

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 April 3, 2008, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0705 for Chaddsford, Section 7, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The request is for 31 single-family detached dwellings on 7.6 acres in the R-M Zone (Residential Medium Development). This application includes the site plans, landscape plans, and architectural elevations.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

| | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Zone(s) | R-M | R-M |
| Use(s) | Vacant | Single-family detached |
| Acreage | 7.6 | 7.6* |
| Area within 100 year floodplain | 0 | 0 |
| Lots | 0 | 31 |
| Parcels* | 1 | 2 |
| Dwelling Units | 0 | 31 |

* Parcels to be conveyed to the HOA should be clearly identified and area calculations provided.

3. **Location:** The subject site constitutes Section 7 of a larger development, Chaddsford, which is located in the northwest corner of Chadds Ford Drive and General LaFayette Boulevard, east of US 301, just north of Charles County. The site is in Planning Area 85A and Council District 9.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** Section 7 of the Chaddsford development is located in the northern portion of the site and is bounded to the east by General Lafayette Boulevard, to the south by Section 2 and the existing community lake, and to the west by land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for use as parkland.
5. **Design Features:** Access to Section 7 is proposed via General Lafayette Boulevard, which will connect to proposed Ava Way, a cul-de-sac. An additional cul-de-sac, Corinne Court, will connect to Ava Way. The construction of 31 single-family units is proposed along Ava Way and Corinne Court. No recreational facilities are proposed within Section 7; however, future residents will have access to the stream valley park immediately to the west and recreational amenities ancillary to the existing lake immediately to the south of the proposed units. Additional recreational facilities including a 2.03-acre community center site, which features a community building, tennis court, swimming pool

and kiddie pool, and children's playground, are located approximately a quarter of a mile south of Section 7 and will be available for use by residents of the Chaddsford development.

The proposal includes the following architectural products by K. Hovnanian Homes:

| Model | Base Finished Area (Sq. Ft.) |
|---------------|-------------------------------------|
| Oliver | 2,859 |
| Kingston | 3,541 |
| Stanton | 3,671 |
| Princeton | 3,061 |
| Patrick Henry | 2,769 |
| Yorktown | 3,386 |
| Revere | 3,325 |
| Patriot | 2,603 |
| Remington | 2,688 |
| Statesman | 2,357 |
| Newton | 2,644 |
| Pennwood | 2,464 |
| Cambridge | 2,536 |
| Fairbanks | 2,515 |

The architecture elevations indicate traditional detailing such as columns, decorative cornice and trim boards, accent windows, accent standing seam metal roofing, porches and optional bays and balconies. Finish materials include brick and stone veneer, vinyl siding, and a combination of these materials.

An entrance feature is shown on the site plan at the northeastern intersection of Ava Way and General Lafayette Boulevard; however, details of the proposed feature were not included with this application.

6. Previous Approvals:

- a. On November 29, 1977, the District Council adopted CR-108-1977 for the entire 277-acre Brandywine Village, placing approximately 212 acres in the M-A-C Zone and 64.7 acres in the R-U Zone (A-8898). On September 14, 1993, the District Council adopted the sectional map amendment for Subregion V, rezoning the M-A-C-zoned 212-acre site into 46 acres of E-I-A, 16.4 acres of L-A-C, and 149 acres of R-M-zoned land (District Council Resolution CR-60-1993).
- b. On February 20, 1997, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-96083 to dedicate Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard to public use and to place the resultant land bays into four outlots. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/47/96) was approved for the entire area concurrently with this application.

- c. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102 was approved by the Planning Board for the entire 212-acre parcel on October 11, 2001 (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-186). This comprehensive design plan included 11 lots on approximately six acres, approximately four acres of open space, approximately four acres for the continuation of Brinton Way, and approximately 13 acres for a community lake. The remaining land area was intended for future development.
- d. On January 22, 2004, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-04174, which governs the subject application, for 307 lots on 100.35 acres. Since that approval, the applicant has chosen to renumber the sections. Nevertheless, Preliminary Plan 4-04174 applies to the subject Specific Design Plan, SDP-0705.
- e. A total of five specific design plans have been approved for Chaddsford, including Sections 1 through 6 and a community center. The most recently approved specific design plan was SDP-0611 for 51 single-family detached units in Section 6, which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on January 31, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-04).

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9878:** Brandywine Village Zoning Application A-9878 created the E-I-A, L-A-C, and R-M Zones for the 212-acre site. The R-M Zone was designated for 149 acres at 5.8 to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. The following conditions of approval of A-9878 are applicable to the subject specific design plan and warrant discussion as follows:

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

Comment: The subject application shows a portion of the area of the parkland dedication on the submitted plans. In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008, the Department of Parks and Recreation indicated that additional dedication should be shown between Lots 15 and 16 for the construction of a feeder trail connection to the master-planned trail located east of Section 7. See Finding 9 below for a detailed discussion of this issue.

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

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section (Stasz to Lareuse, December 24, 2007), the Type I tree conservation plan and Type II tree conservation plan show the preservation of sensitive environmental features in a manner that helps to define the pattern of neighborhoods.

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

Comment: Section 1 of the overall development provided detached units of a smaller size than would normally be approved and provide affordability for seniors and young adults starting out. Section 2 is a townhouse development. Sections 3 through 5 included townhouses and single-family detached dwellings. The average size of the single-family detached units approved in Sections 3 through 5 was 2,515 square feet. The average size of the units proposed for Section 6 was 2,791 square feet. The average size of the units proposed for Section 7, the subject section, is 2,887 square feet. Overall, the Chaddsford development has achieved the goal of providing a mix of housing types.

Considerations

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

Comment: These considerations were carried forward as conditions of approval of Chaddsford Sections 3, 4 and 5 (SDP-0509) and Section 2 (SDP-0513). The applicant provided evidence that the above considerations had been addressed during the certification process for SDP-0509 and SDP-0513. The applicant has provided an additional report with this application that addresses each of these considerations (attached).

- 8. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01:** The following conditions of approval of the comprehensive design plan are applicable to the review of the subject specific design plan and warrant discussion as follows:
 - 1. Prior to certificate approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan,**
 - a. The following revisions shall be made to the plans or information shall be provided:**
 - (1) A minimum lot width of 40 feet (at the street line, unless indicated otherwise) for the proposed lots in the development. No more than 25 percent of the total number of single-family lots in the development may be less than 50 feet in width. The rest of the lots**

shall be 50 feet or more in width, with no less than 25 percent of the total number of lots at least 60 feet in width. (On culs-de-sac the lot width may be measured at the building line).

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

Comment: The following is a breakdown of the number of approved and projected lots for the Chaddsford development, demonstrating conformance to the conditions above. A similar chart is shown on the plans, which contains minor errors. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require the revision of the cumulative lot size table on the coversheet of the SDP prior to signature approval. In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008, the Subdivision Section indicated that although the lot size tabulation was provided on the specific design plan, the width of cul-de-sac lots at the front building restriction line was not dimensioned on the plans. The Subdivision Planner recommended the addition of this information and verification of lot widths in accordance with the requirements of Condition 1(a)(1) above, prior to signature approval of the plans.

| Chaddsford Cumulative Lot-Size Table for Single-Family Detached Units | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Lot Percentages Tracking Chart | Percent Required Per CDP Condition 1A | SDP-0109 Plat 195-91 | Section 1 SDP-0407 | Section 3-5 SDP-0509 | Section 2 SDP-0513 | Section 6 SDP-0611 | Section 7 SDP-0705 | Total SFD Lots | Cumulative Percentages |
| 36' and 40' Street Frontage | Maximum 25% | 0 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 25.4%* |
| 50' Street Frontage | ----- | 0 | 40 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 16 | 108 | 34.7% |
| 60' Street Frontage | Minimum 25% | 11 | 12 | 35 | 0 | 51 | 15 | 124 | 39.9% |
| Total Single-Family Detached | 100% | 11 | 131 | 87 | 0 | 51 | 31 | 311 | 100% |

*The total of lots with between 36 and 50 feet of street frontage is 0.4 percent in excess of the 25

percent limit set by the CDP. All 79 of the lots that fall within this range were approved under SDP-0407 for Section 1. At the time of the review of Section 1, the projected total number of single-family detached lots was 326. Currently, the projected number of single-family detached lots for the entire Chaddsford development is 311. As a result of the decrease in the total number of lots, the percentage of lots within the 36 feet to less than 50 feet width of street front has increased above the maximum 25 percent permitted in the CDP. Staff believes that the 25.4 percent should be considered in conformance with the CDP approval, as there is no reasonable remedy to this issue.

| Chaddsford Cumulative Percentage Table for Single-Family Attached Units | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------------|
| Lot Percentage Tracking Chart | Percent Required Per CDP Condition 1A | SDP-0109 Plat 195-91 | Section 1 SDP-0407 | Section 3-5 SDP-0509 | Section 2 SDP-0513 | Section 6 SDP-0611 | Section 7 SDP-0705 | Total SFA Lots | Cumulative Percentages |
| Single-Family Attached | Maximum 30% | 0 | 0 | 75 | 57 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 30% |

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------|
| Total Number of Lots | 443 |
|-----------------------------|------------|

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

Comment: This condition has been carried over as a condition of approval of this specific design plan.

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

Comment: This condition should be carried over as a condition of approval of this specific design plan and has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report. Even though the number of units proposed is only 31, these units contribute to an overall project number of 443 dwelling units.

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

Comment: This condition should be carried over as a condition of approval of this specific design plan and has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report. Even though the number of units proposed is only 31, these units contribute to an overall project number of 443 dwelling units.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04174:** The following conditions of approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision are applicable to the review of the subject specific design plan and warrant discussion as follows:

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

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section (Stasz to Lareuse, December 24, 2007), a revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98-08, was submitted with this application and conforms to TCPI/46/97-04.

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

Comment: The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8065-2007-00, which is valid until March 27, 2010. At the time of the writing of the staff report, comment from DPW&T regarding the subject SDP's conformance to the approved stormwater management concept plan has not been received. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require this information prior to signature approval.

4. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following, which shall be reflected on the SDP:

- a. **Construct the master plan stream valley trail per DPR standards at the location agreed to by the applicant and DPR. The applicant shall provide whatever structures necessary to provide dry passage along the trail. Timing for the construction and bonding of the trail shall be in accordance with the recommendations of CDP-0102/01 and further determined at the time of review of the SDP.**
- d. **A six-foot-wide asphalt feeder trail from the northern portion of the stream valley trail to the residential development shall be shown on the SDP. The applicant shall provide the construction of this trail in conjunction with the development of this pod.**

Comment: In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008, the Department of Parks and Recreation indicated that the applicant is not providing feeder trail access to the residential subdivision; however, the revised plans do show a connection. As a result, DPR recommended the dedication of a 30-foot-wide strip of land between Lots 15 and 16 to provide a six-foot-wide feeder trail

connection to the master-planned trail located east of Section 7. The parks planner further indicated that such dedication may result in the loss of one or more lots. Several conditions are recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation and have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report.

In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008 (Chellis to Reed), the Subdivision Section provided the following analysis of the subject SDP's conformance with these conditions:

"The SDP plan submitted with this application does not provide this required trail connection. Preliminary plan Finding 14 of PGCPB Resolution No. 05-15, which relates to this condition (4.d.), establishes that the approved CDP Condition 1. a.(5) requires the master plan trail along the lake to be located on parkland to be dedicated to M-NCPPC and connected to private feeder trails from townhouse development Pod E, single-family Pod F, and recreation Pod K. No connection is shown between the townhouses or single-family units and the master plan trail. A 100-foot-wide, parallel greenway was created to separate lots along Road F from Road B, but this greenway does not have a trail connection as mentioned in Condition 12.

"Pod F on the approved CDP is the subject of this application. The preliminary plan was certified without showing this connection which, per Condition 4 d., was to be addressed at the time of SDP review. This condition has not been addressed. The feeder trail should be located on M-NCPPC property and provide a connection to Ava Way cul-de-sac (DPR Exhibit A, File 4-04174). The lotting pattern should be adjusted to accommodate the required trail connection. An easement on lots is not anticipated for the construction of this trail connection."

Since the original submission of the plans, the applicant has shown a feeder trail within a WSSC easement located between Lots 15 and 16.

Conditions recommended by the Department of Parks and Recreation have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require a 30-foot-wide parkland dedication between Lots 15 and 16 for the construction of a feeder trail connecting to the adjacent master-planned trail, instead of the trail within the easement.

- 7. The applicant, his heirs, successors and or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of the internal public streets unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of issuance of street construction permits.**

Comment: The plan shows standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal public streets.

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

- g. Court K should be pulled back away from General Lafayette Boulevard (at**

least 75 feet) to improve the look from General Lafayette Boulevard. Open space (30–40 feet) is needed along General Lafayette Boulevard to plant street trees.

Comment: Court K has been reconfigured and its terminus is shown on the plans approximately 80 feet from the right-of-way of General Lafayette Boulevard. A minimum 30-foot-wide area of open space has been provided along General Lafayette Boulevard for the planting of street trees.

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

Comment: Two corner lots are proposed along General Lafayette Boulevard: Lot 1 and Lot 31, with proposed areas of 9,853 and 7,158 square feet, respectively. Both lots are substantially larger than the average 6,054-square-foot lot size for Section 7.

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

Comment: Revisions to the lake were approved by the Planning Board under SDP-0513 for Section 2.

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

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section (Stasz to Lareuse, December 24, 2007), the revised Type II tree conservation plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-08, provides all woodland conservation areas outside of all utility easements.

- 10. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-M Zone (Residential Medium Development), Sections 27-507-510 of the Zoning Ordinance.
- 11. **The *Landscape Manual*:** The proposed development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and Section 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets, of the *Landscape Manual*. The landscape plan and the 4.1 schedule should be revised to account for the requirements of Section 4.1(c) and 4.1(d) separately.

The site is the subject of an Alternative Compliance application, AC-08003, which is a request for relief from the strict requirements of Section 4.6 of the *Landscape Manual*:

REQUIRED: Section 4.6 Buffering Residential Development from Streets (Lot 1)

| | |
|--|---|
| Length of bufferyard: | 68 feet |
| Landscape yard width: | 35 feet (for a collector street) |
| Fence: | Yes |
| Plant Materials (with 50% reduction for fence) | 2 shade trees 5 evergreen trees 10 shrubs |

PROVIDED:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Landscape yard width: | 31 feet |
| Fence: | Yes |
| Plant materials: | 3 shade trees 5 evergreen trees 11 shrubs |

REQUIRED: Section 4.6 Buffering Residential Development from Streets (Lot 31)

| | |
|--|---|
| Length of bufferyard: | 31 feet |
| Landscape yard width: | 35 feet (for a collector street) |
| Fence: | Yes |
| Plant Materials (with 50% reduction for fence) | 1 shade tree 3 evergreen trees 5 shrubs |

PROVIDED:

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| Landscape yard width: | 35 feet |
| Fence: | Yes |
| Plant Materials | 1 shade tree 4 evergreen trees 10 shrubs |

JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant does not meet the strict requirements of Section 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets, along Lots 1 and 31 adjacent to General Lafayette Boulevard. For Lot 1, the applicant is proposing to reduce the bufferyard width from 35 feet to 31 feet. The plan proposes a six-foot-high opaque fence behind the existing ten-foot public utility easement. In addition, the applicant is proposing one additional shade tree and 100 percent of the evergreen trees and shrubs. For Lot 31, the applicant is proposing the full 35-foot-wide bufferyard. It is set back from the right-of-way behind a 15-foot-wide stormdrain easement where the planting of

trees is undesirable and possibly prohibited. The applicant is proposing to install a six-foot-high opaque fence along the rear property line with the evergreen trees and shrubs in 20 feet of the 35-foot-wide bufferyard. The applicant is also proposing 100 percent of the shade trees, one extra evergreen tree, and 200 percent of the required shrubs in the bufferyard.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Alternative Compliance Committee and the Planning Director recommend approval of alternative compliance pursuant to Section 4.6 of the Prince George's County *Landscape Manual* for Lots 1 and 31 of Chaddsford, Section 7, along General Lafayette Boulevard, as stated in the findings above, subject to the following condition:

- a. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the site plan shall be revised to provide a six-foot-high, nonwood natural color, sight-tight fence along the entire rear yard of Lots 1 and 31.

This condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report.

Although the plans appear to provide sufficient plant material on Lots 8 and 9 to meet the requirements of Section 4.6 of the *Landscape Manual*, the plans should be revised to include a schedule for this planting to ensure adequacy. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require the addition of these schedules to the plans prior to signature approval.

In an effort to discourage the planting of invasive plant species within the county, staff has recommended a condition that would require the deletion of any such plant species from the landscape plans prior to signature approval of the specific design plan.

12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** According to the Environmental Planning Section (Stasz to Lareuse, December 24, 2007), this property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are existing woodlands and there are previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans. The original CDP, preliminary plan, and TCPs were approved so that permits could be issued for the construction of sewer and water lines from US 301 to Phase I of Brandywine Village along McKendree Road. At that time, TCPI/47/96 was reviewed and was found to satisfy the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/47/96-01, was approved with CDP-0102; a revision, TCPI/47/96-02, was approved with CDP-0102/01; a further revision, TCPI/47/96-03, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080; and the most recent revision, TCPI/47/96-04, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-04174.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98, was approved for the entire project to allow the installation of water and sewer lines. The Type II tree conservation plan is revised with each SDP. The revised Type II tree conservation plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-08, conforms to TCPI/46/97-04.

13. **Urban Design Review:** Several issues have been raised in the review of the architectural elevations. Where front façade projections are proposed to be clad in masonry, wrapping of the masonry around the side(s) of such projections provides an improved appearance. Second floor bay windows should be removed as optional features, as they appear to be floating on the front facade. Porches are optional features proposed on numerous models; however, the depth of the porch is not dimensioned on the elevation drawings. All porches should be dimensioned and should be a minimum of six feet wide to ensure that they will provide a usable space for comfortable seating. Several models are proposed to have roof pitches of 6:12 and should be revised to be a minimum 7:12. Due to the fact that numerous architectural models do not include standard features on side elevations, such as windows, staff is recommending that all side elevations be revised to include a minimum of two standard features. In addition, the east elevations of the units on Lots 1 and 31 will be highly visible from General Lafayette Boulevard. Therefore, staff is recommending that these elevations include a minimum of three standard features on the east end wall and a wraparound porch facing General LaFayette Boulevard. The Princeton model, Elevation D3, features a total of three doors on the front façade, two of which are located off of the proposed dining room and appear to serve no purpose. These doors should be replaced with windows coordinating with the overall design of the front façade.

Numerous architectural models are missing from the template sheet. The footprint of each approved model should be added prior to signature approval of the plans.

Several models feature elevations where no reverse gable is proposed, creating an uninteresting roof line and front facade. As a result, staff is recommending the deletion of the following elevations:

Fairbanks—Elevation A
Princeton—Elevation A
Patrick Henry—Elevation D
Kingston—Elevations A1 and B1
Stanton—Elevations A1 and A3
Newton—Elevation A1
Oliver—Elevation A1

Several conditions have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, which would require these additional items and revisions to the plans prior to signature approval of the subject specific design plan.

