

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on November 29, 2007, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07044 for Addition to Townsend Subdivision, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is a request for the approval of two single-family detached units on two lots within the Townsend Subdivision.
2. **Location and Surroundings:** The property is located north of Dangerfield Place at the terminus of Francesca Drive, approximately 450 feet west of its intersection with Delphi Drive. The subject site is surrounded by the Killiecrankie Neighborhood Playground, an M-NCPPC-owned park in the R-R Zone to the north, and single-family detached homes in the R-R Zone to the south, east and west. Further to the south is Dangerfield Place.
3. **Previous Approvals:** Preliminary Plan 4-04092 was approved for this property by the Prince George's County Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-212) on October 7, 2004, subject to 16 conditions. Final plats for the subject lots were recorded in Plat Book 213, Plat 20 on June 8, 2006.
4. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-R	R-R
Use(s)	Vacant	Single-family Detached
Acreage	1.94	1.94
Lots	2	2
Dwelling Units	0	2

5. **Design Features:** The subject detailed site plan proposes two single-family detached units on two lots east of existing Francesca Drive. The two lots will be accessed via an extension of Francesca Drive. Lot 1 is designed as a flag lot and is substantially larger than Lots 2, 3 and 4, which are immediately adjacent to the eastern property line of Lot 1. The applicant has proposed the retention of existing, mature woodland along this property line. Additional landscaping is proposed along the southern property line of Lot 1, adjacent to the rear yards of existing single-family detached homes and also between Lots 1 and 2, north of the access drive for Lot 1.

Architecture is not part of the subject application because the review is limited to the relationship between Lots 1 and 2, landscaping and house siting.

6. **Conformance to Preliminary Plan 4-04092:** The detailed site plan is in conformance with the approved preliminary plan. The following conditions of approval are applicable to the review of this detailed site plan and warrant discussion as follows:

8. **Development of this property shall be in conformance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, #7797-2004-00, and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: The subject detailed site plan has an approved stormwater management concept plan, 7797-2004-02, which will be valid through February 14, 2009. This revision to the stormwater management concept plan deleted the on-site stormwater management facilities and a fee-in-lieu of on-site stormwater management will be provided. In accordance with the most recent revision to the stormwater management concept plan, stormwater management facilities are not shown on the subject detailed site plan. Therefore, the proposed development is in accordance with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 7797-2004-00.

11. **Prior to the issuance of building permits, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board for Lot 1 (flag lot), Lot 2, and Parcel B. The review shall ensure a harmonious relationship is created between the flag lot (Lot 1), the stormwater management facility on Parcel B, and Lot 2 consistent with Applicant Exhibit A. Review shall include house siting, landscaping, fencing (if appropriate), and driveway layout. A limited detailed site plan shall also be required for views of the stormwater management facility on Parcel A. The limited detailed site plan for Parcel A, unlike for Parcel B, may be approved by the Planning Board or designee.**

Comment: In a memorandum dated October 23, 2007, the Subdivision Section indicated that pursuant to a revision to the approved stormwater concept plan, at the time of final plat, the two stormwater management facilities referenced in the above condition were no longer required. Therefore, Parcel B was deleted and the portion of the above condition that refers to Parcel B and views of the stormwater management facility on Parcel A are no longer applicable. However the relationship of Lots 1 and 2 remains relevant. Applicant Exhibit A showed the unit on Lot 1 oriented toward the stormwater management facility on Parcel B in an effort to provide open views of the pond. Since this facility is no longer proposed, the preservation of open views is no longer necessary. Therefore, the unit has been shifted slightly and is now shown with a more typical orientation toward the street. The proposed orientation would result in a more usable front and rear yard than would have been provided pursuant to Applicant Exhibit A. Landscaping is proposed in excess of what was shown on Applicant Exhibit A between Lot 1 and the existing single-family homes to the south to ensure that the rear yards of these units are effectively screened. In addition, an approximately 85-foot-wide strip of existing, mature woodland is proposed to be retained between the front of the unit on Lot 1 and the rear of the unit on Lot 2. This is greatly in excess of what was proposed by Applicant Exhibit A, which proposed the clearing of this woodland and replacement with a Type A bufferyard (10-foot-wide landscaped

yard). The proposed combination of house siting and landscaping will ensure that a harmonious relationship is created between Lot 1, Lot 2, and the single-family detached residences to the south. See Finding 9 below for a detailed discussion of the proposed development's conformance to the landscaping requirements for flag lot development set forth by the Subdivision Regulations.

7. **Conformance to the Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application is in conformance with Section 27-428, R-R Zone; 27-441(b), Table of Uses for the R-R Zone; and 27-442, Regulations for the R-R Zone.
8. **Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. According to Section 4.1(a), Lot 1 is required to be planted with a minimum of four shade trees and three ornamental or evergreen trees. The site plan proposes six shade trees, four ornamental trees, and 18 evergreen trees. According to Section 4.1(b), Lot 2 is required to be planted with a minimum of three shade trees and two ornamental or evergreen trees. The site plan proposes three shade trees, two ornamental trees, and seven evergreens. Although the subject detailed site plan is in conformance with the applicable requirements of the *Landscape Manual*, the applicant has proposed a total of 13 Eastern White Pines, a widely overplanted species. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require the planting of a wider variety of evergreen species.
9. **Conformance to the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations regarding flag lot development:** In accordance with Section 24-138.01(d)(6), a Type A bufferyard is required where a rear yard is oriented toward a driveway that accesses other lots. Therefore, a Type A bufferyard is required along the southern property line of Lot 2, adjacent to the access drive for Lot 1 and also along the southern property line of Lot 1 where the drive is adjacent to the rear yards of existing single-family dwellings. The plans provide a Type A bufferyard in both locations. The bufferyard adjacent to the single-family detached homes to the south is planted with 25 plant units in excess of what is required by the *Landscape Manual* for a Type A bufferyard.

In accordance with Section 24-138.01(c)(7), a Type C bufferyard is required in flag lot development where a front yard is oriented toward a rear yard. Therefore, a Type C bufferyard is required where the front of the unit proposed on Lot 1 is oriented toward the rear yard of the unit on Lot 2.

The applicant is proposing the retention of an approximately 85-foot-wide strip of existing woodland in this location (55 feet in excess of the 30-foot landscape strip required by the *Landscape Manual* for a Type C bufferyard) and has appropriately designated 30 feet of this strip of woodland as a Type C bufferyard. Therefore, the subject detailed site plan is in conformance with the above requirements for flag lot development and will ensure that a harmonious relationship is created between Lot 1, Lot 2, and the existing single-family detached homes to the south of Lot 1.

10. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is greater than 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and it has a previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/83/06. In a memorandum dated September 24, 2007, the Environmental Planning Section indicated that the landscaping proposed is consistent with the approved TCPII.
11. **Referrals:**
 - a. **Subdivision Section:** In a memorandum dated October 23, 2007, the Subdivision Section indicated that the site is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-04092, which was approved for eight lots and two parcels. A final plat was recorded on June 8, 2006, for the subject property, which differed from the preliminary plan in that two stormwater management ponds on Parcels A and B were no longer required. As a result, Parcel B was deleted. The subdivision planner indicated that the lotting pattern shown on this limited DSP is consistent with the record plat.
 - b. **Permit Review Section:** In a memorandum dated October 8, 2007, the Permit Review Section offered several comments that are either not applicable at this time or have been incorporated as conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.
 - c. **Transportation Planning Section:** In a referral response dated September 21, 2007, the Transportation Planning Section indicated that the proposed transportation-related improvements, as submitted in the subject application, are acceptable.
 - d. **Department of Parks and Recreation:** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comment has not been received from the Department of Parks and Recreation.
 - e. **The Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T):** At the time of the writing of the staff report, comment has not been received from DPW&T.
12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 Detailed Site Plan DSP-07044, subject to the following condition:

Prior to certification, the following revisions to the detailed site plan shall be made or the specified information shall be provided:

- a. Replace four (4) of the proposed Eastern white pines with one or more alternative evergreen species to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
- b. Provide the dimensions of each driveway.
- c. Label the setback distances from all property lines.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Cavitt, with Commissioners Squire, Cavitt, Vaughns, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 29, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20th day of December 2007.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator