



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

DETAILED SITE PLAN

DSP-07046

Application	General Data
Project Name: Glenwood Hills Subdivision, Phase II Location: South of Central Avenue, approximately 4,000 feet east of the intersection with Addison Road Applicant/Address: Glenwood Hills Venture, LLP 5410 Edson Lane, Suites No. 220 Rockville, MD 20852	Date Accepted: 9/26/2007
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 121.08
	Zone: M-X-T
	Dwelling Units: 197
	Gross Floor Area: N/A
	Planning Area: 75
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 6
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 201SE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
63 single-family detached and 134 two-family dwelling units	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-12-2003)
	8/7/2007
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed:
	3/4/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Christopher Lindsay	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-07046 Glenwood Hills, Phase II

Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site 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 detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the M-X-T Zone
- b. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*
- c. The requirements of previously approved CSP-88020/02
- d. The requirements of previously approved 4-04081
- e. Referral comments

FINDINGS

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

- 1. **Request:** This application proposes a mix of residential single-family and two-family dwelling units as part of a larger mixed-use community.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Residential
Acreage	121.08 (entire site)	22 (Phase II)
Single-family detached units	0	63
Rear-loaded	0	22
Small lot front-loaded	0	35
Large lot front-loaded	0	6
Two-family units	0	134
Total residential units	0	197

ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA

Single-Family Detached Models

Model	Base Finished Square Footage
Austin II	2,288 (detached 2-car garage)
Belvedere	1,998 (2-car garage)
Carroll II	2,772 (detached 2-car garage)
Halifax	1,873 (1- or 2-car garage)
Hammond	2,010 (2-car garage)
Hemingway	1,904 (detached 2-car garage)
Kipling	3,061 (2-car garage)
Michner II	2,552 (detached 2-car garage)
Melville	1,977 (detached 2-car garage)
Montgomery	2,884 (2-car garage)
Oberlin	2,632 (2- or 3-car garage)
Ravenwood	2,261 (2-car garage)
Sheridan	2,459 (2-car garage)
Taylor	2,808 (2-car garage)
Tolstoy	3,596 (2-car garage)

Two-Family Attached Models

Model	Base Finished Square Footage
Matisse	1,642 (1-car garage)
Picasso	2,641 (1-car garage)

3. **Location:** The Glenwood Hills development is located south of MD 214 (Central Avenue) along Karen Boulevard.

Karen Boulevard runs north and south through the center of the property, roughly bisecting the site. The Glenwood Hills development is divided into four phases along this north-south axis. A Detailed Site Plan for Phase I (DSP-07003) was approved for the area north of the subject phase, consisting of 90 single-family detached houses and 117 townhouses, along with a community recreation area to serve the whole development. The subject application is for Phase II. A Detailed Site Plan for Phase III (DSP-07048) has been submitted concurrently with this application, and is proposed to consist of 45 single-family and 144 multifamily dwelling units. Phase IV will consist of the commercial retail and office portion of the development and will be located at the northern end of the site, adjacent to Central Avenue.

The conceptual site plan for Glenwood Hills identified five phases of development, but the land area and dwelling units proposed in the second phase of development in that plan have been divided between the submitted Phase I and Phase II detailed site plans. Therefore, the detailed site plan for Phase III will correspond with the fourth phase proposed in the CSP, while the detailed site plan for Phase IV is expected to correspond with the fifth phase proposed in the CSP.

4. **Surroundings and Uses:** Immediately north of the Phase II site is the Glenwood Hills Phase I development, consisting of a mix of single-family houses and townhouses, as well as the central

recreation area to serve the Glenwood Hills community. Further north from this is Parcel P, intended for future development as the commercial phase of the mixed-use community. Parcel P is immediately south of Central Avenue.

South of the Phase II site is the Phase III site, for which a detailed site plan has been submitted concurrently with this one (DSP-07048). This phase is proposed to consist of 45 single-family houses and 144 multifamily dwelling units. South of this is the site of the Walker Mill Middle School.

To the east, the site borders land owned by PEPCO, which also owns a strip of land running east-west between the Phase I and Phase IV sites. PEPCO possesses a structure on the northern end of this land, adjacent to Central Avenue, and overhead power lines run south alongside the eastern edge of the Glenwood Hills development.

On the west side, the subject site borders an existing single-family residential development in the R-55 Zone.

5. **Prior Approvals:** The Glenwood Hills property (previously identified as Parcel 165) was formerly zoned R-R (Rural Residential). The 1986 sectional map amendment for Suitland-District Heights rezoned the property to the M-X-T (Mixed-Use Transportation-Oriented) Zone. The Glenwood Hills property was originally planned under the name Meridian in a Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020, which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board (PGCPB No. 88-303) on September 8, 1988. CSP-88020 included 2,146,700 square feet of office, 1,794 residential dwelling units, a 300-room hotel, and 85,100 square feet of retail. That plan was revised, renamed Glenwood Hills, and approved by the Planning Board on March 31, 1994 (after a request for reconsideration of the original Planning Board's decision to disapprove the plan). Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/01 was approved (PGCPB No. 93-269) with 785 dwelling units (105 detached units, 310 townhouse units, and 370 multifamily units) and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. Another revision to the Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/02, was approved (PGCPB No. 04-170) on July 15, 2004, for 202 single-family detached units, 117 single-family attached units, 278 multifamily residential units, and 203,000 square feet of office/retail space.

Following the approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/01, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94066 was approved on November 10, 1994, and the resolution, PGCPB No. 94-351, was adopted on December 1, 1994. Because of the size of the proposed development, the preliminary plan was valid for six years with the possibility of two 2-year extensions. Two extensions were granted and the preliminary plan expired on December 1, 2004. A new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04081, was approved with conditions on October 28, 2004, and the resolution, PGCPB No. 04-252, was adopted on November 18, 2004. The subject DSP covers a portion of the development approved in CSP-88020/02 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081. The site also has a Stormwater Management Concept Approval, # 39362-2002-02.

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07003, for Phase I of the development, was approved on October 11, 2007, with the resolution passing October 18, 2007. This DSP was for 90 single-family detached houses, 117 townhouses, and the central recreational pod.

6. **Design Features:** The plan proposes three distinct residential types: front-loaded single-family detached houses, rear-loaded single-family detached houses, and two-family attached dwellings (two-over-twos). The units are grouped together so that each type of unit can be seen as composing a distinct pod of development, although the two types of detached houses are not separated from each other.

Like the overall Glenwood Hills development, this phase is built on both sides of Karen Boulevard. The east side of the site is proposed to be developed with 134 rear-loaded two-family units. These two-family units are grouped in 14 sticks of 8–12 units each. Access to the two-family pod from Karen Boulevard is through two access points at the north and south ends of the pod, from which access streets lead to a network of alleys running behind the units. Two sticks of units face toward Karen Boulevard, and two more sticks face north and south onto each of the access roads. The sides of four sticks of units face Karen Boulevard. Each unit features a one-car garage at the rear of the unit, with a driveway 19 feet in length providing a parking space for an additional car.

On the west side of Karen Boulevard, the 22 rear-loaded single-family houses are clustered together in one block, with an alley running through its center for vehicular access. These units follow a neo-traditional model, utilizing freestanding detached garages facing into the rear alleys for their vehicle storage. The fronts of the houses are thus reserved for pedestrian access to the public sidewalks. This allows the first row of rear-loaded houses to front directly onto Karen Boulevard rather than facing away from the main road or utilizing a parallel stub street for access. The placement of these units continues a line of such houses facing onto Karen Boulevard within Phase I.

West and south of the rear-loaded single-family houses, the remaining 41 single-family houses are developed according to the more conventional model of front-loaded garages. This section of the development features a pair of culs-de-sac where the houses back up against a woodland preservation area on Parcel B. There is also one street connection into Phase I.

The bulk of the development's recreational facilities are considered to be within the recreational center in Phase I, including a 6,636-square-foot clubhouse (with an aerobics room, exercise room, locker rooms, larger meeting/ party room, large TV room, library, computer room, and a kitchen with appliances), a 25-meter swimming pool, one 2,550-square-foot multiage playground, one tennis court, two picnic areas with eight picnic tables and nine benches, four spring animals, and segments of five-foot-wide and eight-foot-wide sidewalks (as reviewed in DSP-07003).

Within the subject phase, there are two proposed play areas. A 2,800-square-foot playground is proposed at the corner of Layla Court and Odelia Drive, roughly in the center of the single-family detached section of the plan. This playground is divided into two separate sections and includes a climbing/play structure, six benches, three picnic tables, and three spring animals. Another play area of 2,100 square feet is proposed at the corner of Bambi Road and Yasmine Way, roughly in the center of the two-family section of the plan. This play area includes a climbing structure, two spring animals, two benches, and two picnic tables.

7. **Urban Design Review:** On the western side of the site, the two proposed culs-de-sac and single-family houses end in close proximity to the existing single-family houses on the western edge of the site. This is consistent with previous approvals, although the opportunity to connect the streets together clearly exists. At the time of conceptual site plan and preliminary plan review, staff had recommended making these connections, but this was opposed by the applicant and by residents of the nearby subdivisions. The pedestrian connection between the culs-de-sac was decided on as an alternative solution that was more acceptable to the applicant and residents.

The proposed arrangement of buildings is very closely spaced. Some of the proposed houses are located within three feet of the side property line, while rear decks behind some houses could be as close as five feet from the rear property line. As noted below in Finding 10, the applicant has

requested development standard amendments to allow this. Within the two-family dwelling pod, although minimum spacing of 20 feet between the faces of buildings has been maintained, some of the sides of buildings fall within four feet of each other. The close spacing is largely consistent with the approved conceptual site plan, as the requested modifications to the approved development standards are minor in nature. Overall the development will offer a variety of housing choices.

As listed in the table above, the applicant has proposed ten conventional house types (with forward-facing attached garages) and five neo-traditional house types (with rear-facing) detached garages. The different house types utilize a variety of roof and window treatments and feature numerous options including brick facades and expanded living space. All of these house types were also approved in Phase I of the development under DSP-07003.

The two-family dwellings proposed on the eastern part of the site include two types of units; every two-unit building section contains one Matisse unit and one Picasso unit. As with other two-family dwellings, the fronts of the units are very attractively treated and articulated through the use of brick facades and generous fenestration, while the sides are mostly faced with siding and have few windows. The rears of the buildings are dominated by rear garage doors at the street level, with decks mounted above the rear driveways. Although the nature of the unit type to some extent dictates the appearance of the rear alleys, landscaping and paving treatments should be used around the driveways to increase their attractiveness. There should also be more attention given to the visible sides of the buildings facing west toward Karen Boulevard and east toward Zoe Loop. The basic model of the building features only four windows on the side of the building, which is much larger than a conventional house or townhouse (the side of the building is approximately 52 feet wide and 56 feet tall at the peak of the roof). On the visible sides of buildings, facing toward Karen Boulevard or Zoe Loop, the Urban Design Section recommends that the buildings should be constructed using additional windows on the second, third, and fourth stories. This would provide a more balanced and attractive endwall on the outward-oriented sides.

8. **Required Findings of the M-X-T Zone:** Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the following findings be made for the Planning Board to approve a detailed site plan in the M-X-T Zone.

In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:

- (1) **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;**

The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes of the M-X-T zone, because it will promote the orderly development of land in the vicinity of a major transit stop, and create a compact, mixed-use, walkable community (in concert with the other phases of Glenwood Hills).

- (2) **For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development 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;**

This requirement does not apply to the subject property as it was rezoned by the 1986 sectional map amendment.

- (3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The proposed development has an outward orientation as buildings front directly onto the public right-of-way on Karen Boulevard, and pedestrian connections are made to the adjacent neighborhood. The impact of developing the entire Glenwood Hills project is also likely to catalyze improvement and rejuvenation within adjacent communities.

- (4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;**

The proposed development of single-family homes and two-family homes is compatible with the existing development in the vicinity. The existing development in the immediate vicinity consists nearly entirely of single-family houses, while garden apartments and commercial properties are to be found closer to the major transportation routes of Central Avenue and Addison Road. Although some of the proposed single-family houses are developed in a neo-traditional model and the two-family houses are more dense than the existing residential areas, these differences do not create incompatibilities.

The proposed development is also compatible with the other phases of Glenwood Hills, which feature a similar mix of conventional single-family houses, neo-traditional single-family houses, and denser attached or multifamily dwelling units.

- (5) The mix of uses, arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, and provision of public amenities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;**

When all the phases of the Glenwood Hills community are built, including the commercial space and the central recreational facilities, the design will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

- (6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

The residential units within Phase II of the development are self-sufficient to the extent that they could be realized without the rest of the phases being completed; however, the phase depends on the completion of Karen Boulevard within the other phases of the development for its access to public roads. Other features of the overall Glenwood Hills that will serve Phase II—including the commercial area and the recreational amenities—are also within other phases. The design clearly allows for effective integration of subsequent phases, as the adjacent phases of development will be compatible uses developed in a manner consistent with Phase II.

- (7) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

A convenient pedestrian system has been provided by sidewalks along all the streets (not along the alleys, where pedestrian activity should be minimal and vehicular traffic will be heavy).

Pedestrian links have been created to the existing single-family houses on the western side of the site. As noted in the referral from the trails coordinator, there are some intersections that do not show delineated crosswalks. This should be corrected prior to signature approval of the plans.

- (8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

Areas of the development to be used for pedestrian activities or gathering spaces include the play areas and the sidewalks in the development. The Urban Design Section believes that adequate attention has been paid to the design of these areas.

- (9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant, or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

This requirement is not applicable to the subject Detailed Site Plan.

- (10) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant.**

The site was the subject of conceptual site plan approval and preliminary plan approval fewer than six years ago.

- (11) On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.**

The area of the entire Glenwood Hills site is 121.08 acres.

9. **Other Requirements of the M-X-T Zone:** The M-X-T Zone regulates density by floor-area ratio (FAR), permitting a base density of 0.4 FAR, which may be increased to 1.4 when developing a mix of residential and commercial uses, and may be increased further by providing additional amenities through the optional method of development. The Glenwood Hills development does

not propose to utilize the optional method of development because the proposed development is less than the base permitted 0.4 FAR.

10. **Conceptual Site Plan:** CSP-88020/02 was approved by the Planning Board on July 15, 2004, with 29 conditions of approval as contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-170. A number of these conditions have already been fulfilled during the review of the preliminary plan and of the Phase I detailed site plan. The following conditions warrant discussion at this time:

12. **A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Board which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.**
13. **The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.**

The recreational facilities within this phase are shown located on HOA land and are in compliance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. The applicant has affirmed that there will be a single umbrella HOA to administer the overall development and the central recreational facilities. Smaller suborganizations would be organized for the different types of units and pods of development. To ensure that the facilities will be available to all residents, the applicant should demonstrate evidence of a legal arrangement in the governing documents of the overall HOA that will ensure all recreational facilities on the site (including but not limited to those in the central recreational area) will be available to all members of the Glenwood Hills community.

14. **Submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**
15. **The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.**
18. **The following schedule shall govern bonding and construction of recreational facilities and shall be included in the recreational facilities agreement(s):**
- a. **Prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.**
 - b. **Prior to the issuance of the 300th building permit in the development, the applicant shall complete the central recreational facilities.**
 - c. **The bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development pods shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each pod respectively, and the completion of the same facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each pod of development.**

This condition remains in effect. Therefore the recreational facilities within the two-family development area must be bonded before the issuance of building permits for the two-

family dwelling units, and must be completed prior to the completion of the 101st two-family unit.

21. **Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500th dwelling unit, the Applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to M-NCPPC Urban Design Division evidence of its good faith efforts marketing of the commercial component along with third-party data on the existing market for office and/or retail development at the Property and adjoining area.**

This condition remains in effect for the entire development.

25. **The following development standards apply and shall be demonstrated throughout the review of future plans:**

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED:

Traditional SFD

**Minimum Net Lot area—6,000 square feet
Minimum finished living area—2,200 square feet
Two car garage—yes
Maximum lot coverage—40%
Minimum lot frontage at the street line—50-60 feet (Footnote 1)
Front yard setback—20 feet (Footnote 2)
Side yard setback—5/10 combined feet
Rear yard setback—20 (excluding decks)
Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet
Maximum height of building—40 feet
Deck standards—to be determined at DSP**

Small Lot SFD Front Load

**Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet
Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet
One or Two car garage—yes
Maximum lot coverage—50%
Minimum lot frontage at the street line—45-50 feet
Front yard setback—15 feet (Footnote 2)
Side yard setback—4 feet
Rear yard setback—20 feet (excluding decks)
Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet
Maximum height of building—40 feet
Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan**

Small Lot SFD Rear Load

**Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet
Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet
Two car garage—yes**

Maximum lot coverage—60%
Minimum lot frontage at the street line—40-45 feet (Footnote 1)
Front yard setback—15 feet, 20 feet along Karen Boulevard (Porches may extend up to 9 feet into the setback area)
Side yard setback—4 feet
Rear yard setback—3 feet
Accessory building rear yard setback—three feet
Maximum height of building—40 feet
Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Footnote 1 Excludes cul-de-sacs, flag lots and lots which front on pocket parks.

Footnote 2 A minimum of 20 feet shall be provided to the garage door

TOWNHOUSES:

All townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance.

MULTIFAMILY:

12-plex multifamily units:

Minimum distance between two buildings—20 feet
Minimum distance from a building to a property line—20 feet
Minimum distance from a building to a parking lot—5 feet
Minimum green space (minimum percent of net lot area)—45%
Minimum of 60% of all facades shall be brick

Two over two units:

Not more than six ground level units in a row
Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 16 feet wide
Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet.
Minimum of 60% of the front façade shall be brick

The Planning Board may make minor modifications to the Development Standards noted above, as a part of any subsequent approval, without the need to amend the Conceptual Site Plan if the Planning Board finds such modification is appropriate and consistent with the character and quality of the development envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan.

The proposed design adheres to most of the above requirements, but in some places within the development the requirements have not been met. The applicant has applied for modifications to the conditions in order to allow these requirements to be relaxed.

The applicant requests that the side yard setback for single-family detached houses be reduced from four feet to three feet. As shown on the plans, this modification would be necessary for the houses and garages on Lots 1, 5, 6, and 13 of Block D. These are part of the rear-loaded neo-traditional houses.

The applicant also requests that the rear yard setback for front-loaded single-family detached houses be reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet. This would apply to Lots 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 11, and

12 of Block B, and Lots 46, 47, 49, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 59, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 72, 74 of Block A. This is a total of 29 lots, out of a total of 41 front-loaded detached houses. However, it should be noted that some of these lots propose setbacks which are more than 15 feet (although still less than the required 20 feet), and that some of these lots might meet the standard 20-foot rear setback if the basic house model is constructed rather than adding options to the houses that intrude into the rear setback.

The Urban Design Section feels that these requested modifications to the development standards are relatively minor and are consistent with the character and quality of development envisioned by the conceptual site plan. The requested modifications are also in line with the modifications that were granted with the approval of DSP-07003 for similar setback modifications within the Phase I development.

The CSP development standards state that deck standards are to be determined at the time of detailed site plan. The applicant has proposed the following:

“For single-family detached houses with an integrated garage, the deck shall not intrude into the rear yard setback for more than 10 feet; and for single-family detached houses with a freestanding garage accessed through a public alley, the deck shall be placed between the house and the garage.”

This standard, in combination with the proposed rear-yard setback modifications above, would mean that decks for some of the front-loaded single-family houses could be placed as close as five feet from the rear property line. This is consistent with the deck standards approved for Phase I under DSP-07003.

28. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

- a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for 60 percent of all single-family detached units fronting on Karen Boulevard, and picket fences shall be provided for single-family detached units along Karen Boulevard in a manner that provides for a separation element to the pedestrian area.**

This condition will remain in effect—the applicant has provided a tracking table on the cover sheet of the DSP to monitor fulfillment of the condition.

- b. Sixty percent of all facades of the clubhouse shall be brick, and the building shall be placed in a visually prominent location.**

The clubhouse is within the Phase I area.

- c. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.**

The proposed residential buildings utilize a variety of rooflines, many of which include reverse gables.

- d. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.**

This phase does not include any entrance features.

- e. **Pole-mounted freestanding signs shall be prohibited for the office/retail component of the development. Freestanding and building-mounted signage shall not be internally lit.**

Freestanding signs are not proposed in this phase.

- f. **Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design.**

The applicant has included lighting fixtures to be used within this phase that are the same as those utilized in the Phase I development.

- g. **Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate areas such as the entrance to the subdivision off of Central Avenue, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily 12-plex development, and the office/retail development.**

The applicant has shown a detail of paving materials as recommended by the Department of Public Works and Transportation for use on pedestrian crosswalks. The detail is acceptable; however, there are a number of intersections where the crosswalk has not been shown on the plan. This should be corrected prior to signature approval of the DSP.

- h. **If allowed by DPW&T, shade tree plantings shall be provided within the median of Karen Boulevard and be of a size and type to create the residential, pedestrian friendly boulevard envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan. A single row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along both sides of Karen Boulevard on one side of the sidewalks.**

The plans show trees planted within the median on Karen Boulevard and along the sidewalks as required by this condition.

- i. **The multifamily (two over two units) pod of the development shall increase the number of units fronting onto Karen Boulevard and ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.**

The two-family dwelling pod was shown on the conceptual site plan with 18 units fronting onto Karen Boulevard. The detailed site plan shows 22 units fronting onto Karen Boulevard, an increase of four units. This does not markedly change the orientation of the groups of units that was shown on the CSP. Because of the closely spaced design employed in this development, it does not appear to be possible to further increase the number of units fronting on Karen Boulevard without completely redesigning the pod and probably significantly reducing the number of units.

The pod is required to meet the Zoning Ordinance's requirement for 2.04 spaces per dwelling unit. Each unit includes a one-car garage and a tandem parking space in the rear driveway. In addition, there are five additional parking spaces provided in asphalt bump-outs parallel to the alleys which are intended to furnish the additional 0.04 spaces per unit. However, it appears that the applicant rounded down when calculating the number of required parking spaces, and should in fact provide at least six spaces rather than five to meet this requirement.

- j. **The location of future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks shall be shown on the plans.**

The plan shows proposed locations for future bus stops and pedestrian connections. Crosswalks are shown on the plans but are not shown at all intersections as would be appropriate. The plans should be revised to show crosswalks at all intersections where sidewalks cross vehicle rights-of-way.

11. **Preliminary Plan 4-04081:** This preliminary plan of subdivision was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2004, with 29 conditions of approval as laid out in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-252. The following conditions warrant discussion at this time:

7. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #39362-2002-00, and any subsequent revisions.**

The Department of Public Works and Transportation has affirmed that this plan is in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #39362-2002-02, a revision to the above-referenced plan.

8. **Prior to submittal of the DSP, the applicant shall determine the extent of the land that should be the subject of a Phase I archeological investigation with the concurrence of DRD. The applicant shall complete and submit a Phase I investigation with the application for DSP (including research into the property history and archeological literature) for those lands determined to be subject. At the time of review of the DSP, the applicant shall submit Phase II and Phase III investigations as determined by DRD staff as needed. The plan shall provide for the avoidance and preservation of the resources in place or shall provide for mitigating the adverse effect upon these resources. All investigations must be conducted by a qualified archeologist and must follow *The Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Schaffer and Cole: 1994) and must be presented in a report following the same guidelines. Grading permits may be issued for areas not subject to a Phase I archeological investigation, subject to the required order of approvals.**

The required Phase I study was submitted at the time of review of the first DSP in accordance with this condition. Two archeological sites were identified but neither was considered to be significant in nature. Therefore the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section agreed that no further archeological study would be required on the property.

12. **At the time of review of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall remove the private streets serving the single-family dwelling units as required by Section 24-128(b)(7) or shall demonstrate a legal alternative.**

The applicant has indicated that the streets serving the single-family dwelling units will be public streets, in conformance with the Subdivision Regulations.

27. **Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

This condition remains in effect.

12. **Landscape Manual:** The development is subject to some portions of the *Landscape Manual*. Specifically, it is subject to Sections 4.1 and 4.7.

- a. Section 4.1 requires that residential yards of less than 9,500 square feet (i.e., all of the lots in Glenwood Hills) be planted with a minimum of one major shade tree and one ornamental or evergreen tree per lot. The plan shows an adequate number of trees within the single-family detached portions of the plan in order to meet this requirement.

For two-family dwellings, a minimum of 1.5 major shade trees and one ornamental or evergreen tree per unit shall be planted in the common open space. For 132 dwelling units, this is a total of 198 shade trees and 132 ornamental or evergreen trees.

Unfortunately the applicant mistakenly utilized the planting standards for multifamily dwelling units in the calculation of how many trees would be required within the two-family pod and has provided only 102 shade trees. It may be possible to count some trees that were provided on the eastern edge of the pod toward the 4.1 requirements; however, this has not been done on the landscape plans. If feasible, the plans should be revised to provide the required number of trees; otherwise, the applicant should apply for alternative compliance to be reviewed by the Planning Director prior to certification of the plans.

- b. Section 4.7 provides for buffering of incompatible uses. Most of the uses on the west side of Karen Boulevard are single-family houses that are compatible with their neighbors, but there are four places in the development where incompatible uses are adjacent and require buffering.

The playground in the single-family detached pod of development is considered a low-impact use that is incompatible with the adjacent houses. Therefore, it requires a type B bufferyard, consisting of a 20-foot landscaped yard along the property line. This has not been demonstrated on the plans, although it appears that adequate space will be available to provide the required bufferyard.

The two-family dwelling pod is adjacent to the central recreational area on the north side, adjacent to PEPCO power lines on the east side, and adjacent to the multifamily pod (in Phase III) on the south side. These are all considered incompatible uses. The two-family pod requires a type C bufferyard along its north and east sides, and a type A bufferyard along its south side. Unfortunately, the proposed landscape plan did not anticipate the need for this amount of buffering, so the plan does not meet these requirements, providing only a ten-foot landscaped yard along the eastern side of the site. The applicant should apply for alternative compliance prior to certification of the plans in order to provide an alternative solution to this problem.

REFERRALS

13. **Transportation Planning Section:** In a memorandum dated December 31, 2007 (Mokhtari to Lindsay), the Transportation Planning Section stated the following:

There is an approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-88020) and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-04081) for the site, each with several transportation-related conditions. Since all of the CSP transportation-related conditions were either fully addressed or were restated as new conditions in accordance with the findings made for the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following

summarizes the status of relevant transportation-related conditions of the approved preliminary plan of subdivision which must be addressed:

13. MD 214 at Addison Road: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. Option 1: The construction of a northbound free right-turn lane along Addison Road.**
- b. Option 2: The construction of an eastbound right-turn lane along MD 214.**

The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 will be implemented shall be made at the time of the initial detailed site plan.

The applicant has provided SHA with the required feasibility study and SHA concurs with the study recommendation that Option 2 would best address the noted inadequacies for this intersection. Provision of this improvement is enforceable at the time of building permit.

14. MD 214 at Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. The modification of westbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
- b. The modification of northbound Ritchie Road to a five-lane approach, which includes two left-turn lanes, a shared through/left-turn lane, a through lane, and one right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

15. Walker Mill Road at Addison Road: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. The modification of westbound Walker Mill Road to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a left-turn/right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

16. Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary,

DPW&T for a possible signal at the intersection of MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the responsible agency. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by the responsible permitting agency. Also, prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. The provision of an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MD 214.**
- b. The addition of a westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.**
- c. The construction of the northbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
- d. The modification of the southbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**

The applicant has provided SHA and DPW&T with the required signal warrant study and SHA concurs with the study recommendation that a signal is warranted. The SHA and DPW&T concurred with the staff to modify items (c) and (d) above by requiring construction of a median along MD 214 which would prohibit through movements between Karen Boulevard and Pepper Mill Drive. Provision of the signal and needed geometric improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 17. Walker Mill Road at Karen Boulevard: Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T for the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The performance of a new study may be waived by DPW&T in writing if DPW&T determines that an acceptable recent study has been conducted. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T.**

The applicant has provided DPW&T with the required signal warrant study and DPW&T concurs with the study recommendation that a signal is warranted. Provision of the signal is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 18. MD 214 at Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:**

- a. **The modification of southbound Hill Road to a five-lane approach, which includes two left-turn lanes, a shared through/left-turn lane, a through lane, and a right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 19. **Total development within the subject property under this preliminary plan shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 780 AM and 933 PM peak hour vehicle trips, in consideration of the rates of trip generation, internal satisfaction, and pass-by travel that are consistent with assumptions in the traffic study. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

The subject plan is a portion of the approved development, and the projected trips that will be generated by this phase would not exceed the established AM and PM trip caps noted above.

- 20. **Karen Boulevard: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:**

- a. **Construct Karen Boulevard as a four-lane collector roadway between MD 214 and the southern end of the site.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 21. **At the time of the initial detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall demonstrate the feasibility and constructability of the improvements described in Conditions 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18. This shall include consideration of right-of-way issues.**

The needed studies have been submitted, and appropriate discussions are included with each condition.

Vehicular access within the site is deemed acceptable if all proposed public and private streets and alleys are constructed to DPW&T standards, with adequate turnaround as required by DPW&T.

Provided that Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 approved in October 2004, **is still valid**, the transportation staff finds the submitted site plan meets the transportation requirements of Subtitle 27 for approval provided the above modifications to the approved preliminary plan of subdivision conditions are noted.

- 14. **Subdivision Referral:** In a memorandum dated November 14, 2007 (Lockard to Lindsay), the Subdivision Section offered the following:

This property was the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081, which was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2004. The resolution adopting that action (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-252) was adopted on November 18, 2004. The site is approximately 4,000 feet

east of the Addison Road Metro Station. The Glenwood Hill development is approved for 220 single-family detached units, 117 townhouse units, 278 multifamily dwelling units, and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. The submitted detailed site plans are for 63 single-family detached units, and 134 two-family units in Phase II; and 45 single-family detached units, and 144 multifamily units in Phase III. The layout shown on the DSP is generally consistent with the approved preliminary plan.

As discussed in the referral for Phase I (DSP-07003), staff is concerned with the applicant's apparent belief that some of the applicable development standards set by the District Council in their approval of CSP-88020/02 were somehow "relaxed" by the approval of the preliminary plan. Staff is uncertain whether this belief also impacts on Phases II and III. While it is true that the approved preliminary plan document contains notes setting a three-foot-minimum side yard setback and a 15-foot rear setback, this does not amend the five- and 20-foot setbacks approved in the CSP, nor could it by any statute staff is aware of. Staff must conclude that these notes were placed on the plan in anticipation of a favorable outcome as requested in the /02 revision to the CSP. However, this proposed amendment to the side and rear setbacks was clearly rejected by the staff in their technical staff report for CSP-88020/02 and was not agreed to by the District Council.

The District Council has recently amended the Subdivision Regulations to give preliminary plans of 400 dwelling units or greater a six-year validity period. Previously that length of time was only for plans of 400 or more **lots**. Consequently, the approved preliminary plan for this case remains valid until November 18, 2010, or until a final plat is recorded, whichever comes first.

Urban Design comment: Staff and the applicant are in agreement that the development standards were set by the conceptual site plan and were not modified by approval of the preliminary plan.

15. **Community Planning referral:** In a memorandum dated October 30, 2007 (Fenwick to Lindsay), the Community Planning South Division found the following:

This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the corridors in the Developed Tier. The existing zoning approved in 1986 allows for mixed-use development at this site and at intensities envisioned by the General Plan for selected locations along the corridor.

This application generally conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1985 approved Suitland-District Heights and vicinity master plan.

The development plan for Glenwood Hills, DSP-07046, reflects the second phase of construction for the subject property. Subsequent construction phases will include additional housing and commercial development. However, the detailed site plans for Phase II do not indicate future commercial development.

The property is located on a General Plan-designated corridor (Central Avenue). It is also located conveniently between two centers designated by the General Plan (Addison Road Metro Station, a community center and the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station, a regional center). The General Plan's vision for corridors and centers is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The General Plan supports this intensive, mixed-use development at local centers and at other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections of transit stops along the corridor. The existing zoning approved in 1986 allows for mixed-use development at this site and

at intensities envisioned by the General Plan for selected locations along the corridor. Planning Board Resolution No. 04-170 Condition 21 states,

“Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500th dwelling unit, the Applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to M-NCPPC Urban Design Division evidence of its good faith efforts marketing of the commercial component along with third-party data on the existing market for office and/or retail development at the Property and adjoining area.”[emphasis added]

The development plan for Glenwood Hills Subdivision proposes to construct in three phases. Construction of 117 townhouses and 90 single-family homes are to be built in Phase I; 63 detached single-family and 134 two-family units in Phase II; and 45 detached single-family and 144 multifamily units in Phase III. The total number of units proposed is 593 with 404 units in the first two phases. Pursuant to the above condition, the project needs to be monitored to ensure that the commercial development originally planned is built in accordance with the Planning Board’s requirements before all building permits for subsequent phases are issued. All the plans should reflect the development of office/retail use on the site plan along Central Avenue.

Pedestrian connections are especially important to the commercial area (along Central Avenue), transit routes, focal points, and other public places within the proposed development. The General Plan emphasizes walkability for development in the Developed Tier and along corridors. The plan **does not** clearly indicate sidewalks. All sidewalks should be labeled with dimensions. The road network must facilitate safe pedestrian connections throughout the proposed development. Pedestrian connections to adjoining residential and existing public uses such as Central High School (south of MD 214 and west of the proposed development) and Walker Mill Middle School (southeast corner of the proposed development) are critical in the future phases of development which may require separate trails.

16. **Department of Public Works and Transportation referral:** In a memorandum dated January 25, 2008 (Abraham to Zhang), the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) offered the following comments:

- a. The property is located on the south side of MD 214, in the vicinity of the 7100 and 7200 blocks. The property will be accessed through a proposed extension of Karen Boulevard in the Glenwood Hills subdivision. MD 214 is under the jurisdiction of the State Highway Administration (SHA). Access requirements and frontage improvement will be established by SHA. Karen Boulevard is a county-maintained roadway; therefore, right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T’s standards modified to provide 11-foot travel lanes and median widths of ten feet narrowing to four feet at floodplain crossings and the Americans With Disabilities Act are required.
- b. Any proposed master plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and DPW&T and may involve right-of-way reservation, dedication, and/or road construction in accordance with DPW&T’s specifications and standards.
- c. Compliance with DPW&T’s utility policy is required. Based upon the plans submitted, proper temporary and final patching and the related mill and underlay in accordance with the established DPW&T’s “Policy and Specification for Utility Installation and Maintenance Permits” are required.

- d. Culs-de-sac are required to allow, as a minimum, the turning movement for a standard WB-40 vehicle and a standard length fire truck. When considering the turning movement, it is assumed that parking is provided on the outside edge or radius of the cul-de-sac.
- e. All improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county are to be in accordance with the county Road Ordinance, DPW&T's specifications and standards modified to allow sidewalks at the curb of various locations, and the Americans With Disabilities Act.
- f. Sidewalks are required along all proposed roadways within the property limits in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the county Road Ordinance.
- g. All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's requirements.
- h. Conformance with street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- i. An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
- j. All proposed access points and intersections shall have adequate intersection site distance in accordance with the latest edition of "A Policy of Geometric Design of Highways and Streets".
- k. A soils investigation report, which includes subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets, is required.
- l. Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments. Coordination with the various utility companies is required.
- m. The detailed site plan is consistent with the approved DPW&T Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 39362-2002-02.

Urban Design comment: It should be noted that DPW&T usually enforces its conditions through its own permitting process.

17. **Trails Coordinator referral:** In a memorandum dated December 6, 2007 (Shaffer to Lindsay), the trails coordinator made the following comments:

The approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and vicinity sector plan recommends two master plan trails that impact the subject site. These trails are identified on Map 16 as the Eastern Trail along the Karen Boulevard corridor and the Railroad Trail along the Chesapeake Beach Railroad right-of-way.

The Railroad Trail impacts the northern portion of Glenwood Hills and is beyond the scope of the subject application.

The Eastern Trail is proposed to follow Pepper Mill Drive and Karen Boulevard to form a continuous north-south trail for walkers and bikers, connecting Seat Pleasant Drive with Walker Mill Road. This trail will ultimately link Peppermill Village and the proposed Glenwood Hills

development to the Peppermill Community Center, Walker Mill Middle School, Baynes Elementary School and the town center. This trail is shown on the submitted DSP.

At the time of preliminary plan, staff recommended several neighborhood connector trails linking the subject site to the surrounding community. Central High School, an existing ballfield, and the Addison Road Metro Station are west of the subject site. At the time of the preliminary plan, several trail connections were required as part of the conditions of approval. These connections included a trail linking to Fawncrest Drive and Quarry Place, a trail connection to Quarry Avenue, and a trail linking the residential community with the commercial component of the development. The trail connection is shown from Uma Court (formerly Street "G") to both Quarry Place and Fawncrest Drive. These trails will link the development with adjacent communities and nearby public facilities. The other two connections are beyond the scope of the subject application.

Condition 9 of approved Preliminary Plan 4-04081 (PGCPB No. 04-252) included the following trail and sidewalk requirements:

- 9. In conformance with the adopted and approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following and will be reflected on the DSP:**
- **Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide trail along the subject property's entire frontage of Karen Boulevard. This trail will accommodate north/south pedestrian and bicycle movement through the site as envisioned by the sector plan.**
 - **Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip, along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.**
 - **Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**
 - **Provide a trail connection from the end of Road "G" or Road "I" to Quarry Place and Fawncrest Drive.**
 - **Provide a trail connection from Road "J" to Quarry Avenue.**
 - **Provide a trail connection from the residential community to the commercial component (Outlot A to be relabeled Parcel P). This connection may be appropriate along the sewer right-of-way indicated on the conceptual site plan. An exact determination regarding the location of the trail will be made at the time of detailed site plan for Parcel P.**
 - **A more detailed analysis of pedestrian and trail connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional trail connections, sidewalks, and pedestrian safety measures may be warranted.**

Conditions appropriate for the subject application are included in the recommendation section.

SIDEWALK CONNECTIVITY:

The subdivisions immediately to the west of the subject site include standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads. Sidewalks are an integral part of the overall trail and pedestrian network and are necessary to facilitate safe pedestrian movement through the community and to nearby destinations such as Central High School, Walker Mill Middle School, Saint Margarets Elementary School, and local parks. Condition 9 of the Preliminary Plan 4-04081 requires the provision of sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.

The sidewalk network provided is comprehensive and includes standard or wide sidewalks along all roads. Included are eight-foot-wide sidewalks along one side of Karen Boulevard (the master plan trail), Gabriela Court, Odella Drive, Layla Court, and Zoe Loop. Supplementing these standard and wide sidewalks are pedestrian walkways between units. Staff supports the sidewalk network as shown on the site plan and believes that it fulfills the master plan recommendation along Karen Boulevard, meets the intent of Condition 9 of 4-04081, and provides for a walkable and accessible community.

Curb cuts and designated crosswalks should be indicated at all intersections, unless modified by DPW&T. The submitted plans do not include curb cuts and crosswalks at all intersections, with the Zoe Loop and Karen Boulevard intersection on Sheet 8 being one example. These curb cuts and crosswalks shall be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan.

18. **Environmental Referral:** In a memorandum dated March 21, 2008 (Shoulars to Lindsay), the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of DSP-07046 and TCPII/049/07-01 subject to conditions.

The Environmental Planning Section originally reviewed the subject property as Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020, and subsequently as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94066, and Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/66/94, which were approved with conditions. The subject property was again reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section as Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 with TCPI/66/94-01, which were approved with conditions. A Detailed Site Plan (DSP-07003) for Phase I of the development and a Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/049/07) were approved by the Planning Board on October 11, 2007. This application proposes the construction of additional residential units as part of Phase II of this development.

Site Description

This 121.08-acre site in the M-X-T Zone is located on the south side of Central Avenue (MD 214), approximately 4,500 feet east of the intersection with Addison Road. A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and erodible soils occur on the subject property. Central Avenue (MD 214), a planned arterial road, has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator and noise impacts are anticipated. The soils found to occur on-site according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey are in the Adelphia, Collington, Sassafras, Howell clay, and Westphalia soil series. Some of these existing soils have limitations that will have an impact during the building phase of the development. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. This property is located in the Beaverdam Creek watershed of

the Anacostia River basin. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the approved General Plan.

Review of Previously Approved Conditions

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject applications. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans.

PGCPB No. 04-94-351(C/A), File No. 4-94066

20. The following shall be provided with the Detailed Site Plan.

- a. A noise study to address townhouse lots located less than 50 feet from the collector right- of- way and single-family lots with a lot depth of less than 100 feet from the collector; or a noise mitigation package to be submitted in conjunction with the architectural review of dwelling units on the referenced lots.**
- b. A complete forest stand delineation.**
- c. Type II Tree Conservation Plan.**

All elements of Condition 20, a through c, have been addressed. No further revisions are required.

PGCPB No. 04-252(C/A), File No. 4-04081

2. A type II tree conservation plan shall be approved at time of approval of the DSP.

A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted with the DSP and will be addressed in the environmental review section.

26. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the streams and their associated buffers, except for areas of approved variations, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. 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 allowed.

This condition will be addressed at the time of final plat review.

PGCPB No. 04-170 (C/A), File No. CSP-88020/02

20. Prior to submission of a Detailed Site Plan for office/retail component, the Applicant shall provide a copy of the approved /proposed stormwater management concept plan for that area.

The subject property has an approved stormwater management concept letter for the entire development; however, a copy of the approved plan was not received. Conditions regarding stormwater management are discussed in the Environmental Review Section below.

- 24. At time of Detailed Site Plan review, if residential uses are proposed within the 65 dbA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.**

There are no noise impacts with regard to this phase of development.

As revisions are made to the plans, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe the changes, the date made, and by whom.

Environmental Review

- a. A detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was submitted for this application and was found to address the requirements for a detailed FSD and as described in the Prince George's Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.

The site contains a mixed deciduous forest, with a combination of upland hardwoods and bottomland species. Much of the bottomland areas of the site have been previously impacted by the dumping of trash, vehicles and other debris. There is an area of extremely high quality woodlands comprised of oak, hickory and beech species that is located adjacent to the power line easement on the north portion of the property. This area also contains a stream valley that intersects with the power line easement. This area is shown on the plan to be preserved.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the forest stand delineation.

- b. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted for review.

This 121.08-acre property in the M-X-T Zone has a 15 percent woodland conservation threshold of 17.43 acres. In addition, there is a ¼:1 replacement requirement of approximately 18.78 acres due to the proposed clearing of approximately 75.13 acres of existing woodland and a 1:1 replacement requirement of 0.78 acre due to the proposed clearing of forested floodplain. This results in a total woodland conservation requirement of 36.99 acres. The TCPII proposes to satisfy the woodland conservation requirement through the preservation of 33.40 acres on-site and 3.59 acres of on-site reforestation. The woodland conservation threshold of 17.43 acres is being met on-site through the preservation of high quality and high priority woodlands. The TCPII is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and the approved Type I tree conservation plan.

The plan needs only one minor revision. The critical root zone for each specimen tree must be shown on the detail sheets of the plan.

- c. Areas of afforestation are proposed in order to fulfill woodland conservation requirements on this site. In order to protect the afforestation areas after planting, so that they may mature into perpetual woodlands, afforestation areas shall be protected by permanent tree protection devices, such as two-rail split fences or equivalent, and all afforestation areas must be placed in conservation easements at time of final plat. Afforestation areas must also be planted prior to building permits issuance to ensure the longevity of the planted areas. The plat note for conservation easements has been revised accordingly. A condition has been recommended to ensure timely installation of the afforestation.
 - d. The Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (39362-2002-00), dated August 21, 2006, was submitted with the application; however, a copy of the associated plan is required for a review for consistency with other plans. The conditions associated with the stormwater management concept approval will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
 - e. Grading or filling of streams and nontidal wetlands requires the permission of the appropriate state and/or federal agencies.
19. In a memorandum dated October 17, 2007, (Chaney to Lindsay), the Permit Review Section noted a number of issues with the plan. Some of these issues were addressed through the submittal of revised plans, while others remain outstanding and are the subject of recommended conditions.
20. The detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE DSP-07046 and TCP II/049/07-01, including modifications to the CSP development standards for rear and side yards, with the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows:
 - a. Show all of the CSP development standards on Sheet 1.
 - b. On Sheet 1 of the DSP, list which lots are subject to modifications of the CSP development standards.
 - c. Clearly indicate all sidewalks using a stippled pattern and provide dimensions for the width of sidewalks.
 - d. Provide a detail for a rolled curb to be utilized along all streets with single-family houses unless modified by DPW&T.

- e. Provide additional evergreen landscaping to screen the views of alleys behind the two-family dwellings from Karen Boulevard, quantities to be determined by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - f. Prepare a driveway detail for the driveways behind two-family dwelling units, utilizing concrete pavers to define the sides of the driveway and the base of the driveway where it meets the alley.
 - g. Demonstrate at least one additional parking space accessible to the two-family dwelling pod.
 - h. Relocate the proposed play areas if necessary to demonstrate the required type B bufferyard between the playground in the single-family pod and the adjacent lots.
 - i. Add landscape schedules to demonstrate bufferyards between the two-family dwelling pod and the adjacent community center and multifamily dwellings.
 - j. Correct the 4.1 landscape schedule for residential plantings in the two-family dwelling pod to account for the fact that the use is not multifamily.
 - k. Correct the 4.7 landscape schedule for the bufferyard between the two-family dwelling pod and the PEPCO property to acknowledge that the PEPCO property is not vacant.
 - l. Provide attractive and hardy shrub and ornamental plantings within the gaps between the driveways of the two-family dwelling units.
 - m. Revise the TCPII to show the critical root zone of each specimen tree on site.
2. The plan shall reflect and the applicant shall provide the following pedestrian-oriented site elements:
- a. A minimum eight-foot-wide trail along the subject property's entire frontage of Karen Boulevard.
 - b. Standard and wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads as shown on the submitted site plan, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - c. A trail connection from the end of Uma Court to Quarry Place and Fawncrest Drive. This trail shall be constructed prior to the issuance of permits for Lots 55–56 and Lots 62–65 of Block A.
 - d. ADA-compatible curb cuts and well-marked crosswalks at all intersections, unless modified by DPW&T. Curb cuts and crosswalks shall be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan to the satisfaction of the Urban Design Section and the trails coordinator.
3. The side elevations of the Matisse/Picasso two-family buildings facing toward Karen Boulevard or toward the eastern edge of the site shall be built with no less than six optional windows made standard on the second, third and fourth floors in an attractive and balanced arrangement.

4. Prior to certification of the DSP, the applicant shall apply for and obtain approval for Alternative Compliance to address the Section 4.1 and Section 4.7 landscaping requirements for the two-family dwelling pod, with the final approval by the Planning Director as designee of the Planning Board.
5. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, a copy of the approved stormwater management concept plan shall be submitted to show compliance with the DSP.
6. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
7. Afforestation and associated permanent protection fencing shall be installed prior to the issuance of building permits for adjacent lots, and in the case of Lot 45, prior to the issuance of the building permit for that lot. A certification prepared by a qualified professional shall be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken.
8. Prior to issuance of building permits for housing in this phase, the applicant shall demonstrate that a legal arrangement has been established to ensure that all residents of the Glenwood Hills community will have equal access to all of the private recreational facilities, including but not limited to the central community facilities.
9. Prior to issuance of building permits for the 500th dwelling unit in Glenwood Hills, the applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provide to the M-NCPPC Urban Design Section evidence of its good faith efforts marketing of the commercial component along with the third-party data on the existing market for office and/or retail development at the property and the adjoining area.