14. **Referral Responses:**

- a. The Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated November 8, 2007 (Masog to Lareuse), examined the transportation-related conditions of A-9878, CDP-0102/01, and 4-04174 as they apply to the subject specific design plan. The transportation planner noted that improvements were required by Basic Plan A-9878 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04174, which was supported by a traffic study submitted in 2003. The planner concluded that the subject application is in general conformance with the

previously approved basic plan, comprehensive design plan, and preliminary plan and will be served by adequate transportation facilities within a reasonable period of time.

- b. In a memorandum dated December 20, 2007 (Shaffer to Lareuse), the Transportation Planning Section's trails planner indicated that the subject specific design plan reflects standard sidewalks along both sides of all roads and a trail connection from Ava Way to the existing trail adjacent to the proposed development in accordance with CDP-0102/01. The trails planner made no master plan trail recommendations.
- c. In a memorandum dated November 7, 2007 (Linkins to Lareuse), the Permit Review Section provided several comments that have either been addressed through revisions to the plans or are addressed in other portions of this report.
- d. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated December 24, 2007 (Stasz to Lareuse), recommended approval of SDP-0705 and TCPII/126/98-08. The environmental planner provided a detailed discussion of the applicable conditions of approval of the basic plan, comprehensive design plan, and preliminary plan of subdivision. In addition, the planner provided the following analysis of the environmental issues related to the development of the subject site:

Environmental Review

A detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was reviewed in conjunction with Preliminary Plan 4-96083. That FSD was resubmitted with CDP-0102 and was found to address the requirements for an FSD in accordance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.

Comment: No further action regarding the FSD is required with regard to this specific design plan review.

Streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, and associated buffers are found throughout this property. The 100-year floodplain is shown on record plats VJ 186-63 and VJ 186-64. Streams, wetlands and associated buffers are correctly shown on the plans submitted with this application.

During the review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96083, variations to Section 24-129 and Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations were approved for the proposed impacts to streams, stream buffers, 100-year floodplain, wetlands, and wetland buffers associated with road crossings for Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard. However, no variation associated with the proposed lake was requested or approved with 4-96083. The lake design was studied in detail during the review and approval of SDP-0108 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01045, which created the parcel containing the lake and approved variation requests for impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers. Impacts for the installation of sewer lines, outfalls for

stormwater management ponds, and at least one street crossing were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080. Impacts for the installation of sewer lines, outfalls for stormwater management ponds, and at least one street crossing were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-04174. The impacts shown on SDP-0705 are consistent with those previously approved. No further information regarding sensitive environmental features is required for the review of this specific design plan.

Although McKendree Road is identified as a historic road, this application proposes no impacts within 600 feet of McKendree Road. No further information regarding historic or scenic roads is required for the review of this specific design plan.

Traffic-generated noise may impact portions of the property. US 301 is the eastern boundary of the subject property. The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the 65dBA noise contour is 531 feet from the centerline of US 301. This noise corridor will impact the L-A-C and E-I-A portions of the site but not the R-M-zoned portion currently under review. General Lafayette Boulevard is designed as a master plan collector roadway and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. Chadds Ford Drive is designed as a 70-foot access road and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. No further action regarding noise is required with regard to this specific design plan review.

- e. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section, in a memorandum dated March 10, 2008 (Harrell to Lareuse), indicated that the proposed development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed fire and rescue, police, and public school facilities.
- f. The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated December 3, 2007 (Irminger to Lareuse), stated there are no General Plan or master plan issues related to this specific design plan. The 2002 General Plan identifies this application as being located in the Developing Tier and in the area identified as a possible future center for Brandywine. The 1993 approved Subregion V master plan and SMA classified the site in the R-M Zone per application A-9878. This application proposes to build 31 detached dwelling units on 7.60 acres. The community planner indicated that general plan and master plan issues for this application were addressed in Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01.
- g. In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008, the Subdivision Section indicated that several conditions of approval of Preliminary Plan 4-04174 are applicable to the subject development. In addition, the Subdivision Section indicated that the site plan proposes grading on an HOA parcel in the northeast corner of the site. As a result, the Subdivision planner recommends that this and all other HOA parcels be labeled to indicate future ownership. A condition of approval has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report that would address the concerns raised by the Subdivision Section.

