facility. However, portions of A-65 crossing Tinkers Creek and between Brandywine Road and MD 5 would have traffic volumes exceeding the upper limit of Level-of-Service D for a four-lane arterial, 27,500 daily vehicles. These sections would need to consider a six-lane divided facility.

- d. If the Subregion V Master Plan recommendation is based primarily upon more than 7,000 jobs at Employment Area H, and if the arterial designation for A-65 is “primarily to serve traffic generated by Employment Area H,” then if the 2002 General Plan diminishes the importance of Employment Area H to any extent, the daily traffic volumes shown in (3) above would be consequently reduced and the need for the full six-lane arterial would be diminished and should be revisited.

Based upon these findings, the Transportation Planning Section finds that the A-65 facility shown on the subject plan is acceptable. The use of the 100-foot right-of-way versus the 120-foot right-of-way recommended by the master plan is acceptable. Either right-of-way can accommodate the four-lane divided facility that is needed to serve the ultimate future traffic along this section of A-65, as shown by the two DPW&T standards that are provided as Attachments B and C. The use of the major collector standard instead of the arterial standard will allow this roadway to be constructed for a lesser design speed with less gradual curves. Given that this roadway will pass near and through existing and planned communities, utilizing a design that will discourage higher speeds by users is prudent. Furthermore, the use of the roundabout between the Wolfe Farm and Bevard East will contribute to a lower overall vehicle speed while retaining the connectivity function of the roadway facility. The use of the arterial standard along the entire A-65 facility would encourage nonlocal commuter traffic and truck traffic along this roadway, having a profound impact on adjacent communities. Without a demonstrated need to accommodate these types of traffic, the construction of an arterial to the full six-lane standard would not be appropriate and would run counter to county planning policies.

The subject property was the subject of a 2005 traffic study, and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2005 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05050. Given the findings above, the transportation staff finds the plan is consistent with past plans, and recommends approval of this plan at this time.

- 28. The non-standard typical section shown for secondary public streets within the subject property shall be specifically approved by DPW&T in writing prior to Specific Design Plan approval.**

Comment: This condition requires DPW&T approval of the nonstandard section for the

secondary public streets shown in the CDP. The secondary streets have been revised to conform to the county's standard.

29. The Comprehensive Design Plan shall be modified to show that following streets as primary streets, with a final determination of function (i.e., primary or secondary) to be made during review of the preliminary plan of subdivision:

A. The street that is proposed to stub into the adjacent Wolfe Farm property.

Comment: The stub street as shown on the CDP has been removed and replaced with the right-of-way for A-65.

30. The arrangement of townhouses fronting on public streets shall be reviewed with DPW&T and M-NCPPC staff prior to the approval of the preliminary plan. Such an arrangement may not receive preliminary plan approval without the concurrence of DPW&T.

Comment: This condition was reviewed at the time of the preliminary plan and the arrangement was approved as shown on the Specific Design Plan.

9. **Preliminary Plan 4-05050:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05050 was approved by the Planning Board on January 19, 2006. Resolution 6-16 was then adopted by the Planning Board on February 16, 2006, formalizing that approval. The following relevant conditions of approval are included in bold face type below, followed by staff comment:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision the plan shall be revised as follows:

e. Revise the APA map to list the airport.

Comment: The APA map shows the Hyde Field airport.

h. Provide legible lot sizes, bearings and distances. All measurements should be legible.

Comment: The SDP plan does not provide legible bearings and distances and right-of-way widths. The plan must be revised prior to signature approval to address this issue.

j. Label the ultimate right-of-way of each public, private street, and alley.

Comment: Label the ultimate right-of-way of each public, private street, and alley.

k. The alley rights-of-way shall be separated from open space elements between sticks of townhouses.

Comment: This condition has not been fulfilled. For example, on sheet 6 of the SDP the width of the alley on Parcel Y is not provided. It is unclear if the eight-foot asphalt trail running between Lots 15 and 16 on a separate parcel or on Parcel Y, and if it is to be dedicated to DPW&T or the HOA. These plans must be revised prior to signature approval in order to provide a basis for review at the time of final plat.

- l. Add a note that the 10-foot PUE is required outside and abutting the alley right-of-way and cannot be encumbered by structures.**

Comment: The ten-foot PUE should be labeled on all sheets, along all public and private rights-of-way, except alleys where the dwelling fronts on a public street, unless otherwise determined appropriate by Verizon.

- m. In accordance with the DPW&T memorandum of September 19, 2005, which requires minor revisions to the plan to accommodate larger rights-of-way (50 feet to 60 feet) on Public Roads V, Z and L, which are public streets on which townhouses front.**

Comment: The SDP reflects this revision.

- n. Reflect the deletion of the stub street into the Wolfe Farm Subdivision to the south.**

Comment: The District Council approval of the CDP required the preliminary plan and CDP to include a note indicating that master plan road A-65 affects the property. Through the specific design plan, the applicant proffers to provide a 100-foot-wide right-of-way for A-65 through the property to the Wolfe Farm. The stub street as shown on the preliminary plan has been removed and replaced with the right-of-way for A-65.

- 2. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved with the specific design plan.**

Comment: A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted with this application and is discussed in the environmental review section below.

