



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Preliminary Plan 4-07011

Application	General Data
Project Name: TOWN CENTER AT CAMP SPRINGS LOTS 333-361 Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Auth Way and Telfair Boulevard. Applicant/Address: Auth Way Land, LLC. 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite #601 Vienna, Virginia 22182 Property Owner: Town Center At Camp Springs Homeowners Assoc.	Date Accepted: 6/18/07
	Planning Board Action Limit: 12/06/07
	Plan Acreage: 47.25
	Zone: M-X-T
	Lots: 29
	Parcels: 0
	Planning Area: 76A
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 09
	Election District: 06
Municipality: N/A	
200-Scale Base Map: 206SE05	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
29 Townhouse Lots	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-58-2003) 03/30/07
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 10/30/07

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Tom Lockard	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07011
Town Center at Camp Springs Lots 333-361

OVERVIEW

The subject property was previously zoned R-R and I-1 and was known as the Capital Gateway Office Park. The property had a preliminary plan approved in 1990 (4-90037) and was subsequently approved and recorded as final plats of subdivision. The property was rough graded and infrastructure was placed on the site, including stormwater management, the main loop road (known as Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive), and street trees. Sidewalks exist in some areas.

The property is the subject of approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015 and Preliminary Plan 4-03090 and would be an expansion thereto. The subject preliminary plan is an application to create fee-simple lots for the construction of 29 townhouses on what has been platted as Parcels I, N and Lot 275 (Plat Book 200, Plat 80). The applicant is also proposing additional townhouses on the multifamily dwelling unit section of this development (Lot 5). That portion of the property is the subject of preliminary plan 4-07010.

SETTING

The subject property is located on the north side of Auth Way, north of the Branch Avenue Metro Station and south of the Suitland Parkway. To the east is I-1-zoned property under the ownership of the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority that is generally undeveloped. To the south across Auth Way is vacant M-X-T-zoned land. To the west is I-3 and I-1-zoned land generally undeveloped.

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Townhouses
Acreage	47.25	47.25
Lots	1	29
Parcels	2	0
Dwelling Units:		
Attached	0	29

2. **Environmental**—A review of the information available indicates that streams, wetlands, wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes are found to occur on the property. According to

the Prince George's County Soil Survey, the soils found to occur are predominantly gravel pit or disturbed soils. Since the exact nature of the soils is not known, DER may require a soils study prior to issuance of permits. Suitland Parkway and the Branch Avenue Metro line are considered significant noise generators that may create adverse noise impacts for the proposed residential use. Suitland Parkway is a National Register Site for which the adjacent viewsheds are an issue. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of the site. This site abuts Henson Creek Stream Valley Park. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. This property is located in the Henson Creek watershed of the Potomac River Basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the adopted General Plan.

Environmental Issues Addressed in the Heights and Vicinity Master Plan

There are few specific recommendations pertaining to the environmental elements of the subject property, which are stormwater management, noise, and woodland conservation. These will be addressed in the Environmental Review section below. There are no specific environmental requirements or design standards that require review for conformance.

Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan

This site contains regulated areas, evaluation areas and network gaps as part of the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. A majority of the area designated as network gap and some of the evaluation area are currently developed under the approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/59/02). The regulated area should be preserved in its natural state with only necessary impacts for development.

Natural Resources Inventory

The preliminary plan application has a signed natural resources inventory (NRI/26/07) dated November 13, 2007, that was included with the application package. The site contains 12 forest stands totaling 10.79 acres. Stands 1, 2, and 6 are dominated by American beech and tulip poplar, Stands 3, 4, 5, and 11 are dominated by red maple, Stand 7 is dominated by sycamore, Stands 8 and 12 are dominated by river birch, Stand 9 is dominated by Eastern white pine, and Stand 10 is dominated by red oak. All except Stand 5 have a high priority for preservation because they are associated with regulated areas.

Woodland Conservation

This site is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/007/90-01, in conjunction with CSP-01015, was approved for a larger area that included the subject site. Individual TCPIs are required to be submitted with each detailed site plan. The current plan is subject to the current Woodland Conservation Ordinance as is required with any new preliminary plan of subdivision.

The subject site has a net tract of 38.69 acres and 8.56 acres of 100-year floodplain. The woodland conservation threshold has been correctly calculated at 5.80 acres, or 15 percent of the net tract. The TCPI proposes to clear 4.53 acres of the on-site upland woodland, with no clearing in the 100-year floodplain. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 4.04 acres of on-site woodland preservation, 3.68 acres of reforestation, and 0.54 acre of off-site mitigation. Because the acreage of proposed off-site mitigation is less than one acre, it should be met with fee-in-lieu.

The total acreage of the proposed woodland preservation and reforestation areas identified on the plan is not consistent with what is provided on the worksheet. The plan totals 7.81 acres, while the worksheet totals 7.72 acres. Verify the acreages of each woodland conservation area and provide the correct acreages on the worksheet.

Some revisions are required. The plan does not clearly show the limits of disturbance, particularly in the area in the rear of proposed Lots 335 and 336. For all areas identified as floodplain preservation, it should be modified to add "not counted" to indicate that these areas are not counted toward meeting the woodland conservation requirement.

Extensive reforestation is proposed in order to fulfill the woodland conservation requirements on this site. In order to protect the reforestation areas after planting, so that they may mature into perpetual woodlands, the planting must be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for the sites and all planting areas must be placed in conservation easements. The easement language for PMA protection will be modified to include the afforestation areas.

Environmental Impacts

The site contains natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The plan as submitted shows the protection of streams and wetlands with associated buffers to the extent possible. There are impacts that were previously approved by the Planning Board (through the approval of a previous preliminary plan and subsequent detailed site plans). Any new impacts must be accompanied by a variation request in accordance with 24-113 of the Subdivision regulations. The current plan proposes no new impacts to the regulated areas on the site. A variation request for impacts is not required.

Noise

This property is located in the noise corridor for the Suitland Parkway, classified as a freeway. The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is not shown on the current plan. A Phase I noise study, dated July 5, 2001, has been submitted. Based on the study, measurements taken approximately 600 feet from the centerline of the Suitland Parkway resulted in 60.3 and 61.8 dBA Ldn. The information submitted is outdated and the average daily traffic had since increased; however, according to the study, the average daily traffic would have to double to increase levels by 3 dBA Ldn. Given the shown proximity of the proposed lots from the location of the measurement, noise would be mitigated through the provision of a fence along the rear of the lots.

This property is also in close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro, a potential noise generator for the proposed residential use. According to available information, proposed Lots 333-337, 343-351, and 352-356 will be affected by significant noise levels associated with the adjacent railway. To reduce noise levels below 65 dBA in the rear outdoor activity areas of the proposed lots, a solid wood fence with no gaps or openings should be placed in areas where noise exceeds 65 dBA. This fence must be shown on the detailed site plan and should be located around the rear yards of the proposed individual units shown within the 65 dBA Ldn contour. A note must also be added to the detailed site plan indicating the type of fence that will be used for noise attenuation.

A vibration study, dated April 26, 2002, was also submitted. The vibration measurements were based on the passing of 12 Metrorail trains. The International Standards Organization and American National Standards Institute have a maximum criterion of 200 micrometers per second for residential use. The vibration levels measured for the 12 Metrorail trains ranged from 0.2-11

micrometers per second, which is well below maximum criteria. No additional information regarding metro related vibration is required.

Soils

According to the Prince George's County Soils Survey, the principal soils on this site are in the Bibb, Fallsington, and Sassafras soil series. Prior to development the site contained sand and gravel pits. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. A soils report may be required by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources during the permit process review.

3. **Community Planning**—The subject property is located within the limits of The Heights and Vicinity Master Plan (2000), Planning Area 76A, in the Silver Hill-Morningside community. The land use recommendation is for mixed-use residential, office and retail. The 2002 General Plan locates the property in a Center in the Developed Tier. The vision for Centers is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The Branch Avenue Metro station is designated a Metropolitan Center. Development of the Town Center at Camp Springs is consistent overall with the land use recommendations of the master plan and General Plan.

This site has an approved conceptual site plan. Master plan issues were identified with the earlier plans. The conceptual site plan includes a much larger area than the subject application. The approved conceptual site plan includes a mixed-use scenario with nonresidential development abutting the east side of the Metro station site (inside the loop road). The proposed subdivision is consistent with the mixed-use scenario approved by the conceptual site plan.

4. **Parks and Recreation**—The staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the above-referenced preliminary plan application for conformance with the approved Heights Master Plan, current subdivision regulations, and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development as they pertain to public parks and recreation facilities.

The subject property is located off of Auth Way, south of Suitland Parkway. The property lies within the existing Town Center at Camp Springs Subdivision (4-03090) and is a proposed 28-unit townhouse addition to the existing development. Using current occupancy statistics for multifamily dwelling units, this development would result in a population of 76 residents in the new community.

According to Section 24-134 of the Subdivision Regulation, the mandatory dedication of parkland from the subject subdivision would be less than one acre. The level of service analyses shows that this community is in "high need" for parkland acreage and in "high need" for outdoor recreation facilities.

At the time of review and approval of the Preliminary Plan 4-03090 for Town Center at Camp Springs, which surrounds the subject application, the Planning Board approved the provision of private recreational facilities on-site. In conversations with the applicant, DPR staff was informed that residents of this subdivision will be incorporated into the already established homeowner's association for the existing Town Center at Camp Springs subdivision and will have access to their private recreation facilities, which includes a tennis court, play area, playground and clubhouse. Directly north of the overall subdivision is the Henson Creek Stream Valley Park. There is an M-NCPPC master-planned trail along the stream valley, which currently terminates at Temple Hills Road. Ultimately this trail will serve as a pedestrian and bicycle connection to

Branch Avenue from neighborhoods to the south and will extend from the Potomac River to Branch Avenue Metro Station and points to the east. Currently there is \$490,000 in the Capital Improvements Program (CIP) for development of the Henson Creek Stream Valley trail system.

On October 29th 2007, staff met with the applicant to discuss recreational options for the subdivision. As a result of this meeting, a mutually acceptable scenario was agreed upon where the applicant will pay a fee contribution to the development of the adjacent Henson Creek Stream Valley Trail.

The amount of the fee required could be based on the cost of the recreational facilities that would be required if private recreational facilities were deemed a desirable option for meeting the requirements for mandatory dedication of parkland. The *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines* provide a formula for determining the value of recreation facilities to be provided. Staff proposes using the formula to determine the value of recreation facilities required from the subject-planned development:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Step 1:} & \quad (N \times P) / 500 = M \\ \text{Step 2:} & \quad M \times S = \text{Value of facilities} \end{aligned}$$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

P = Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500

Number of units in project: Includes all dwelling units proposed for future development within the project area.

Population per dwelling unit by planning area: The Research Section of the Planning Department publishes projections of household type and size by planning area each year.

Multiplier: Is the ratio of the projected total population of the proposed community to a standard population increment of 500 persons.

Standard value of facilities for population of 500: Is the cost of providing and installing adequate recreation facilities for a population of 500. This monetary amount is determined by the Department of Parks and Recreation on a biennial basis and is based on the cost of a representative selection of recreation facilities, which, according to generally accepted standards in the recreation industry, will satisfy the needs of the typical group of 500 citizens (this list of the quantity and respective value of the recreation facilities to be provided for a typical population of 500 is updated regularly).

Value of facilities to be provided: This dollar amount reflects the minimum cost of recreation facilities to be provided for the residents in the project area.

5. **Trails**—Due to its proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro Station, the subject site is ideal for transit-oriented development and pedestrian connections to Metro. Prior approvals have addressed this in a number of ways. Previously approved DSP-02024 includes a sidewalk plan reflecting numerous trail and sidewalk connections for the subject property. It is recommended that these previously approved connections be incorporated into the revised preliminary plan.

The existing M-NCPPC Henson Creek Trail currently ends at Temple Hills Road. The approved Heights Master Plan recommends that this trail be extended to the vicinity of the Branch Avenue Metro in the M-NCPPC parkland. This trail will provide a major pedestrian and bicycle connection to the Branch Avenue Metro and town center from the communities to the south. A major trail connection was included in the previously approved DSP-02024 that will provide access to the future stream valley trail extension from the town center. This trail is shown on the sidewalk plan of DSP-02024 and will access the subject site at three locations. Staff recommends that the revised preliminary plan include these three connections from the previously approved DSP.

The major trail connection will run from Auth Way through Parcel A to Habersham Avenue adjacent to Lot 195. This trail should link to the subject subdivision at Lumpkin Place, Talmadge Avenue, and Habersham Avenue. It appears that the homeowners association's open space between lots 320 and 321 will have to be widened to accommodate the trail connection to Lumpkin Place. A trail connection was also approved from Habersham Avenue to Troupe Place. Again, it appears that the homeowners association's land will have to be provided between Lot 236 and Lot 237 to accommodate this connection.

The DSP also include a connection to the future stream valley trail extension and this should be at a location acceptable to the Department of Parks and Recreation. The previously approved sidewalk network is comprehensive. It is recommended that it be constructed as shown on the DSP. This network will include:

- a. A seven-foot-wide concrete sidewalk along Auth Way.
- b. Six-foot-wide concrete sidewalks on both sides of Telfair Boulevard.
- c. Five-foot-wide concrete sidewalks along both sides of Candler Place, Lanier Avenue, and Glynn Place.
- d. Six-foot-wide concrete sidewalks along both sides of Milledge Boulevard.
- e. A four-foot wide sidewalk on the north side of Habersham Avenue and a five-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of Habersham Avenue.
- f. Four- or five-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of Talmadge Avenue, Effingham Place, Lumpkin Place, Troupe Place, and Lowndes Place.

The previously approved sidewalk and trail network is comprehensive and will accommodate pedestrians through the town center, as well as provide a trail connection to Metro. It is recommended that the previously approved trails and sidewalks be incorporated into the new preliminary plan.

6. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 47.25 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. The property is located on the south side of Suitland Parkway at the Branch Avenue Metro Station. The applicant proposes a residential subdivision of 29 townhouse units in an area that was previously planned to encompass employment uses.

The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of relevant materials and analyses conducted by the staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.

Growth Policy—Service Level Standards

The subject property is located within the Developed Tier as defined in the General Plan for Prince George's County. It is also within the Branch Avenue Metropolitan Center, as defined in same. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better.

Unsignalized intersections: *The Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

The applicant proposes to subdivide portions of an existing recorded subdivision into a residential subdivision. The existing subdivision was approved for subdivision as Preliminary Plan 4-90037 in 1990 and it was platted as Capital Gateway.

Capital Gateway was approved at the time of preliminary plan with a trip cap. During review of the underlying conceptual site plan CSP-01015, it was determined that the proposed development is well within the established trip cap for Capital Gateway. Because the subject site is within a larger site, compliance with the trip cap will be based upon compliance with the underlying conceptual and detailed site plans, or any future modified or succeeding plans. A condition to this end will be provided in place of the trip cap condition that was included with 4-90037.

Several other conditions were included with Preliminary Plan 4-90037. These conditions, and their status for the subject plan, are summarized below:

Condition 7: This condition identifies several transportation improvements that were identified as necessary for the development of the property. All of these conditions are enforceable prior to building permit. It appears that most of the required improvements are in place. Nonetheless, the subject plan should include a condition requiring that these conditions be checked prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property.

Condition 8: This condition sets a trip cap for the subject property, and the plan conforms to the cap. A condition will be added pursuant to the discussion earlier in this memorandum.

Condition 9: This condition requires that certain portions of the property be placed in reservation for the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. The needed properties were placed in reservation or otherwise acquired, and the station and its facilities are constructed and operational. Further enforcement of this condition is no longer needed.

Condition 10: This condition allows the trip cap established by Condition 8 to be exceeded by establishment of a transportation demand management program. The trip cap condition described earlier will incorporate a reference to this condition as well.

Condition 11: This condition concerns a conveyance along Old Soper Road. The area of the conveyance is now owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and so the condition is no longer applicable and is not needed for this plan.

Condition 12: This condition concerns denial of access between the subject property and a number of local streets in the area. All record plats reflected this condition, and the site plan shows no access to any of these streets. No replacement condition will be needed because none of the named streets are adjacent to the subject property.

The proposed subdivision would generate 19 and 18 peak direction trips in the morning and evening peak hours, respectively. Based on a detailed analysis provided by the applicant’s traffic consultant , it has been determined that even with the inclusion of the these proposed 29 townhouse units, the available peak direction trip caps would be reduced to 731 AM trips and 244 PM trips. Therefore, the approval of this subdivision would have no additional impact on the transportation network deemed to be critical, and was reviewed as part of the original preliminary plan of subdivision for the entire site (4-90037) and the underlying Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015.

Transportation Staff Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision—as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George’s County Code—if the application is approved consistent with the above findings.

- 7. **Schools**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this preliminary plan for impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and CB-30-2003 and CR-23-2003 and concluded the following.

Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 7	Middle School Cluster 4	High School Cluster 4
Dwelling Units	29 DU	29 DU	29 DU
Pupil Yield Factor	.24	.06	.12
Subdivision Enrollment	6.96	1.74	3.48
Actual Enrollment	33,058	13,185	17,855
Completion Enrollment	215.76	52	104
Cumulative Enrollment	18.96	4.74	9.48
Total Enrollment	33,299.68	13,243.48	17,971.96
State-Rated Capacity	39,187	11,256	16,332
Percent Capacity	84.97	117.65	110.04

Source: Prince George’s County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2007

County Council bill CB-31-2003 establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amount of \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between I-495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. Council bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation and the current amounts are \$7,671 and \$13,151 to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

The school surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section finds that this project meets the adequate public facilities policies for school facilities contained in Section 24-122.02, CB-30-2003 and CB-31-2003 and CR-23-2003.

8. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)-(E) of the Subdivision Ordinance.

Public Facilities staff have determined that this preliminary plan is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station Morningside, Company 27, using the Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George’s County Fire Department.

Pursuant to CR-69-2006, Prince George’s County Council and the County Executive suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A, B) regarding sworn fire and rescue personnel staffing levels.

The Fire Chief has reported that the department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in CB-56-2005.

9. **Police Facilities**—The subject property is located in Police District IV. The response time standard is 10 minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The times are based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The preliminary plan was accepted for processing by the Planning Department on June 18, 2007.

Reporting Cycle	Previous 12-Month Cycle	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency
Acceptance Date June 18, 2007	6/06-6/07	10 minutes	17 minutes
Cycle 1	7/06-7/07		
Cycle 2	8/06-8/07		
Cycle 3	9/06-9/07		

The response time standards of 10 minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls were met July 2, 2007.

The Police Chief has reported that the department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in CB-56-2005. Pursuant to CR-69-2006, Prince George’s County Council and the County

Executive suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A, B) regarding sworn police personnel staffing levels.

10. **Health Department**—The Health Department reviewed the application and had no comments.
11. **Stormwater Management**—The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), Engineering Division, has determined that on-site stormwater management is required. Stormwater Management Concept Plan 16466-2007 has been approved (April 16, 2007) with conditions to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan.
12. **Historic Preservation**— Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the above-referenced 47.25-acre property located at 4301 Telfair Boulevard in Camp Springs, Maryland. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. The subject property has already been graded and built upon. There are no known archeological sites or historic sites within a one-mile radius of the subject property. It is unlikely that any archeological sites will be identified on this property.

However, Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state or federal agencies. 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 state or federal monies or federal permits are required for a project.

13. **Urban Design**—The Urban Design Section has reviewed the above-referenced preliminary plan of subdivision. The plan proposes to create 29 new lots for attached dwellings within existing Parcel N, which is owned by the homeowners' association of the Town Center at Camp Springs. The new lots are proposed to be located to the northwest of the existing attached houses, between the existing development and an environmentally sensitive area. Existing Private Road A would be extended to provide access to 24 of the new lots, while the other five new lots would be located on the north side of existing Talmadge Circle. All of these lots are proposed for front-loaded attached houses. In general, the proposed lots create a similar pattern of development to the previously-approved housing on the rest of the Town Center site.

The middle lots of the attached groups are 24 feet wide, while the end lots are 26 feet wide. The lots are 60–61 feet long. The preliminary plan suggests that the houses to be constructed on the lots will be approximately 40 feet long, leaving the remaining 20 feet divided between both rear and front yards. The Urban Design Section is concerned that the depth of the lots does not provide enough room in front of the proposed houses for cars to park on the driveways within their own lots. Most of the houses shown on the plan are set back from the road approximately 20 feet, which is insufficient because they are only set back about 10–15 feet from the sidewalk. If the houses were constructed as indicated on the preliminary plan, the cars parked in the driveways would obstruct the sidewalks along the private roads. This is in conflict with Section 27-556, which states that parking areas must be designed so that parked cars cannot project into streets or walkways.

The parking schedule provided on the preliminary plan indicates that each house will have four dedicated parking spaces—two in the garage and two in the driveway. The Zoning Ordinance requires the 29 new townhouses to provide at least 60 parking spaces, while the plan claims 122 spaces are provided, including the garage and driveway spaces for each unit. However, the driveways are likely to be heavily used for parking by visitors, households with multiple vehicles,

and residents who use their garages for storage instead of parking. The driveways are too short because most vehicles parked in them would obstruct the sidewalk. This could render the sidewalks nearly useless to pedestrians since the wide, closely-spaced driveways might block pedestrian pathways every few feet. In addition, most of the sidewalks run directly adjacent to the street. This creates another problem because the driveway aprons interrupt the grade of the sidewalk.

There is not adequate space to increase the depth of the proposed lots because they are too closely spaced between the existing houses to the southeast and the wetland buffer area to the northwest. If the houses are relocated towards the rear of their lots approximately 10 feet, there would be adequate space for the front driveways but the grading behind the houses might further impact the environmental area. This would result in unusable rear yards but allow for pedestrian circulation along the sidewalks. This particularly affects Lots 333–337, which are especially constrained by onsite grades and the close proximity of the wetland buffer. However, there does not appear to be an acceptable alternative to pushing the units back from the street. If some lots cannot provide the required front driveway space then those lots should be removed.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. The applicant shall contribute to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation for the development of the Henson Creek Stream Valley Trail. A fee shall be established during consideration of the detailed site plan based on the following formula:

Step 1: $(N \times P) / 500 = M$

Step 2: $M \times S = \text{Value of facilities}$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

P = Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500

2. The fee shall be determined by DPR upon request by the developer. The request shall be submitted to DPR two weeks prior to submission of the detailed site plan.
3. The applicant shall provide evidence of the payment to M-NCPPC prior to the approval of the final plat.
4. In conformance with the approved Heights Master Plan, and prior approvals for CSP-01015 and DSP-02024 (including the approved sidewalk plan), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:
 - a. Construct the eight-foot-wide trail from Auth Way to Habersham Avenue, as reflected on the previously approved sidewalk plan. This trail should have six-foot-wide feeder trails linking to Lumpkin Place and Talmadge Avenue (see Condition 4, CSP-01015 and the sidewalk plan for DSP-02024).
 - b. The sidewalk within Auth Way shall be seven feet wide with brick paver edge details and

- c. A six-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along both sides of Telfair Boulevard (sidewalk plan, DSP-02024).
 - d. Five-foot-wide concrete sidewalks shall be constructed along both sides of Candler Place, Lanier Avenue, and Glynn Place (sidewalk plan, DSP-02024).
 - e. A six-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along both sides of Milledge Boulevard from Auth Way to Lanier Avenue in the same design as the sidewalk within Auth Way. A five-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed on at least one side, with a four-foot-wide sidewalk on the other side, of all secondary streets. Four-foot-wide sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of tertiary streets (Condition 8, DSP-02024).
5. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the TCPI shall be revised as follows:
- a. Show a continuous and refined limit of disturbance for the entire site.
 - b. Verify the acreages of each woodland conservation area and provide the correct acreages on the worksheet.
 - c. Revise the plan so the site boundary is consistent with subject site
 - d. Revise the plan to provide a chart for each treatment area, type, and acreage including preservation areas, reforestation areas, afforestation areas, woodland not counted, clearing areas, clearing areas in the floodplain, and off-site clearing and provide a table showing the acreage of each with the floodplain and off-site clearing shown separately.
 - e. Revise Note 9 to eliminate the following: “, and as a result, this sheet is provided as a detail to the previously approved TCPI for subject lots associated with “4-07011.”
 - f. Revise the legend to correctly identify all symbols used on the plans.
 - g. Revise the worksheet as necessary
 - h. Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.
6. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/025/07). The following notes shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/025/07), or as modified by the Type II tree conservation plan and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved tree conservation plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved tree conservation plans for the subject property are available in the offices of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission.”

7. Reforestation/afforestation must be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for the sites; and all reforestation/afforestation must be placed in conservation easements. The easement language for expanded buffer protection will be modified to include the afforestation areas.
8. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the expanded stream buffer, adjacent preservation areas, and adjacent planting areas except for areas where impacts have been approved, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is permitted.”
9. At the time of the detailed site plan, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to show the location of the noise attenuation fence in the rear outdoor activity areas of all proposed lots and provide a detail for its construction, or add the following note to all sheets where fences appear:

“All fences shown as noise attenuation fences shall be constructed of solid wood with no gaps or openings.”
10. Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permit containing the residential unit stating that the building shell of the subject structure has been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.
11. At the time of the detailed site plan approval, a Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved.
12. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 16466-2007 and any subsequent revisions.
13. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, each lot shall demonstrate that its driveway pad provides at least 20 feet of length between the front façade (garage) to the sidewalk. The sidewalk must be five feet wide and set far enough back from the road so that it is free and clear of the driveway apron. Any lot for which this cannot be demonstrated shall be removed from the plan.
14. Total development within the subject property shall be limited by the existing approved site plans CSP-01015, DSP-02023, DSP-02024, and DSP-05051. Any modifications to these plans or succeeding plans shall be determined to be consistent with the overall trip cap for the Capital Gateway site described in Conditions 8 and 10 of PGCPB No. 90-253 approving Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-90037.
15. The improvements described in Condition 7 of PGCPB No. 90-253 shall be verified to be complete prior to the issuance of any building permit within the subject property.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF THE TYPE I TREE CONSERVATION PLAN, TCPI/025/07