- h. In a memorandum dated March 10, 2008 (Solomon to Lareuse), the Department of Parks and Recreation reviewed the applicable conditions of approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision and recommended approval of the subject specific design plan subject to six conditions, which have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report. Of particular concern was the subject specific design plan's conformance with Conditions 4(a) and 4(d) of Preliminary Plan 4-04174, which is discussed in detail in Finding 9 above.
 - i. In a memorandum dated October 30, 2007 (Stabler to Lareuse), the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section indicated that five archeological sites have been identified within a one-mile radius of the subject property and that the probability of the subject property containing significant historic or prehistoric resources is moderate to high. The staff archeologist recommended a Phase I archeological investigation in accordance with the Planning Board's directives, as described in the *Guidelines for Archeological Review* (May 2005). However, the preliminary plan of subdivision for the subject site, 4-04174, was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on February 3, 2005 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-15) and predates the *Guidelines for Archeological Review*. No archeological work was required at the time of preliminary plan approval and staff cannot lawfully require such work at this juncture. However, the applicant has proffered to conduct a Phase I archeological investigation, and if necessary, a Phase II or Phase III evaluation. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, detailing the process for this investigation.
15. **Required Findings for approval of a specific design plan (Section 27-528 Planning Board action):**
- (1) **The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, and for Specific Design Plans for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the applicable design guidelines for townhouses set forth in Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11), and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) and, as it applies to property in the L-A-C Zone, if any portion lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail station, the regulations set forth in Section 27-480(d) and (e);**

Comment: As stated in Findings 8 and 11 above, the subject specific design plan is in conformance with the approved comprehensive design plan and the applicable standards of the *Landscape Manual*. The subject specific design plan does not propose the construction of townhouse units.

- (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: Findings for adequate public facilities were made in conjunction with the preliminary plan for the development and in memoranda dated March 10, 2008, by the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Section, and dated December 24, 2007, by the Transportation Section, which indicated that the proposed development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities.

(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: The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8065-2007-00, which is valid until March 27, 2010. At the time of the writing of the staff report, comment from DPW&T regarding the subject SDP's conformance to the approved stormwater management concept plan has not been received. A condition has been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report that would require this information prior to signature approval.

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

Comment: In a memorandum dated December 24, 2007 (Stasz to Lareuse), the Environmental Planning Section indicated that Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/126/98/08 for the subject site is in conformance with TCPI/46/97-04, which was approved with CDP-0102/01.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/126/98-08), and APPROVED Alternative Compliance No. AC-08003, and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0705 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. All residential structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with the National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George's County laws in order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services.
2. Prior to signature approval of the specific design plan, the applicant shall make the following revisions to the plans or provide the following information:
 - a. Provide construction details for the proposed entry feature to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. The entry feature shall coordinate with the previously approved features for Sections 1 through 6.
 - b. Provide evidence from DPW&T that the proposed development is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan.
 - c. Revise the cumulative lot size table on the coversheet of the SDP. Two separate tables shall