- 3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the Stormwater Management Concept Plan #25955-2005-00 and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: The Type II TCP shows stormwater management facilities to control water quantity and quality for the proposed development. The DER referral indicates that the applicant revised the stormwater management plan and that department has found the site plan to be consistent with the concept approval.

- 14. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Subregion V Master Plan, the**

applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following at the time of Specific Design Plan:

- a. The Subregion V Master Plan designates Thrift Road as a master plan trail/bicycle corridor. Depending on the type of roadway required by the Department of Public Works and Transportation, one of the following shall be provided:
 - (1) If a closed section road is required, the applicant shall construct an eight-foot wide Class II trail along the site's entire road frontage of Thrift Road.**
 - (2) If an open section road is required, the applicant shall provide wide asphalt shoulders along the subject site's entire road frontage of Thrift Road and a financial contribution of \$210.00 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of one "Share The Road With A Bike" sign. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.****
- b. Provide an eight-foot wide asphalt HOA trail from the southernmost cul-de-sac to the proposed trail immediately to the north, in the vicinity of the stormwater management pond.**
- c. Provide an eight-foot wide asphalt HOA trail from one of the cul-de-sacs west of the main stream valley to the main north-south trail that is proposed.**
- d. Provide trails within and to the proposed public park.**
- e. Provide trail connections from the proposed public park to Roulade Place and Mordente Drive.**
- f. Provide a wide asphalt shoulder along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 223 in order to safely accommodate bicycle traffic, unless modified by SHA.**
- g. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**
- h. Provide a connection from Block KK to the internal trail.**

Comment: The trails coordinator reviewed the subject application and provides the following discussion relating to his review in conjunction with the requirements above:

“The Bevard East development consists of 562.85 acres within Subregion V and comprises four submitted specific design plans and a public park. The property is in the vicinity of Cosca Regional Park and Piscataway Creek Stream Valley Park, both of which contain major existing or planned trail facilities. The subject application includes an extensive network of trails within an open space network. The trails shown on the previously approved CDP-0504 and Preliminary Plan 4-05050 are extensive, total over 12,000 linear feet in length, and connect the isolated southern portion of the development with the recreational facilities and the northern residential areas.

“At the time of the approval of the CDP and the preliminary plan, staff recommended two short connector trails linking adjacent culs-de-sac with the proposed trail system. These two trails connect Public Road C (SDP-0504) and Public Road J (SDP-0514) with the planned trail network. These connections would provide additional access to the proposed trail network from surrounding residential areas in locations where direct access is not being proposed. These trails have been reflected on the submitted specific design plans. However, the recreation and conceptual landscape elements plan should be revised to include these connections. Similarly, some trails are not labeled on some sheets and the location gets lost with the topographic lines. The trail network should be consistently marked and labeled on all plans and sheets.

“The following master plan trail facilities impact the subject site:

- “• A proposed bikeway along Thrift Road (SDP-0504).
- “• A proposed trail along A-65.
- “• A proposed trail from A-65 to the planned parkland in the southern portion of the subject site

“The trail along A-65 will be completed at the time of road construction. Regarding Thrift Road, at the time of preliminary plan approval it was determined that the type of trail or bikeway facility implemented would depend upon the type of road improvements required by DPW&T (see Condition 14 of 4-05050). If an open section road is required, the bikeway can be accommodated via bicycle-compatible road improvements and “Share the Road with a Bike” signage. If a closed section road is required, a Class II trail should be provided. It appears that a closed section road will be provided, as a standard sidewalk is shown along the subject site’s frontage on the submitted plans. Staff recommends that an eight-foot-wide, Class II trail be provided along the site’s frontage in place of the standard sidewalk currently shown (SDP-0504).

“The trail to the planned parkland will provide access from the site to planned

M-NCPPC recreation facilities envisioned in the master plan. It appears that this public parkland will be provided at the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Public Road P and MD 223. Staff supports the planned trail locations shown on the specific design plans. Standard sidewalks along internal roads, in conjunction with the internal trails, should ensure adequate pedestrian access to the planned parkland as envisioned in the master plan.

“Staff also supports the trail connections from the proposed public park to the adjacent Mary Catherine Estates community at Roulade Place and Mordente Drive. These pedestrian connections, while not providing for vehicular access, will improve the walkability of the neighborhood and provide needed pedestrian connections from the existing community to the planned parkland. These connections should be considered by DPR and the applicant as the facilities included in the public parkland are determined.

“Due to the density of the proposed development (including townhouses and many single-family lots of less than 10,000 square feet), staff recommends the provision of standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T. This is reflected on the submitted specific design plans.

“In conformance with the approved Subregion V Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide the following:

- “a. Provide a wide asphalt shoulder along the subject site’s entire road frontage of MD 223 in order to safely accommodate bicycle traffic, unless modified by SHA.
- “b. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T. All trails shown on Sheet 1 (cover sheet) of the subject application should be marked and labeled on all 30- and 100-scale sheets in the approved SDP.”

Comment: These conditions are included in the recommendation section of this report.

- 17. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan the applicant shall submit evidence from the Health Department whether an Environmental Site Assessment and testing will be required. If required that applicant shall submit evidence of satisfactory testing with the review of the specific design plan.**

Comment: The applicant submitted evidence from the Health Department prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan that further testing will not be required.

- 19. In accordance with Section 27-548.43 of the Zoning Ordinance and prior to final plat approval the Declaration of Covenants for the property, in conjunction with the**

formation of a homeowners association, shall include language notifying all future contract purchasers of homes in the community of the existence of a general aviation airport. Washington Executive Airport (Hyde Field) is within one mile of the community. The Declaration of Covenants shall include the General Aviation Airport Environmental Disclosure Notice. At the time of purchase contract with homebuyers, the contract purchaser shall sign an acknowledgement of receipt of the Declaration. The liber and folio of the recorded Declaration of Covenants shall be noted on the final plat along with a description of the proximity of the development to the general aviation airport.

- 20. The specific design plan review shall include review for conformance to the regulations of Part 10B Airport Compatibility, Division 1 Aviation Policy Areas of the Zoning Ordinance. The specific design plan shall delineate, at an appropriate scale for review, the impact of the APA policy areas on the site.**

Comment: The SDP coversheet demonstrates that APA 3 and 6 do not impact this site.

- 27. Construction drawings for the recreational facilities on public parkland shall be reviewed and approved by the Park Planning and Development staff prior to certificate approval of the first specific design plan.**

Comment: This condition will also become a condition of this SDP.

- 29. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall make a monetary contribution of a minimum \$2,000,000 toward the construction of the Southern Region Community Center in three phases:**

- a. \$200,000.00 for the design and engineering of the community center shall be paid prior to the issuance of the 50th building permit.**
- b. \$ 900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 200th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).**
- c. \$ 900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 400th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).**

Comment: This condition will also become a condition of this SDP.

- 32. Prior to the issuance of any permits that impact 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. All impacts to sensitive environmental features that require mitigation by state or federal permits shall provide the mitigation using the following priority list: (1) on-site, (2) within the Piscataway Creek Watershed and/or (3) within the Potomac River watershed.

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

“Prior to the issuance of any permits that impact 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. All impacts to sensitive environmental features that require mitigation by state or federal permits shall provide the mitigation using the following priority list: (1) on-site, (2) within the Piscataway Creek Watershed, and/or (3) within the Potomac River watershed.”

- 34. As part of the review of the specific design plan, the landscaping in the 40-foot-wide scenic easement adjacent to the 10-foot public utility easement parallel to the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road and Thrift Road shall be reviewed.**

Comment: The comprehensive design plan required trees to be planted in the 40-foot easement in an orchard-like setting. The SDP satisfies this requirement by proposing ornamental trees to be planted in a grid pattern similar to orchard planting. However, there are a few areas where the grid pattern breaks down. Prior to signature approval, the landscape plan shall be revised to fill in those areas with additional trees planted in the grid pattern.

In addition, trees proposed, Malus “Spring Snow,” are susceptible to scab problems. These trees should be replaced with trees less susceptible to scab.

10. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject SDP is in general compliance with Sections 27-514.08 through Section 27-515, Purposes, Uses, Regulations, Minimum Size Exceptions and Uses Permitted of the Zoning Ordinance for Development in the R-L (Residential Low) Comprehensive Design Zone.
11. **Landscape Manual:** The project is subject to the Landscape Manual provisions for Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets. Staff has evaluated the submitted landscape plans according to the relevant provisions of the Landscape Manual and found the plans to be basically in compliance, but that the appropriate schedules should be added to the plans.
12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site has previously approved tree conservation plans. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/53/04, was approved with Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504. A revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan,

TCPI/53/04-01, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-05050. The approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/53/04-01 requires that all woodland conservation for the project be done on-site. Additionally, because this is a comprehensive design zone, no woodland preserved on small lots may be used to meet any requirement of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

The Bevard East project consists of five phases of development. Each phase has an individual Type II tree conservation plan. The sum of the phases must meet the total requirements on-site. An individual phase is not required to fully meet its own requirement. The phased worksheet is shown on sheet 2 of 14. Until all individual TCP plans have been approved, the phased worksheet is used as a reference to monitor compliance of the project with the approved Type I TCP. If any particular TCPII is not approved, the overall development will still retain compliance with the Type II TCP because clearing of woodland would be reduced and additional woodland would be retained on-site.

The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/72/06, has been reviewed and was found to require revisions. This phase contains 169.65 acres of the 562.85-acre project. The plan proposes clearing 33.40 acres of the existing 109.85 acres of upland woodland, clearing 0.48 acre of the 8.13 acres of woodland within the 100-year floodplain, and no clearing off-site. The threshold for this phase is 40.31 acres and this phase of the project proposes 74.18 acres of on-site preservation and 6.71 acres of on-site planting.

Because this is a comprehensive design zone and the residential lots are small, no portion of any lot should be encumbered with a restrictive easement. Woodland conservation areas are restrictive because they severely limit the use of the land. Overall, the plan fulfills the goals of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and the Green Infrastructure Plan by providing for the conservation of large contiguous woodlands along the stream valleys. Some technical changes should be made.

On most sheets, the tree protection fences are located only along the boundaries of woodlands that are to be retained as woodland conservation areas; however, the tree protection fences should be located along the proposed limits of disturbance and not between woodlands retained but not part of any requirement and woodlands retained as designated woodland conservation areas. All areas within the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road must be calculated as cleared. There is a detail showing permanent fencing to be placed along planting areas; however, the location of the fencing is not shown in the legend or on the plans. Because there are significant areas that will need to be planted, the timing of planting these areas is a concern. The proposed limits of disturbance are missing from some sheets. Sheets 8 and 21 of 24 show off-site clearing; however, this does not appear in the worksheet. The planting tables indicate the use of eastern hemlock; however, this species does not survive well in the area because of insect problems. A portion of woodland conservation area E is shown to be cleared on sheet 11. Sheet 12 shows a trail alignment that requires changes as part of SDP-0517. All required woodland conservation should be provided on-site. As noted previously, clearing for impacts not approved during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan 4-05050 must be eliminated. All lots must show minimum 40-foot cleared areas behind each structure in order to provide adequate outdoor

activity areas.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to:

- a. Ensure that all tree protection fences are located only where appropriate
- b. Show the permanent fencing for planting areas in the legend and on the plans
- c. Ensure that the limits of disturbance are correctly shown on all sheets
- d. Include all off-site clearing in the worksheet
- e. Substitute a suitable evergreen for eastern hemlock in the planting tables
- f. Provide minimum 40-foot cleared areas at the rear of every structure
- g. Calculate all woodlands on lots less than 20,000 square feet in area as cleared
- h. Calculate all woodland within the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road as cleared
- i. Add a pattern to the legend and the plan to indicate all areas of woodland retained but calculated as cleared
- j. Revise the boundary of woodland conservation area E on sheet I1 to follow the limits of disturbance
- k. Revise the worksheet as needed
- l. Add the following note to each sheet of the TCPII that shows reforestation/afforestation areas:

“All reforestation/afforestation areas adjacent to lots and split rail fencing along the outer edge of all reforestation/afforestation areas shall be installed prior to the Building Permits for the adjacent lots. A certification prepared by a qualified professional may be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation 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.”
- m. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

Comment: The conditions above have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

13. 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, because trees do not exist. The townhouses are designed as front and rear loaded garages served by alleys.
 - (B) The townhouses front on public streets, where possible, and private streets in other areas.
 - (C) The townhouses are located away from the recreational facilities so there is no need for buffering of the rear of units.
 - (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 fenestration. However, prior to the issuance of any building permits for the townhouse units, the permit drawings shall include the proposed front elevations for each building stick for review and approval by the Urban Design Section.
 - (E) The plan provides for alley-served townhouse units.
 - (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 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.

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

Historic Preservation—In comments dated February 28, 2006, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no effects on historic resources.

Archeological Review—In comments dated March 20, 2006, the staff archeologist stated that Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations were completed on the above-referenced property and the draft report (which included Bevard East, West and North) was received on July 13, 2005, and comments were sent to the archeology consultant URS, by Donald Creveling,

Archeology Program Manager, M-NCPPC Natural and Historical Resources Division, Department of Parks and Recreation, in a letter dated October 17, 2005. Four copies of the final report were received by the Planning Department on February 17, 2006. Four historic and two prehistoric archeological sites (18PR774, 18PR775, 18PR776, 18PR777, 18PR778, 18PR779) were identified on the entire Bevard property (North, West, and East). All the archeological sites were determined to be disturbed or too minor to be considered significant. No further archeological work is required on the subject property. However, additional work may be required by the Maryland Historical Trust as part of the Section 106 process. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, to include archeological sites. This review is required when federal monies, federal properties, or federal permits are required for a project.

Community Planning—The following was provided from the Community Planning Division for this case:

- This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier.
- This application is generally in conformance with the suburban estate and low density planned neighborhood land use recommendations of the 1993 Subregion V Approved Master Plan and SMA.

Transportation—In comments dated July 21, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section discussed the alignments of A-65 as shown on the plan. (See the discussion of CDP Condition No. 27).

Subdivision—The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-05050, approved by the Planning Board on January 19, 2006. The resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution 06-16(C) was adopted on February 16, 2006. The preliminary plan remains valid until February 16, 2012, or until final record plat(s) are approved. The following comments were provided by the Subdivision Section in review of the subject plans:

- a. Section 27-195(c)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance, specifically Map Amendment Approval, requires that all building permit plans shall list the condition(s) and should show how the proposed development complies with them. The SDP does not provide reference to the approved map amendment (A-9967) nor does the plan list the conditions of that approval as required.
- b. The “lot size” chart should be revised to include the “large lot component” of Phase I.
- c. Add a note stating that development of this property shall conform to A-9967 and CDP-0504.

- d. Revise the regulation table to correspond to lot numbers, to allow for the verification of conformance to the percentage maximums (townhouses vs. singles), and standards proposed.
- e. Each sheet of the SDP should label the parcel and lot numbers shown on that sheet and provide the acreage including the HOA parcels.
- f. The font size should be increased to ensure that site plans that are microfilmed and copied are legible.
- g. Remove the “M-NCPPC Approval” box from the approval sheet; these plans will be affixed with a certificate of approval.
- h. Each lot should be reviewed to ensure conformance to the development standards established by the approved CDP.

Comment: These referral comments should be addressed to ensure that the SDP(s) is in substantial conformance to the approved preliminary plan of subdivision. These items have been added as conditions of approval of the plans.

Parks—In comments dated April 14, 2006, the Department of Parks and Recreation stated that while there are no parks and recreation issues associated with the subject specific design plan, Condition 4 of the approving resolution for Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504 requires approval of construction drawings for the park to be approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation prior to certificate approval of the first specific design plan for the overall project. Urban Design staff has included a recommended condition to this effect below.

Public Facilities—In a memorandum, undated, Harrell to Lareuse, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section have reviewed this specific design plan. In accordance with the provisions of Section 27.528 (a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance which specifically states:

That 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.

Fire and Rescue

The Prince George’s County Planning Department determined at the time of Preliminary Plan 4-5050, the property is within the required 7-minute response time for the first due fire station Company 25 Clinton, using the 7 Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department. Lots Block KK Lots 1-91 and Block LL Lots 1-8, are beyond response time standards.

The required fire and rescue facilities have been determined to be inadequate and the applicant

was required to provide a public safety mitigation fee to address the excessive response time for fire and rescue services.

Police Facilities

The Prince George’s County Planning Department has determined the plan is located in District IV, Oxon Hill. The standard for emergency calls response is 10 minutes and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The test is based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The specific detailed site plan application was accepted for processing by the Planning Department on February 27, 2006.

	Date	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency Calls
Acceptance Date	1/05/05–1/27/06	11 minutes	23 minutes

The police and fire and rescue service response time requirements for emergency calls were not met, and a public safety mitigation fee was assessed at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, which was filed on July 28, 2005. The actual fee to be paid will depend upon the year the grading permit is issued and is subject to an adjustment on an annual basis in accordance with the percentage change in the Consumer Price Index for all urban Consumers

Environmental Planning—The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of SDP-0514 and TCPII/72/06 subject to conditions.

The Environmental Planning Section notes that portions of this site have been reviewed as applications SE-1823, SE-3266 and SE-3755 that were for the mining of sand and gravel. Preliminary Plan 4-04063 and TCPI/77/04 were withdrawn before being heard by the Planning Board. An application for rezoning, A-9967, was approved with conditions by PGCPB Resolution No. 05-233. The Planning Board approved a Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0504, and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/53/04, with conditions. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/53/04 have not been certified because final District Council action is pending. The Planning Board approved a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-05050, and a revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/53/04-01, with conditions. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05050 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/53/04-01 have been signed. Five specific design plans that contain the entire Bevard East project are under concurrent review.

This phase contains 195.97 acres of the 562.85-acre property in the R-A Zone and is located between Piscataway Road and Thrift Road, north of Windbrook Drive. There are streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplains and associated areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils and areas of severe slopes on the property. There are no nearby existing sources of traffic-generated noise; however, two master plan arterial roads, A-54 and A-65, could impact the property. The proposed development is not a noise generator.

Environmental Review

As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

- a. According to the “Prince George’s County Soil Survey,” the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Chillum, Croom, Iuka, Matapeake, Rumford, Sassafra and Westphalia soils series; however, portions of the site were mined for sand and gravel after the publication of the “Prince George’s County Soil Survey,” Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Portions of this site have been mined for sand and gravel as approved by applications SE-1823, SE-3266 and SE-3755. These gravel pit areas are of concern. Due to the unknown nature of the soils and the limitations associated with these areas, a soils report addressing the soil structure, soil characteristics, and foundation stability was submitted and reviewed. The limits of previous mining are shown on the approved natural resources inventory.

The soils report shows the locations of 80 boreholes, includes logs of the materials found, notes the findings of tests of samples collected, provides an overview of the findings and recommends mitigation measures for problem areas.

The site is generally suitable for the proposed development. Specific mitigation measures will be further analyzed during the development process by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission for installation of water and sewer lines, by the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the installation of streets, and by the Department of Environmental Resources for the installation of stormwater management facilities, general site grading, and foundations.

Comment: This information is provided for the applicant’s benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this specific design plan review. Additional soils reports may be required by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, the Department of Public Works and Transportation, and the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources during the permit review process.

- b. This site contains natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The Subregion V Master Plan indicates that there are substantial areas designated as natural reserve on the site. As noted on page 136 of the Subregion V Master Plan:

“The Natural Reserve Area is composed of areas having physical features which exhibit severe constraints to development or which are important to sensitive ecological systems. Natural Reserve Areas must be preserved in their natural state.”

The Subregion V Master Plan elaborates on page 139:

“The Natural Reserve Areas, containing floodplain and other areas unsuitable for development should be restricted from development except for agricultural, recreational and other similar uses. Land grading should be discouraged. When disturbance is permitted, all necessary conditions should be imposed.”

For the purposes of this review, the natural reserve includes all expanded stream buffers and isolated wetlands and their buffers. A wetland study and plan were submitted with the application. All streams shown as perennial or intermittent on the plans require minimum 50-foot stream buffers that shall be expanded in accordance with Section 24-130(b)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations. A natural resources inventory is required to show all regulated buffers. A natural resources inventory, NRI/40/05, has been signed and the expanded stream buffers are accurately depicted on the Type II tree conservation plan. Of the 562.85 acres of the entire Bevard East project, approximately 104 acres are within expanded stream buffers.

Impacts to significant environmental features that are required to be protected by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations are proposed. The design should avoid any impacts to streams, wetlands or their associated buffers unless the impacts are essential for the development as a whole. Staff will generally not support impacts to sensitive environmental features that are not associated with essential development activities. Essential development includes such features as public utility lines (including sewer and stormwater outfalls), street crossings, and so forth, which are mandated for public health and safety; nonessential activities are those, such as grading for lots, stormwater management ponds, parking areas, and so forth, which do not relate directly to public health, safety or welfare. Impacts to sensitive environmental features require variations to the Subdivision Regulations.

Variation requests with exhibits for 18 impacts were received on January 9, 2005 and reviewed with Preliminary Plan 4-05050. Of the 18 requests, 9 were fully approved, 7 were approved in part and 1 was denied by the Planning Board. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/53/04-01, was revised prior to signature to reflect the Planning Board decision.

The impacts shown on the SDP are **not** consistent with those that were granted variation request by the Planning Board during the approval of Preliminary Plan 4-05050. On sheet 4 of 21, grading is shown northeast of proposed Lot 1; however, this impact was specifically denied by the Planning Board during the review of plan 4-05050. There is an impact for a trail shown on sheet 18 of 21; however, no variation request for this impact was requested during the review of plan 4-05050. On sheet 6 of 21, there are impacts created by a trail alignment indicated on the Phase 4 portion of site; however, no

variation request for this impact was requested during the review of plan 4-05050.

Because this is a comprehensive design zone and the residential lots are small, no portion of any lot should be encumbered with a restrictive easement. Conservation easements are restrictive because they severely limit the use of the land.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the specific design plan, the SDP and Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised to eliminate all impacts for which variation requests were not approved during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan 4-05050.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the SDP, the SDP and TCPII shall be revised to revise all lots less than 20,000 square feet in area to ensure that no portion of any of the lot would be encumbered by a conservation easement.

- c. Piscataway Road is the nearest source of traffic-generated noise and is designated as an arterial in the Subregion V Master Plan. Section 24-121(a)(4) requires that residential lots adjacent to existing or planned roadways of arterial classification or higher be platted to a minimum depth of 150 feet and that adequate protection and screening from traffic nuisances be provided by earthen berms, plant materials, fencing, and/or the establishment of a building restriction line for new residential structures.

The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour will be about 168 feet from the centerline of Piscataway Road in ten years. Based upon dedication of 60 feet from the centerline of existing Piscataway Road, the predicted 65 dBA Ldn contour is approximately 118 feet from the edge of the proposed right-of-way and clearly not impacting any proposed lot within the phase of the development. No further action regarding traffic-generated noise is required with regard to this specific design plan.

Recommended condition: Prior to certification, SDP and TCPII shall be revised to show the 65dBA noise contour at 168 feet from the centerline of Piscataway Road.

- d. Piscataway Road and Thrift Road are designated scenic roads. As required by Condition 16 of CDP-0504, the scenic easements are shown on the SDP and TCPII. No further action regarding scenic roads is required with regard to this specific design plan.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)— In comments dated May 24, 2004, DER stated that the site plan for Bevard East, Phase 4 is consistent with the revised Stormwater Concept 25955-2005-01.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—In comments dated March 17, 2006, DPW&T noted:

- The plan was unacceptable because it does not show the alignment of the proposed A-65

roadway as shown on the master plan.

Comment: This requirement has been addressed since the DPW&T referral was written.

- Old Fort Road East (A-65) is a proposed arterial roadway with a hiker/biker trail and that its extension would be required, together with right-of-way dedication and construction from MD 223 to Thrift Road.
- Such construction would have to be designed in accordance with DPW&T's standards and specifications for an urban arterial road.
- The proposed development includes access from Thrift Road, MD 223, and Tippett Road. Noting that Thrift Road is a proposed scenic rural two-lane collector, they stated that right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements would be required in accordance with DPW&T's standards for a scenic and historic rural two-lane collector road. They also mentioned that right-of way dedication and roadway improvements would be required along Tippett Road, designed in accordance with DPW&T's standards for its classification as a primary residential road.
- Adequate turnaround would have to be constructed at the end of Roulade Place and Mordente Drive would have to be provided.
- An access study would have to be made by the applicant and reviewed by them to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
- Conformance with street tree and lighting standards would be required.
- Sidewalks would be required along all roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.
- All storm drainage systems and facilities would have to be designed in accordance with DPW&T's and DER's requirements.
- Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments and coordination with the various utility companies would be required.
- A detailed review of subdivision roadways at time of detailed site plan review.
- All improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county must be designed in accordance with the county's Road Ordinance, DPW&T's Specifications and Standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Installation of a traffic signal at the intersection of MD 223 and the access road to the

subdivision is required, if warranted. If the signal is not currently warranted, a full signal installation fee-in-lieu contribution from the developer for future installation of a signal will be required.

- A soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for Thrift Road, Tippet Road, and the proposed subdivision streets is required.

Specifically, with respect to the subject phase of the Bevard project, DPW&T offered the following:

- On Drawing 7 of 18, at the intersection of Public Road A and Thrift Road, adequate intersection sight distance must be provided based on the AASHTO criteria.
- On Drawing 10 of 18, at the intersection of Public Road B and Thrift Road, adequate intersection sight distance must be provided based on the AASHTO criteria.

Comment: Please note that DPW&T's requirements are enforced through its separate permitting requirements.

15. As required by Section 27-528 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board must make the following findings prior to approval of the specific design plan:

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

Comment: SDP-0516 conforms to the requirements of approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0504 as approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-269 and the applicable standards of the *Landscape Manual*.

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

Comment: In comments dated July 21, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the requirements for approval of this plan at this time are met in regard to the roadway systems for the subject property. In comments from the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section, they found that the fire and rescue and the police facilities were determined to be adequate through mitigation requirements at the time of preliminary plan. Therefore, the subject project will not affect the previous finding that 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.

- (3) Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no**

adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.

Comment: In revised comments dated May 24, 2006, the Department of Environmental Resources stated that the subject project is consistent with revised stormwater concept #25955-2005-01. Therefore, it may be said that the adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.

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

Comment: In comments dated June 1, 2006, the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of Tree Conservation Plan II/72/06, subject to conditions. Such conditions have been included in the recommendation section of this report. Therefore, it may be said that the specific design plan is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

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 (TCPII72/06), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0516 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the following revisions to the plans shall be made:
 - a. Identify on the coversheet that all single-family detached units on corner lots shall be constructed having a minimum of three end-wall features on the end wall visible from the street.
 - b. Identify on the coversheet that all highly visible townhouse units shall be constructed with a minimum of three end-wall features and that the end wall shall be brick. Where a brick end-wall is required, the front façade shall also be brick.
 - c. The coversheet shall be revised to include all of the information listed in the CDP development standards.
 - d. The template sheet shall be revised to include the height and number of stories for each model type (not to exceed the CDP maximum height of 40 feet) and the dimensions and all the options for each model.
 - e. Provide legible lot sizes, bearings and distances, and all dimensions of site improvements.
 - f. Identify all garages and number of spaces.

- g. Provide a parking schedule on the cover sheet listing all required and proposed parking for the townhouse portion of development, and adjust the plan accordingly.
 - h. Identify all handicap accessible parking.
 - i. The alley rights-of-way shall be separated from open space parcels between sticks of townhouses.
 - j. The ten-foot-wide public utility easement should be labeled on all sheets along all public and private rights-of-way, as required by the public utility company.
 - k. Demonstrate all floodplain areas on the site plan.
 - l. Demonstrate the 25-foot setback from the floodplain on the site plan.
 - m. The plans shall provide for additional landscaping around storm water management facilities
 - n. The landscape plans shall be revised so that the orchard-like planting along Piscataway Road is continuous and in a grid pattern.
 - o. Provide Section 4.1 landscape schedules on the landscape plans.
 - p. The landscape plans shall be revised to replace the Malus “Spring Snow” with a variety less susceptible to disease.
 - q. Add a note stating that development of this property shall conform to A-9967 and CDP-0504.
 - r. Each sheet of the SDP shall label the parcel and lot numbers shown on that sheet and provide the acreage including the HOA parcels.
 - s. The font size shall be increased to ensure that site plans that are microfilmed and copied are legible.
 - t. The “M-NCPPC Approval” box shall be removed from the approval sheet; these plans will be affixed with a certificate of approval.
 - u. The approval sheet shall include the conditions of the Basic Plan, A-9967.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits:
- a. A detailed site plan revision shall be submitted for the central recreational area, which includes the architectural elevations and floor plans, and all of the recreational facilities demonstrating conformance to the Parks and Recreation Guidelines.

- b. Each lot should be reviewed to ensure conformance to the development standards established by the approved CDP.
 - c. For the single-family detached dwellings, the architectural elevations shall be approved by the Planning Board in a separate umbrella architecture specific design plan (SDP-0605).
 - d. The plans shall be revised to add a tracking chart that demonstrates 60 percent of the townhouses and the single-family detached units will have brick fronts.
 - e. For the single-family attached units, the permit drawings shall include the proposed front elevations for each building stick for review and approval by the Urban Design Section, as designee of the Planning Board. The plans shall demonstrate a variety of model types sufficient to define each unit individually through the use of variation in roofline, window and door treatment.
 - f. Provide a chart to demonstrate the percentage of lot coverage on the site plans and a chart for yard area for the single-family attached lots.
 - g. Provide all the setbacks and distances from the dwellings to the property lines for the single-family detached units.
3. Prior to signature approval of this SDP and final plat, the feasibility of installing traffic calming measures and crosswalks at the following locations shall be determined in consultation between the applicant and the appropriate transportation agency, either SHA or DPW&T:

MD 223/Windbrook Drive
MD 223/Mary Catherine Drive
MD 223/entrance to Bevard North/Bevard East

The applicant shall be required to install any traffic calming measures and crosswalks that are deemed to be feasible and appropriate by the operating agencies. The result of such discussions shall be provided to planning staff in writing, and any required improvements shall be added as a note on any final plat.

- 4. The applicant shall dedicate to M-NCPPC 14± acres of developable land for future parkland at the time of the first final plat of subdivision for the overall project.
- 5. Prior to final plat, the applicant shall obtain signature approval of the specific design plan, signature approval of the basic plan, and signature approval of the comprehensive design plan.
- 6. Prior to signature approval of the plans, construction drawings for the recreational facilities on public parkland shall be reviewed and approved by the Park Planning and Development Division.

7. Prior to submission of any final plats of subdivision:
 - a. The applicant shall enter into a public Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA) with M-NCPPC for the construction of recreation facilities on parkland. The applicant shall submit three original executed RFAs to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for their approval three weeks prior to the submission of the final plats. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County.
 - b. The applicant shall enter into a private RFA with M-NCPPC for the construction of recreation facilities on HOA lands. The applicant shall submit three original executed RFAs to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for their approval three weeks prior to the submission of the final plats. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County.
8. The applicant shall submit to DPR or DRD a performance bond, a letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of the public and private recreation facilities, as appropriate, in the amount to be determined by DPR or DRD, at least two weeks prior to issuance of grading permits, for either the public or private lands.
9. The recreational facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the 50th building permit for the overall site.
10. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall make a monetary contribution of a minimum \$2,000,000 toward the construction of the Southern Region Community Center in three phases:
 - a. \$200,000.00 for the design and engineering of the community center shall be paid prior to the issuance of the 50th building permit.
 - b. \$900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 200th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
 - c. \$900,000.00 for the construction of the community center shall be paid prior to issuance of the 400th building permit. Beginning from the date of issuance of the 50th building permit, this amount shall be adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI).
11. Prior to signature approval, the architectural elevations for the townhouses shall be modified as follows:
 - a. Each model shall be revised so that the end wall will have a minimum of three

architectural features such as windows, doors or masonry fireplace chimneys, and these features shall form a reasonably balanced and harmonious composition and shall have front facades and the end wall with brick.

- b. A standard deck shall be provided on all rear load garage townhouse units.
12. In conformance with the approved Subregion V Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:
 - a. Provide a wide shoulder along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 223 in order to safely accommodate bicycle traffic, unless modified by SHA.
 - b. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T. All trails shown on Sheet 1 (cover sheet) of the subject application shall be marked and labeled on all 30- and 100-scale sheets in the approved SDP.
 13. Prior to certification of the SDP, the coversheet shall be amended to include the TCPII numbers for each companion SDP: SDP-0504, TCPII/71/06; SDP-0514, TCPII/72/06; SDP-0515, TCPII/73/06; SDP-0516, TCPII/74/06 and SDP-0517, TCPII/75/06.
 14. Prior to certification of the SDP or TCPII, a revision to Stormwater Management Concept Plan #25955-2005-00, allowing for the proposed changes, must be obtained from the Prince George's Department of Environmental Resources.
 15. The following note shall be placed on each final plat:

“Prior to the issuance of any permits that impact 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. All impacts to sensitive environmental features that require mitigation by state or federal permits shall provide the mitigation using the following priority list: (1) on-site, (2) within the Piscataway Creek Watershed and/or (3) within the Potomac River watershed.”
 16. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the SDP and Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to eliminate all impacts not approved during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan 4-05050.
 17. Prior to certification of the SDP, the SDP and TCPII shall be revised to revise all lots less than 20,000 square feet in area to ensure that no portion of any of the lots would be encumbered by a conservation easement.
 18. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to:

- a. Ensure that all tree protection fences are located only where appropriate
 - b. Show the permanent fencing for planting areas in the legend and on the plans
 - c. Ensure that the limits of disturbance are correctly shown on all sheets
 - d. Include all off-site clearing in the worksheet
 - e. Substitute a suitable evergreen for eastern hemlock in the planting tables
 - f. Provide minimum 40-foot cleared areas at the rear of every structure
 - g. Calculate all woodlands on lots less than 20,000 square feet in area as cleared
 - h. Calculate all woodland within the land to be dedicated for Piscataway Road as cleared
 - i. Add a pattern to the legend and the plan to indicate all areas of woodland retained but calculated as cleared
 - j. Revise the boundary of woodland conservation area E on sheet 11 to follow the limits of disturbance
 - k. Revise the worksheet as needed
 - l. Add the following note to each sheet of the TCPII that show reforestation/afforestation areas:

“All reforestation/afforestation areas adjacent to lots and split rail fencing along the outer edge of all reforestation/afforestation areas shall be installed prior to the Building Permits for the adjacent lots. A certification prepared by a qualified professional may be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation 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.”
 - m. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
19. At the time of purchase contract with homebuyers, the contract purchaser shall sign an acknowledgment of receipt of the airport disclosure.
 20. No structure within APA 6 shall be higher than 50 feet.

21. No two houses directly adjacent to each other or across the street from one another shall have the same elevation.
22. All single-family detached dwellings shall not be less than 2,200 square feet of finished living area.
23. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to conform to the conceptual stormwater management approval, or the stormwater management plan shall be revised to conform to the subject plan.

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, July 27, 2006 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of September.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:bjs