



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

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN PLAN CDP-9306/02

Application	General Data
Project Name: Villages of Piscataway (aka the Preserve at Piscataway) Location: South of Floral Park Road and Danville Road Applicant/Address: Bailey's Associates, L.P. c/o Greenvest, L.C. 8614 Westwood Center Drive Vienna, VA 22189	Date Accepted: 08/01/2008
	Planning Board Action Limit: N/A
	Plan Acreage: 878.68
	Zone: R-L & L-A-C
	Dwelling Units: 1,140
	Gross Floor Area: 30,000–45,000 sq. ft.
	Planning Area: 84
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 09
	Municipality: None
200-Scale Base Map: 218SE02 & 03	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
To amend the minimum permissible roof pitch from 8:12 to 7:12 and to allow townhouse decks to extend beyond rear setback lines.	Informational Mailing:	03/25/2008
	Acceptance Mailing:	07/21/2008
	Sign Posting Deadline:	10/07/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Lindsay, Chris	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306/02
Villages of Piscataway

Urban Design staff has reviewed the proposed revision to the comprehensive design plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The comprehensive design plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the basic plan for Zoning Map Amendments A-9869 and A-9870, and with the 39 conditions and 11 considerations of CR-60-1993
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the R-L and L-A-C Zones.
- c. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** This application proposes to modify the approved development regulations established for the Villages of Piscataway by CDP-9306/02. Specifically, the applicant proposes to modify the minimum allowable roof pitch of buildings from 8:12 to 7:12, and to allow rear decks on townhouses to extend up to ten feet beyond rear building restriction lines.
2. **Location:** The Villages at Piscataway is located in Planning Area 84, south of Floral Park Road near its intersection with Piscataway Road.
3. **Surroundings and Uses:** The properties surrounding the Villages of Piscataway are predominantly large-lot residential or agricultural parcels in the R-A Zone. To the northeast, the Bailey's Village section of the project is adjacent to the historic Piscataway Village, which features a traditional cluster of historic houses along a main street.
4. **Previous Approvals:** On September 14, 1993, the Prince George's County District Council adopted CR-60-1993 approving the *Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V*,

Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B. The sectional map amendment, in conjunction with Zoning Applications A-9869 and A-9870, rezoned 858.7 acres in the R-A Zone to the R-L (Residential Low Development, 1.0 to 1.5 du/acre) Zone and 19.98 acres to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone. The rezoning was approved with 39 conditions and 11 considerations.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306 for Villages of Piscataway was approved by the Planning Board on March 24, 1993. On November 18, 2004, the Planning Board approved a request for reconsideration of a condition relating to the development of the golf course, as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 94-98.

On June 7, 2007, the Planning Board approved CDP-9306/01, a revision to increase the maximum permissible height of townhouses within the project to 40 feet.

Specific design plans have been approved for the development of all the lots within the project.

5. **Design Features:** The Villages of Piscataway consist of eight separate areas: Glassford Village, Bailey's Village, Edelen Village South, Edelen Village North, Lusby Village West, Lusby Village East, Danville Estates West, and Danville Estates East. The villages include a mix of single-family detached and attached houses, with recreational facilities and commercial spaces located at the centers of some villages. An eighteen-hole golf course is planned to be developed in the spaces between the villages. The historic Edelen House is located on the western edge of Bailey's Village.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. **Zoning Ordinance:** Prior to approving a comprehensive design plan, the Planning Board must make the required findings found in Section 27-521:

(a)(1) The plan is in conformance with the Basic Plan approved by application per Section 27-195; or when the property was placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment per Section 27-223, was approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;

In general, the plan remains in conformance with approved Basic Plans A-9869 and A-9870. There is one condition of the plan which warrants discussion in the context of the proposed revision:

10. **The L-A-C portion of the project known as Bailey's Village shall be designed so as to be compatible with the adjacent Historic Bailey's Plantation (Edelen House) and the historic village. Specific details pertaining to the building mass, height, scale, and construction materials and details shall be provided as part of the CDP submission.**

The proposed roof pitch requirement, although not readily discernable in most circumstances, has the potential to reduce the compatibility of buildings with the Edelen House and the historic village. The Edelen House features particularly steep roofs, and the flatter roof standard proposed

by this revision would not be compatible with that standard. Therefore, the Urban Design Section recommends that the proposed adjustment to roof pitch requirements should not apply to buildings within Bailey's Village. This recommendation is in agreement with the comments of the Historic Preservation Section.

- (a)(2) The proposed plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations;**

The proposed revisions to the plan will allow builders slightly more flexibility in the construction of the development. The slightly lower roof pitch proposed as the standard will allow for the incorporation of additional house models into the product mix provided in the plan.

- (a)(3) Approval is warranted by the way in which the Comprehensive Design Plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities, and satisfies the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project;**

The proposed revisions will not detract from the design elements, facilities, and amenities provided as part of the project. Granting the proposed revision will allow builders to have greater flexibility in providing different house types for future residents.

- (a)(4) The proposed development will be compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings;**

- (a)(5) Land uses and facilities covered by the Comprehensive Design Plan will be compatible with each other in relation to:**
 - (A) Amounts of building coverage and open space;**
 - (B) Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses; and**
 - (C) Circulation access points;**

The proposed land uses will remain compatible. The proposed revision to allow the rear decks of townhouses within the rear setbacks established by the CDP will have a negligible impact on the amount of open space provided. The Villages of Piscataway include both rear-loaded and front-loaded townhouses. In the case of rear-loaded townhouses, most of the rear setback area on the lot will be paved in order to provide driveway access to the rear alley. In this situation, the construction of decks above the driveways will not impact the amount of open space. Where the townhouses are front-loaded, the construction of decks will slightly reduce the amount of open space provided on the lot but will allow the homeowners to have more usable outdoor space. Lot coverage will not be affected by the revision, which will not reduce the compatibility of the townhouses with the other land uses covered in the CDP or with the immediate surroundings.

- (a)(6) Each staged unit of the development (as well as the total development) can exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability;**

- (a)(7) The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities;**

The proposed revision will have no impact on the staging of the development.

- (a)(8) Where a Comprehensive Design Plan proposal includes an adaptive use of a Historic Site, the Planning Board shall find that:**

- (A) **The proposed adaptive use will not adversely affect distinguishing exterior architectural features or important historic landscape features in the established environmental setting;**
- (B) **Parking lot layout, materials, and landscaping are designed to preserve the integrity and character of the Historic Site;**
- (C) **The design, materials, height, proportion, and scale of a proposed enlargement or extension of a Historic Site, or of a new structure within the environmental setting, are in keeping with the character of the Historic Site;**

The proposed revision does not propose an adaptive reuse of a historic site.

- (a)(9) **The Plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle, and except as provided in Section 27-521(a)(11), where townhouses are proposed in the Plan, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the requirements set forth in Section 27-433(d);**

The plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines for site plans (Section 27-274) and for townhouses (Section 27-521(a)(11)).

- (a)(10) **The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan;**

The plan's conformance with approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/9/94 is not affected by this revision.

- (a)(11) **Notwithstanding Section 27-521(a)(9), property placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone pursuant to Section 27-226(f)(4), shall follow the guidelines set forth in Section 27-480(g)(1) and (2); and**

As required under 27-226(f)(4), the property was placed in the comprehensive design zone through the Sectional Map Amendment process in conjunction with the two Basic Plan applications, A-9869 and A-9870. However, Section 27-480(g) does not apply because the Sectional Map Amendment was not intended to implement the land use recommendations of a plan approved after October 1, 2006.

- (a)(12) **For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies the requirements for the use in Section 27-508(a)(1) and Section 27-508(a)(2) of this Code.**

The Villages of Piscataway are not part of a Regional Urban Community.

7. **Roof Pitch Amendment:** Approved CDP-9306 sets a minimum roof pitch requirement for main structures of 8:12 (the slope of the roof must rise vertically at least eight inches for every twelve inches of horizontal distance). The applicant requests to amend this minimum requirement to 7:12, a slightly less steep requirement. This would allow flexibility in the provision of different houses with a less steep roof.

The proposed 7:12 standard is a common roof pitch within the housing industry. For purposes of comparisons, some styles of houses such as 1960 and 1970 style ranch homes often feature significantly shallower roofs such as 5:12. Both steeper and flatter roofs have different

advantages. Steep roofs shed precipitation more effectively, provide more usable attic space beneath the roof, and present a more animated streetscape. Flatter roofs are generally more cost effective because of the smaller amount of roof material employed and the greater ease of construction on a flatter surface. Although a 7:12 roof pitch does present a slightly different appearance from an 8:12 roof pitch, the difference is not significant and brings the project in line with current practices and requirements of other projects in the County.

The applicant's proposal leaves in place other elements of the architectural design standards that require roofs to be simple and symmetrical in form, disallowing the provision of vents or other roof protrusions facing a street, and regulating the type of materials from which the roof may be constructed.

Staff believes that the lower roof pitch should not be utilized within Bailey's Village, which is intended to be consistent with historic Piscataway Village and with the Edelen House.

Staff feels that with the exception of Bailey's Village, the amended roof pitch requirement is an acceptable revision to the CDP standards. This will allow the homebuilders greater flexibility to respond to demand when marketing the Villages of Piscataway.

8. **Townhouse Deck Amendment:** The applicant has proposed that the rear decks of townhouses be allowed to extend up to ten feet beyond a rear setback building. The CDP establishes a rear setback for townhouses of 20 feet from the property line. It should be noted that townhouse lots in other projects frequently do not have rear setback lines, so that this restriction is uncommon in the county. In addition, all townhouses fronting on public streets are required to provide parking garages on private alleys, which are located in the rear of the townhouses. For the small townhouse lots, the rear decks may provide a highly desirable outdoor space available to homeowners. Townhouse lots of limited depth may not have enough space to provide rear decks outside of the required building setback. Permitting the rear decks to extend up to ten feet into the setback would allow for decks to be provided under these circumstances, while the actual townhouse building itself would remain within the setback. Where there are driveways on the rear alleys, the decks would hang over the rear driveways, and therefore would not reduce the amount of green space in the development.

The Urban Design Section believes that granting this revision would not detract from the quality of the development and would be of use to the future homeowners by allowing the construction of decks where they could not be provided under current CDP development standards. Therefore, the Urban Design Section recommends that the extension of decks beyond the 20-foot rear yard setback should be limited to decks that are no more than twelve feet deep.

9. **Historic Preservation Section:** In a referral dated September 25, 2008, the Historic Preservation Section offered the following comments:

Historic Preservation Section staff recommends that any approval of the subject application should include the following condition: "The roof pitch of all buildings to be constructed within Bailey's Village shall remain at 8:12 according to CDP-9306, as approved by the Planning Board," in order to enhance the compatibility of new construction in Bailey Village with the adjacent Edelen House Historic Site (Historic Site No. 84-023-06).

The condition recommended by Historic Preservation staff has been reworded and included with the conditions in the Recommendation Section of the report.

RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing evaluation and analysis, Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE CDP-9603/02, with the following conditions:

1. The development standards for the comprehensive design plan for the Villages of Piscataway shall be modified to include the following:
 - a. The minimum roof pitch for all main buildings (except in Bailey's Village) shall be 7:12.
 - b. The minimum roof pitch for all main buildings in Bailey's Village shall be 8:12.
 - c. Townhouse decks may extend up to ten feet beyond the rear building setback line, provided that the deck is no more than 12 feet deep.