- be provided for the single-family detached and attached lots in accordance with Finding 8.
- d. Revise the landscape plans to substitute any invasive species with native species.
 - e. Revise the landscape plans to include separate schedules for Sections 4.1(c) and 4.1(d) of the *Landscape Manual*.
 - f. Revise the landscape plans to include landscaping schedules in accordance with Section 4.6 of the *Landscape Manual* for Lots 8 and 9.
 - g. Revise the plans to provide a six-foot-high, nonwood, natural-color, sight-tight fence along the entire rear yard of Lots 1 and 31.
 - h. The plans shall be revised to clearly identify the parcels to be dedicated to the HOA and the area calculations of such parcels.
 - i. The architectural elevations shall be revised to indicate a minimum 7:12 roof pitch.
 - j. The architectural elevations shall be revised to incorporate a minimum of three end wall features for all of the units in a balanced or symmetrical design.
 - k. A wraparound porch or full brick side elevation shall be provided on highly visible Lots 1 and 31.
 - l. The architectural elevations shall be revised to include the dimensions of the depth of all porches. Porches shall be a minimum of six feet deep.
 - m. The architectural elevations shall be revised to delete all second-story bay windows on the front façade.
 - n. The architectural elevations of the Princeton model D3 shall be revised to delete the two doors to the left of the main entry door. These doors shall be replaced with windows coordinating with the overall design of the façade.
 - o. The plans shall be revised to add a tracking chart to demonstrate that 60 percent of the units will have full brick fronts.
 - p. Revise the plans to include the lot width at the front building line for all cul-de-sac lots. Any lots not in conformance with Condition 1(a)(1) of CDP-0102/01 shall be revised to have a minimum width of 50 feet at the front building line.
3. The developer, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall display in the sales office all of the plans approved by the Planning Board for this subdivision, including all exterior elevations of all approved models, the detailed site plan and landscape plan.

4. Prior to certificate approval of SDP-0705, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows:
 - a. Provide a 28-foot-wide parcel of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC between proposed Lots 15 and 16 from Ava Way as shown on DPR Exhibit A. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall convey this property to M-NCPPC at the time of final plat of subdivision.
 - b. Provide a six-foot-wide feeder trail from Ava Way to the master-planned trail between proposed Lots 15 and 16.
5. The feeder trail shall be designed in accordance with the applicable standards in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.
6. Prior to certificate approval of SDP-0705, the applicant shall provide construction drawings to DPR for review and approval for the feeder trail including typical sections and details for any structures necessary to assure dry passage such as a bridge, boardwalk or retaining wall. The trail shall be designed to meet DPR and ADA accessibility design standards. DPR shall review and approve the trail layout and slopes to ensure it meets recommended design standards prior to certification of the SDP.
7. No building permits shall be issued for any lots adjacent to the feeder trail (shown as Lots 15 and 16) until the feeder trail is under construction.
8. The location of the trail shall be staked in the field and approved by DPR prior to construction.
9. Prior to final plat of subdivision the applicant shall amend the Public Recreational Facilities Agreement for Chaddsford, Liber 24463, folio 561, dated February 16, 2006, to include the feeder trail to be constructed on park property as part of this SDP.
10. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 135th unit in the development, the applicant shall submit to the Department of Parks and Recreation a performance bond, a letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, for the construction of the public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland in the amount to be determined by DPR.
11. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 16th unit in the subject SDP, all public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed.
12. An archeological survey shall be conducted on the 7.60 acres of the subject site. The survey shall include the following:
 - a. Prior to certification of the specific design plan (SDP), the applicant shall provide a Phase I archeological investigation, according to the Planning Board's Guidelines for Archeological Review (May 2005), to determine if any cultural resources are present. A

Phase I research plan shall be submitted for approval by the staff archeologist prior to commencing Phase I work. The Phase I investigation shall include:

- (1) A title search, tracing the title back as far as possible.
- (2) The examination of census records, in order to determine if past owners held slaves.
- (3) Any other investigation determined to be necessary.

Written M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to signature approval of the SDP.

- b. Prior to approval of any ground disturbing activities, if it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

- (1) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II and, if required, the Phase III level.
- (2) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.

- c. Prior to approval of any ground disturbing activities, if a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner.

13. The following architectural elevations shall be deleted:

Fairbanks—Elevation A
Princeton—Elevation A
Patrick Henry—Elevation D
Kingston—Elevations A1 and B1
Stanton—Elevations A1 and A3
Newton—Elevation A1
Oliver—Elevation A1

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 Cavitt, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Cavitt, Vaughns, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 3, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 24th day of April 2008.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs