

A M E N D E D R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Oakcrest West LLC is the owner of a 15-acre parcel of land known as Tax Map 80 in Grid F-1 and is also known as Parcel 3, said property being in the 6th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Multifamily High Density Residential (R-10); and

WHEREAS, on July 15, 2011, NIA The Michael Companies, INC filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 2 parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-11007 for Lustine Parcel 3 was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on January 12, 2012, for its review and action in accordance with Article 28, Section 7-116, Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, the staff of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommended APPROVAL of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on January 12, 2012, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

*WHEREAS, by letter dated August 20, 2012, the applicant requested a reconsideration of Conditions 1(b), 1(d), 1(e), and 8, and matters relating to Parcel B; and

*WHEREAS, on September 13, 2012, the Planning Board approved the request for reconsideration based on a mistake to recognize the legal deed division of Parcel 3 as described herein, to reduce the limit of the PPS from 15 acres to 4.91 acres (proposed Parcel A and Outlot C); and

*WHEREAS, on December 20, 2012, the Planning Board heard testimony regarding the reconsideration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED the Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-008-11), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-11007, Lustine Parcel 3, including a Variance to Sections 27-442(c), 27-442(e), and 27-442(h) of the Zoning Ordinance for 2 parcels with the following conditions:

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

1. Prior to signature approval of the subject preliminary plan of subdivision, the following technical corrections shall be made:

~~*[a. Combine General Notes 12 and 13 and revise it to “Water and Sewer Category 3.”]~~

~~[b. Revise General Note 23 with the correct density for Parcel B to be 49 dwelling units per acre.]~~

~~[c. Remove the statement regarding the variation.]~~

~~[d. Add a note for a variance to Sections 27-442(e), 27-442(e), and 27-442(h) of the Zoning Ordinance for Parcel B.]~~

~~[e. Show the ten-foot wide public utility easement (PUE) for Parcel A, and add a note for Parcel B that the PUE will be established prior to final plat with consent of all affected utilities.]~~

*a. Label Outlot C to be retained by owner. Reflect Outlot C as .0168 acres, Parcel A 4.37 acres, and the half of the right-of-way (ROW) easement that is a part of this application as 0.523 acres, total gross as 4.91 acres.

*b. Clearly label the dedication of that portion of Outlot C which is encumbered by the ROW easement of Ridley Street to be dedicated to public use, and provide the corrected area of Outlot C, “net.”

*c. Label the southern portion of Ridley Street to be dedicated to public use and remove “by deed.”

*d. Revise General Note 1 to indicate that the property is part of (P/O) Parcel 3.

*e. Revise Site Data to indicate that Max dwelling units is 234 (48 DU Acre x 4.91=235), 120 proposed.

2. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-008-11). The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-008-11), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Conservation Plans for the subject property are available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Planning Department.”

3. ~~*[Prior to approval of the detailed site plan for Parcel A, a valid stormwater management concept approval letter shall be submitted.]~~ Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved Stormwater Management Technical Plan 32661-2009-00, and any subsequent revisions.
4. ~~*[Prior to approval]~~ At time of the final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances *on Outlot C. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated primary management area (PMA) ~~*[except for the area included in the approved impacts]~~ 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.”
5. Prior to approval of the detailed site plan, the private on-site recreational facilities for Parcel A shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section (M-NCPPC) for adequacy and an appropriate mix of recreational facilities. A payment of a fee to supplement the requirements of mandatory dedication may be determined at the time of approval of the detailed site plan and ~~*[is]~~ to be paid prior to final plat approval.
6. The applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit three original recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) for the construction of recreational facilities on Parcel A for approval prior to submission of the final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George’s County Land Records.
7. Prior to issuance of building permits for Parcel A, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of recreational facilities on Parcel A.
8. At the time of final plat, the applicant shall ~~*[dedicate]~~ grant a ten-foot public utility easement (PUE) on Parcel A along the north side of Ridley Street and the west side of Brooks Street (Public rights-of-way). ~~[public right of way as delineated on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision. For Parcel B, the applicant shall provide a ten-foot public utility easement (PUE) or alternative easement acceptable to all applicable utilities, in conjunction with the final plat approval.]~~
9. ~~*[At the time of final plat, the applicant shall dedicate the 70-foot wide easement (1.046 acres) to public use (Ridley Street) as shown on the approved preliminary plan.]~~ At the time of final plat,

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

the applicant shall dedicate 35 feet from the center line of the 70 foot wide easement (.523 acre) to public use (Ridley Street) as shown on the approved preliminary plan. The final plat shall also include the southern half (35 feet wide) of the easement if the consent of the property owner is obtained.

10. Total development within Parcel A shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 62 (12 in, 50 out) AM peak hour trips, and 72 (47 in, 25 out) PM peak hour trips. ~~*[Total development within Parcel B shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 218 (44 in, 174 out) AM peak hour trips, and 252 (164 in, 88 out) PM peak hour trips.]~~ Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
11. Prior to approval of the detailed site plan *and/or special exception for Parcel A, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following road improvements, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and M-NCPPC in the detailed site plan review:
 - a. Provide a second access point onto Ridley Street for Parcel A. The second access point should be across from the existing entrance on Ridley Street for Parcel B, near Gethsemane Way.
 - ~~*[b. Provide five foot wide sidewalks along Ridley Street. The sidewalk should be constructed with a minimum five foot wide landscaped setback between the sidewalk and curb as recommended in the 2009 Approved Marlboro Pike Sector Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment.]~~
 - *[e]b. Provide a sidewalk connection from the interior of the site to a sidewalk along Ridley Street.
12. Any nonresidential development of the subject property shall require approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to approval of permits.
13. Prior to final plat approval, a special exception (SE) shall be approved for all proposed multifamily residential dwellings on Parcel A in buildings over 110 feet high, including any associated community buildings or recreational facilities, in accordance with Part 4, Division 1 of Subtitle 27 of the County Code. After the SE approval, a DSP including any associated community buildings or recreational facilities shall also be approved, in accordance with Part 3, Division 9 of Subtitle 27.
14. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for each phase of the subject property, the following road improvement shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been designed per the appropriate operating agencies and (c) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process: Construct northbound left turn lane on Brooks Drive at Ridley

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Street. At the time of detailed site plan, if there is no access directly to Ridley Street from Parcel A, the construction of the northbound left lane on Brooks Drive is not required.

*15. The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along the property’s entire street frontages unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the findings and reasons for the decision of the Prince George's County Planning Board are as follows:

1. The subdivision, as modified, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and of Article 28, Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	R-10	R-10
Use(s)	Residential—Multifamily	Residential—Multifamily
Acreage	* [45] <u>4.91</u>	* [45] <u>4.91</u>
Lots	0	0
Outlots	0	* [0] <u>1</u>
Parcels	1	* [2] <u>1</u>
Dwelling Units	420 (to remain)	* [540-(120 [new])]
Public Safety Mitigation Fee	No	No
Variance	No	* [Yes, Sections 27-442(e), 27-442(e), and 27-442(h)] <u>No</u>
Variation	No	No

Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, this case was heard before the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) on August 5, 2011.

3. **Community Planning**—The 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* designates the subject property within the Developed Tier. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods. This preliminary plan of subdivision is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier by maintaining a pattern of medium- to high-density residential. Approval of this application does not violate the General Plan’s growth goals for the year 2025, upon review of the current Prince George’s County General Plan Growth Policy Update.

The land use proposed by this preliminary plan conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2009 *Approved Marlboro Pike Sector Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* and the

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
 [Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* for residential development. The sector plan and master plan retained the property in the R-10 Zone.

This application proposes to develop 120 multifamily housing units on proposed Parcel A, directly to the north and across Ridley Street from the existing multi-story apartment complex ~~*[on proposed Parcel B]~~. The applicant proposes to develop three multifamily buildings with 34 units in each building on Parcel A. The buildings are designed to be located in the interior of the site with parking around the perimeter. The 2009 *Approved Marlboro Pike Sector Plan* developed design standards that seek to visually tie the corridor together. These standards provide recommendations for each land use entity, including activity nodes, transition areas, and neighborhood areas. The sector plan locates this property in an activity node known as Priority Area 3, which emphasizes pedestrian accessibility and comfort with good connectivity and human-scale features. New construction is recommended to be oriented toward the sidewalk to encourage pedestrian activity and interaction, which also promotes safety and security. The master plan also recommends preserving and expanding the green infrastructure network and promotes community connectivity with the environment. The applicant will be required to address the Marlboro Pike design standards upon submission of the detailed site plan for Parcel A, which is required for multifamily dwelling units in the R-10 Zone (Section 27-439 of the Zoning Ordinance).

4. **Urban Design**—The 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) and the Zoning Ordinance contain site design guidelines and requirements that are applicable to the development of this property.

Conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance

Pursuant to Section 27-439, in the R-10 Zone, a detailed site plan (DSP) is required for all proposed multifamily dwellings (110 feet high and under), including any associated community building or recreational facilities, in accordance with Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance. Multifamily dwellings higher than 110 feet are subject to approval of a special exception (SE) site plan. Therefore, prior to approval of the final plat, the proposed multifamily residential buildings on proposed Parcel A will require a DSP if the proposed building is 110 feet high and under, and will require both a DSP and SE if the proposed building is higher than 110 feet.

Section 27-442 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth various bulk regulations for the site and development that will be judged for the proposed multifamily buildings on Parcel A at the time of DSP or SE review. ~~*[However, by the layout provided on the Type 1 tree conservation plan, Parcel A does not meet the requirement which calls for a minimum of 50 percent of the net lot area to be preserved as green area and a maximum of 50 percent lot coverage.]~~ The conformance of Parcel A with other zoning regulations will be reviewed at the time of DSP or SE.

~~*[In addition, Parcel B, which is being created by this preliminary plan of subdivision for the existing multifamily development, must conform to the applicable zoning regulations. The existing development on proposed Parcel B was never previously the subject of a DSP or SE.]~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~This application is proposing no new improvement for the existing development on Parcel B. In the future, per Section 27-419.01 of the Zoning Ordinance, they are allowed to do certain site improvements without a DSP or SE and regardless of whether or not the existing development conforms with the current requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance may require a DSP or SE be approved for other site improvements or a change of use of the existing development on Parcel B in the future dependent on what is proposed at that time.]~~

Conformance with the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual

The property is subject to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince's George's County Landscape Manual*. Specifically, the site is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Developments from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscape Requirements. Compliance with these regulations for the proposed multifamily residential development will be judged at the time of DSP or SE review.

Other Urban Design Issues

The submitted tree conservation plan shows a conceptual site layout for the proposed multifamily residential buildings on Parcel A that presents some urban design concerns:

- a. Appropriate on-site usable green space and recreational facilities should be provided.
- b. Tall retaining walls, if necessary, should be located towards the rear and sides of the site, away from street frontages. Any structure that is higher than six feet should meet the setback requirements for main buildings.
- c. Multiple driveway entrances should be provided for safety and circulation purposes.
- d. Efforts should be made to place the proposed buildings close to the street frontage to the south and to avoid large expanses of parking between the buildings and the street.
- e. Given the setback and height regulations, consideration should be given to locating all of the proposed multifamily units within one building.
- f. Pedestrian improvements, such as, but not limited to, sidewalk connections, bus shelters, benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, and pedestrian-scale lighting fixtures, should be incorporated into the site design and will be reviewed at the time of DSP.
- g. Footnote 6 in the regulations table for the R-10 Zone requires that at least 80 percent of the total number of dwelling units of the multifamily project shall be within buildings having a minimum height of 52 feet. Not more than 20 percent of the total number of dwelling units of the multifamily project may be in buildings of a lesser height. Conformance with these requirements will be judged at the time of DSP or SE review for Parcel A.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

These issues are mentioned now for informational purposes as final design review will be done at the time of DSP or SE review.

5. *~~[Parcel B Variance to Sections 27-442(e), 27-442(e), and 27-442(h) of the Zoning Ordinance~~—This preliminary plan proposes to subdivide the site into two parcels and dedication of a public right of way; Parcel A is currently undeveloped and Parcel B will retain the two existing multifamily buildings. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) has requested the dedication of the 70-foot wide access easement, Ridley Street, in its current alignment as a public right of way. Dedication of the easement changes its status relating to zoning standards for abutting properties. As a result, the public right of way is nine feet from the existing westernmost multifamily building and three feet from the existing easternmost multifamily building on Parcel B. The dedication would also reduce the net tract area of Parcel B, which will change the lot coverage and available density.

~~[Section 27-442(e), Table IV of the Zoning Ordinance~~ establishes the minimum lot coverage and green area requirement. Specifically for the R-10 Zone, the maximum allowable lot coverage and the minimum required green area on the property are both 50 percent. Parcel B has two existing multifamily buildings and associated parking. The dedication of Ridley Street would result in the reduction of the net tract area and subsequently increase the lot coverage on Parcel B. Therefore, a variance from Section 27-442(e) must be requested. The applicant has submitted a variance to request an increase in the allowable lot coverage from 50 percent to 62 percent and to decrease the green area to 38 percent from the required 50 percent.

~~[Section 27-442(e), Table IV of the Zoning Ordinance~~ establishes building setbacks. Specifically for the R-10 Zone, the minimum side yard depth along a street for a corner lot is 30 feet plus an additional foot for every two feet the building exceeds 36 feet in height. For this site, the existing multifamily building is approximately 108 feet and is a corner lot. Therefore, the side building setback requirement is 66 feet. Since the existing buildings on Parcel B will have a side building setback less than 66 feet once the 70-foot wide easement is dedicated as a public right of way, a variance from Section 27-442(e) must be requested. The applicant has submitted a variance to request a reduction of the side building setback from 66 feet to 9 feet (a 57-foot decrease) for the western building and to three feet (a 63-foot decrease) for the eastern building on Parcel B.

~~[Section 27-442(h), Table IV of the Zoning Ordinance~~ establishes maximum allowable density. Specifically for the R-10 Zone, the maximum allowable density is 48 dwellings per acre. Parcel B has two existing multifamily buildings with a total of 420 dwellings. Dedication of the easement would result in the proposed net lot area of 8.4 acres for Parcel B. In this case with the existing 420 dwellings on Parcel B, the density would be 50 units per acre, a variance from Section 27-442(h) must be requested. The applicant has submitted a variance to request to increase the density from 48 dwellings per acre

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

(maximum of 404 dwellings) to 50 dwellings per acre (maximum of 420 dwellings, which currently exist) for Parcel B.

~~*[The approval of these variances will only allow the existing site improvements to remain without demolition.~~

~~[Variances may be granted provided the application meets the following criteria contained within Section 27-230(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The above variances are area variances, and for the purposes of this application have been evaluated together. The findings below are applicable for all three variances, which have been evaluated together:~~

~~[(1) — A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions;~~

~~[The 70 foot wide easement for public ingress/egress (Ridley Street), which runs east to west across the entire site, creates an extraordinary condition for this site. Ridley Street has served the tenants of Oakerest Towers and Hutchinson Commons well in its current state as an easement since its original construction. The current alignment of Ridley Street, in the middle of the property, has already physically divided the property into north and south portions. The proposed subdivision of the property into two parcels is a reflection of the physical division of the property by Ridley Street and is merely a re-designation from a private easement to a public street at the request of a governmental agency (DPW&T).~~

~~[The applicant originally proposed Ridley Street to remain as an easement and a part of proposed Parcel B, which would have resulted in Parcel B and the existing multifamily development remaining in conformance with the Zoning Ordinance for lot coverage, green area, density, and setbacks. During the review process of this preliminary plan, DPW&T requested that Ridley Street be dedicated as a public right of way. The dedication of Ridley Street as a public right of way would not change the alignment of the road, nor the orientation or proximity of the existing buildings to this right of way, merely its status as a “public right of way.” However, the change in the status of Ridley Street from an easement to a public street results in a change of the lot size of proposed Parcel B and therefore, the existing multifamily development would not conform with Sections 27-442(c), 27-442(e), and 27-442(h) of the Zoning Ordinance as discussed herein. When the existing multifamily development was constructed on the existing site in the 1970’s, it met all applicable regulations and it is only with the dedication of the existing private street at this time, as requested by the DPW&T, that these variances are necessary without the demolition of part of the occupied improvements. Were it not for the required dedication of the existing road at its current alignment in the middle of the site, by the public agency, this extraordinary situation of nonconformance to the Zoning Ordinance would not occur.~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~*(2) — The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and~~

~~[Strict application of the density, setbacks, lot coverage, and green area requirement for Parcel B will result in practical difficulty for the existing owner and will greatly restrict the development potential of the entire site. Denial of the variances for Parcel B will result in the existing multifamily development not conforming to the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance and therefore, subdivision of the site at the proposed configuration, with the dedication of Ridley Street for public use, could not occur.~~

~~[In order for Parcel B to strictly comply with the regulations, the existing multifamily buildings will have to move 66 feet back from Ridley Street to meet the setback requirement, some part of the buildings and parking will need to be demolished to meet the lot coverage requirement, and 16 dwelling units would need to be razed to meet the density requirement. This will result clearly in a peculiar and unusual practical difficulty for the owner.~~

~~*(3) — The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.~~

~~[Approval of these variances does not impair the existing neighborhood and provides development consistent with surrounding multifamily developments. Therefore, the variances will not significantly impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the approved 2002 General Plan or the 2010 Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. Approval will further those intents and purposes and enhance the integrity of those plans by retaining the existing developed site. Approval of these variances will allow the property to continue to act as a multifamily residential use, thus contributing to the General Plan's goal of providing increased opportunities for higher density multifamily dwellings in the Pennsylvania Avenue corridor. Additionally, it will meet the master plan's Comprehensive Plan goal of the entirety of Parcel 3 serving as a multifamily residential use. The variances and existing development will be consistent with the 2002 General Plan and 2010 Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.~~

~~*[Variances to Section 27-442(e), Green Area and Lot Coverage; Section 27-442(e), Setbacks; and Section 27-442(h), Density, for Parcel B are approved based on the findings above.]~~

*[6]7. **Environmental**—A Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP1-008-11, and a signed Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-027-11, are required and have been reviewed.

*The review of this application included an approved Natural Resource Inventory NRI-027-11, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-11007, and Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCPI 008

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

11. The PPS and TCP1 were previously approved by the Planning Board to subdivide Parcel 3 (15 acres) into two parcels for multifamily development, that approval was reconsidered by the Planning Board at the request of the applicant once it was determined that the existing Parcel 3 was previously subdivided by deed. On September 13, 2012, the Planning Board approved a reconsideration request and the applicant submitted a revised TCP and PPS proposing Parcel A, Outlot C, and the dedication to public use of half of the ROW of Ridley Street. The proposal is now for multifamily development on Parcel A.

*This 4.91-acre site is in the R-10 Zone and is located on the northwest intersection of Ridley Street and Brooks Drive. The project area is comprised of Parcel A, Outlot C, and half of Ridley Street. All of the development will occur on Parcel A. Outlot C is an extension of that area of land that is north of Ridley Street, attached to Parcel A along the southeastern boundary and travels in a southerly direction, only one foot wide, along the eastern boundary of part of Parcel 3. A review of the available information and the approved NRI indicates that the site contains *[a stream, wetland, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes] no regulated environmental feature on Parcel A, but Outlot C contains 90 square feet of regulated environmental features. The site has frontage along Brooks Drive, a master-planned collector roadway that is not regulated for noise.

According to available information, Marlboro clay does not occur on this property. The soils found to occur on this site according to the *[Prince George's County Soil Survey,] NRCS Web Soil Survey are in the *Beltsville-Urban Land Complex, [Croom, Potomac,] and Udorthent-Urban Land Complex Series [series]. These soil types generally exhibit slight to moderate limitations for development due to steep slopes, high water table, and impeded drainage. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this preliminary plan of subdivision review. A soils report in conformance with County Council Bill CB-94-2004, regarding subsurface water conditions for proposed residential construction with a basement, may be required during the permit review process by the Department of Environmental Resources (DER).

According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. The site is within the Oxon Run watershed of the Potomac River basin and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the General Plan.

Green Infrastructure Plan Conformance

* [The site contains evaluation areas and network gap areas identified.] The site contains no features in the 2005 Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure *Plan[,-located along the southern boundary of proposed Parcel B]. This area is partially wooded and contains regulated environmental features. The submitted application shows *[no new disturbance to this area] this wooded area to be removed. The proposed design is in conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

Environmental Review

~~*[A signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-027-11) indicates that this site contains streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplain. The forest stand delineation report describes two forest stands totaling 3.44 acres. There is one specimen tree on the site.]~~ There is an approved Natural Resource Inventory (NRI-027-11) which includes the subject site and the adjacent part of Parcel 3. The subject site contains 90 square feet of regulated environmental features associated with a stream. There is a 2.16-acre woodland area on-site that was identified on the NRI. No specimen trees are located within Parcel A. The information on the signed NRI is correctly shown on the TCP1 and the preliminary plan of subdivision.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area exceeds 40,000 square feet, contains more than 10,000 acres of woodland, and does not have a previously approved tree conservation plan. A Type 1 tree conservation plan has been submitted and is recommended for approval with this application.

*The correct gross tract area of the site is 4.91 acres and is shown on the TCP1 as 5.39 acres. This number should be revised. The site has a total woodland conservation requirement of 2.26 acres. The plan shows proposed clearing of 2.16 acres on the net tract, 0.0 acres of forest within the floodplain, and 0.0 acres of off-site woodland clearing. The TCP1 plan proposes to meet the woodland conservation requirement with 2.26 acres of off-site woodland conservation, and 90 square feet within the 100-year floodplain will also be persevered on-site, but not counted towards the requirement. No specimen trees are proposed for removal.

~~*[The subject site has a total woodland conservation requirement of 4.76 acres. The plan proposes to clear 2.36 acres of woodland on Parcel A, and proposes to meet the entire requirement of 4.76 acres with off-site woodland conservation. The existing woodland in the southern part of the site (Parcel B), which also serves as the riparian buffer for the on-site stream, will remain undisturbed, but not counted as woodland because the woodland outside of the floodplain and storm drainage is less than the 50-foot width requirement for conservation.]~~

~~[Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance requires that "Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree's condition and the species' ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual." The site contains one specimen tree located within the primary management area (PMA) on Parcel B that is to be preserved.]~~

Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a grading permit. Properties zoned R-10 are required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. A conceptual landscape plan is not required for review with a preliminary plan application and has

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

not been submitted. Tree canopy coverage should be reviewed with the DSP application for each parcel individually.

*Outlot C site contains regulated environmental features that are required to be preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible under Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations. The on-site regulated environmental features include streams and their associated 75-foot-wide buffers, wetlands and their associated 25-foot-wide buffers, and the 100-year floodplain. The proposed design shows no impacts to regulated environmental features. Therefore, the regulated environmental features have been preserved to the fullest extent possible based on the limits of disturbance shown on the tree conservation plan submitted for review.

At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances on Outlot C. The conservation easement will contain the delineated primary management area and will be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat.

***[Primary Management Area (PMA)]**

~~[This site contains regulated environmental features that are to be protected pursuant to Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The on-site regulated environmental features include a stream valley with its associated 60-foot-wide stream buffer and the 100-year floodplain. Section 24-130(b)(5) requires that the preliminary plan and all plans associated with the subject application demonstrate “the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.” Impacts to regulated environmental features require a letter of justification.~~

~~[A letter of justification has been submitted. Parcel B contains PMA along the southwestern boundary of the site. A portion of the PMA is encumbered with existing parking associated with the existing multifamily buildings, developed since 1977. When the existing multifamily development was constructed on the site, it met all of the applicable regulations. With this preliminary plan, Parcel B is subject to the new environmental regulations, specifically, an increase in the stream and floodplain buffers to 60 feet. The application proposes to subdivide the existing parcel and redevelop the northern portion of the site. No new development is proposed on the southern portion of the site (Parcel B) and no new disturbance is proposed to the regulated environmental features within the PMA. The proposed subdivision and grading plan, as shown on the TCPI, will have no adverse impacts on the PMA above those impacts that have been in existence since the original development of the site.~~

~~[The proposed site design demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible because no new disturbances are proposed and the existing infrastructure has no adverse impact to the on-site regulated environmental features. Requiring the impacts to be removed from the PMA would cause greater disturbance than what currently exists.]~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~striketrough~~ indicate deleted language

*[7]8. **Stormwater Management**—The Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), Office of Engineering, has determined that on-site stormwater management is required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 32661-2009-00, was approved on January 18, 2010 and expired on May 4, 2010. According to the previous approval, stormwater will be addressed through underground storage and treatment. A new valid stormwater management concept approval letter is required prior to approval of the detailed site plan for Parcel A.

*The approved stormwater concept plan is required to be designed in conformance with any approved Watershed Management Plan, which the technical plan approval is based on, pursuant to Subtitle 32 Water Resources and Protection, Division 3 Stormwater Management, Section 172 Watershed Management Planning. As such, the requirements of Section 24-130(b)(4), which requires that a subdivision be in conformance with any watershed management plan have been addressed with the approval of the SWM concept plan by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.

*[8]9. **Parks and Recreation**—This preliminary plan of subdivision has been reviewed for conformance with the Subdivision Regulations, the approved area master plan, the Land Preservation and Recreation Program, and the Zoning Ordinance as they pertain to public parks and recreation. *This application proposes Parcel A for new residential development. The applicant’s current proposal for Parcel A is for the development of up to 120 multifamily dwellings, with a projected population of 288 persons.

***[Background**

~~[The subject property is directly adjacent to the Hutchinson Commons Neighborhood Mini Park (M NCPPC property) to the southwest and located approximately one-half mile south of the Greater Capitol Heights/Oakerest Community Park School Center.~~

~~[The southern portion of the property is currently developed with two residential towers know as Oakerest Towers Apartments, built in the early 1970’s. The apartments are part of the larger community of Oakerest which spans almost the entire length of Brooks Drive to the east, and consists of seven additional multifamily buildings.~~

[Analysis

~~[In accordance with Section 24-134(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, mandatory dedication of parkland is required for all residential subdivisions, with some exceptions. This application proposes to subdivide Parcel 3 into two parcels, Parcel B for the existing multifamily residential buildings and Parcel A for the new residential development. The configuration of Parcels A and B is a result of the dedication of the right of way of Ridley Street, which will divide the property.~~

~~[Based on information provided by the applicant, there are 420 existing multifamily dwelling units on proposed Parcel B, which yields a projected population of 1,008 persons. The applicant’s~~

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

current proposal for Parcel A calls for the development of up to 120 multifamily dwellings, with a projected population of 288 persons.

[The applicant has provided information about the existing facilities available to residents of existing Oakerest Towers Apartments on Parcel B, a list of the existing amenities is:

- [•—— Outdoor swimming pool
- [•—— Three tennis courts
- [•—— Two practice hand ball/multi courts
- [•—— Playground
- [•—— Outdoor grills and picnic tables
- [•—— Shuffleboard
- [•—— Indoor fitness center
- [•—— Arboretum area

[It should be noted that some of facilities listed above are not on the subject property, but are within the Oakerest Community, with no restrictions on their use by the current residents. The existing private recreational facilities currently available to the residents of the Oakerest Tower Apartments on proposed Parcel B are acceptable and fulfill the requirements for mandatory dedication of parkland.]

The applicant has provided a base package of amenities proposed for the multifamily units on Parcel *A[~~, which has a projected population of 288 persons~~]. The *[~~current~~] proposed amenity list includes:

- Indoor multipurpose room
- Multipurpose/media room
- Cyber café computer room
- Fitness room with exercise equipment
- Outdoor activity patio with moveable furniture
- Landscape and green areas

Private recreational facilities should be provided for Parcel A to meet the requirements for mandatory dedication. The applicant should incorporate more active recreational facilities in their final design with site plan review. The type and amount of private on-site recreational facilities will be guided based on the type of multifamily housing developed, whether senior housing or traditional market rate. The bonding and triggers for the construction of the private recreational facilities should be determined prior to approval of a detailed site plan or special exception. A payment of a *fee-in-lieu to supplement the requirements of mandatory dedication may be determined at the time of approval of the detailed site plan and to be paid prior to final plat approval.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

~~*[In summary, the on-site private recreational facilities that exist on Parcel B and t]~~The proposed facilities for Parcel A are adequate and meet the requirement of Section 24-134 for mandatory dedication of *parkland with further analysis at the time of special exception of detailed site plan review.

*[9]10. **Trails**—This preliminary plan has been reviewed for conformance to Section 24-123 of the Subdivision Regulations, the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), and the *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment* (area master plan).

The MPOT, Complete Streets section, Policy 2 recommends that “All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.” The subject property is within the Developed Tier, as it is described in the county’s 2002 General Plan, and sidewalks are recommended along Ridley Street. There are no sidewalks along the road at this time. ~~*[It is recommended that the plans show a]~~ A sidewalk should be along Ridley Street and that sidewalk connections be constructed from the interior of the site to the sidewalk at the time of site plan review.

The approved Subregion 4 Master Plan recommends that Brooks Drive contain bike lanes along the subject property frontage. Brooks Drive currently contains sidewalks and appears to be adequate. Further review should occur at the time of DSP. The designated bike lanes may be provided by the county in the future, if the road is re-stripped by the county as funds become available. The area master plan contains a policy to provide sidewalks and neighborhood trail connections within existing communities to improve pedestrian safety, allow for safe routes to Metrorail stations and schools, and provide for increased nonmotorized connectivity between neighborhoods. The subject property is within a developed area and is a 2.1 mile walk (approximately) from the subject property to the Suitland Metrorail station. Sidewalks along Ridley Street would improve pedestrian circulation along the subject property frontage and improve access for neighborhood residents to schools, bus stops, shopping, and the Metrorail station. ~~*[It is recommended that s]~~Sidewalks should be provided along the entire subject property frontage of Ridley Street.

The subject property is also in a designated “neighborhood area” as described in the Approved Marlboro Pike Sector Plan, which contains more “pedestrian zone and streetscape” design guidelines. The guidelines’ specific recommendations for neighborhood areas include consistent and wide concrete sidewalks with a minimum width of five feet that are ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) compliant and easily accessible. A minimum five-foot-wide landscaped setback between the sidewalk and the curb is recommended in the plan (page 109).

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

Based on the preceding analysis, adequate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-123 of the Subdivision Regulations.

*[10]11. **Transportation**—*~~[The applicant is proposing to create two new parcels, Parcel A and Parcel B. Parcel B contains two existing apartment buildings.]~~ The applicant is proposing 120 multifamily residential units on Parcel A. A private street was authorized by the Planning Board pursuant to Section 24-128(b)(11) of the Subdivision Regulations at the time of approval of the abutting Hutchinson Commons Community. Parcel A has two driveway aprons along Ridley Street; one adjacent to Brooks Drive and the other adjacent to Gethsemane Way. *~~[Parcel B is served by four access points onto Ridley Street and one access onto Brooks Drive.]~~

The subject property is located within the Developed Tier, as defined in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to following standards:

- **Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, is permitted at signalized intersections subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals.”
- **Unsignalized intersections:** *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of materials and analyses consistent with the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals.”

Traffic Study Analysis

A traffic impact study was submitted which included four critical intersections. The traffic counts in the study were taken in March 2011. The traffic generated by the proposed preliminary plan would impact the following critical intersections:

- Marlboro Pike and Capitol Heights Boulevard
- Marlboro Pike and Brooks Drive
- Brooks Drive and Ridley Street (unsignalized)

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4) and Brooks Drive

Using the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” the development within Parcel A (120 multifamily dwelling units) shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 62 (12 in, 50 out) AM peak hour trips, and 72 (47 in, 25 out) PM peak hour trips. ~~*[Total development within Parcel B (420 multifamily dwelling units) shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 218 (44 in, 174 out) AM peak hour trips, and 252 (164 in, 88 out) PM peak hour trips.]~~ The traffic study identified the following critical intersections:

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
	Marlboro Pike and Capitol Heights Boulevard	874	734	A
Marlboro Pike and Brooks Drive	1,049	1,222	B	C
Brooks Drive and Ridley Street	11.9*	12.8*	--	--
MD 4 and Brooks Drive	1,060	1,144	B	B
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

As indicated above, under existing conditions, all of the intersections are operating at acceptable levels-of-service and/or intersection delay as defined by the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals.”

For background traffic conditions, a growth rate of 1.0 percent per year was used. The growth rate was projected for three years, the expected build-out date for the site. Background development included Dupont Heights, Greater Capitol Heights, Spaulding Heights, the Bradbury Subdivision, the Equinox Condos, and the Suitland Gateway. These approved developments represent 186 single-family units, 25 townhouses, 676 multifamily units, and 41,500 square feet of retail space. Background conditions are shown in the chart below.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
	Marlboro Pike and Capitol Heights Boulevard	1,004	916	B
Marlboro Pike and Brooks Drive	1,150	1,495	B	E
Brooks Drive and Ridley Street	13.2*	15.2*	--	--
MD 4 and Brooks Drive	1,249	1,400	C	D
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

Under background conditions, all of the intersections are operating at acceptable levels-of-service and/or intersection delay as defined by the "Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals."

The new trips expected to be generated by the proposed 120 multifamily residential units were added to background traffic to obtain future traffic conditions. The use would generate 62 new trips (12 in, 50 out) during the AM peak hour and 72 new trips (47 in, 25 out) during the PM peak hour. *~~[Parcel B contains 420 multifamily units which generate 218 AM peak hour trips (44 in, 174 out) and 252 PM peak hour trips (164 in, 88 out); these are existing units and the trips generated are existing.]~~

FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
	Marlboro Pike and Capitol Heights Boulevard	1,009	926	B
Marlboro Pike and Brooks Drive	1,159	1,519	C	E
Brooks Drive and Ridley Street	14.1*	15.4*	--	--
MD 4 and Brooks Drive	1,263	1,409	C	D
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
 [Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Under future conditions, all of the intersections are operating at acceptable levels-of-service and/or intersection delay as defined by the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals.”

DPW&T and SHA Comments

The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) requests that the applicant provide a northbound left turn lane on Brooks Drive at Ridley Street. DPW&T also requests that the existing easement for Ridley Street be converted to a public right-of-way, dedicated to public use. It is in the public interest to convert Ridley Street to a public roadway. DPW&T also recommended that a second access point on Ridley Street near Gethsemane Way be provided for better circulation which will be reviewed at the time of DSP.

~~*[Access is proposed by means of Ridley Street from Brooks Drive. Brooks Drive currently operates as a four-lane divided roadway with a 48-foot wide median. In reviewing the traffic impact study, DPW&T has recommended the construction of an exclusive left turn lane on the northbound Brooks Drive approach to Ridley Street as a means of enhancing safety. Currently, vehicles turning left onto Ridley Street are making the turn from the through lane. The traffic study anticipates more left turn movements at this location, and with no left turn bay available DPW&T has indicated that there would be an increased potential for rear-end accidents with the proposed development. This recommendation is carried forward and is consistent with Section 24-124(a)(1), which requires that there be “adequate access roads to serve traffic which would be generated by the proposed subdivision.” The applicant has indicated that direct access to Ridley Street may not be proposed at the time of review of the detailed site plan. In that case the need for the exclusive left turn lane is not a result of the development on Parcel A, and should therefore not be a condition of this approval.]~~

Site Access and Circulation

For Parcel A, the preliminary plan identifies one driveway access onto Ridley Street, approximately 50 west of its intersection with Brooks Drive. Based on the closeness of the access point to Brooks Drive, traffic circulation and delivery of public services and safety would be better served with a second access point on Ridley Street. This would be located near Gethsemane Way, preferably opposite existing driveways ~~*[on Parcel B]~~ to the south on part of Parcel 3 (Oakcrest Towers), and will be reviewed with the detailed site plan.

Master Plan Roadways

There are no master plan roadways in the immediate vicinity of the site. Brooks Drive was removed from the 2010 Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan as an arterial roadway; the current plan does not designate it as a master plan roadway. Ridley Street is shown on the preliminary plan with a 70-foot right-of-way and a note “to be dedicated to public use” in accordance with DPW&T’s request.

Based on the preceding findings, adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

*[11]12. **Schools**—The proposed preliminary plan has been reviewed for its impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and County Council Resolution CR-23-2003, and concluded the following:

Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 7	Middle School Cluster 4	High School Cluster 4
Dwelling Units	102	102	102
Pupil Yield Factor	0.042	0.039	0.033
Subdivision Enrollment	4.2	4.0	3
Actual Enrollment	32,508	9,899	16,049
Total Enrollment	32,512.2	9,903	16,052
State Rated Capacity	39,039	11,571	16,314
Percent Capacity	83%	85.6%	98.4%

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

*At the time of this analysis the preliminary plan of subdivision reflected 102 units. The analysis was not recreated based on the 120 units because it is provided for informational purposes only.

County Council Bill CB-31-2003 established a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WAMATA); or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. County Council Bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation, and the current amounts are \$8,565 and \$14,682 to be paid at the time of issuance of building permits for each dwelling unit.

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

*[12]13. **Fire and Rescue**—The proposed preliminary plan has been reviewed for the adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(C) and (E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed development is within the seven-minute required response time for the first due fire station using the *Seven Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map* provided by the Prince George’s County Fire/EMS Department.

First Due Fire/EMS Company #	Fire/EMS Station	Address
-------------------------------------	-------------------------	----------------

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

26	District Heights	6208 Marlboro Pike
----	------------------	--------------------

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

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

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

There are no public facility projects in the Prince George’s County Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2011–2016.

The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Mitigation of Adequate Public Facilities: Public Safety Infrastructure.”

*[13]14. **Police Facilities**—The subject property is located in Police District III, Palmer Park. The response time standard is ten minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The times are based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The preliminary plan was accepted for processing by the Planning Department on July 15, 2011.

Reporting Cycle	Previous 12 Month Cycle	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency Calls
Acceptance Date 7/15/2011	7/2010-6/2011	7 minutes	7 minutes
Cycle 1			
Cycle 2			
Cycle 3			

The response time standards of 10 minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls were met at the time of acceptance.

The Police Chief has reported that the Police Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in CB-56-2005. Pursuant to CR-69-2006, the Prince George’s County Council and the County Executive temporarily suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) regarding sworn police personnel staffing levels.

*[14]15. **Water and Sewer**—Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed the subject property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System, and will therefore be served by public systems.

*[15]16. **Health Department**—The Prince George’s County Health Department has evaluated the proposed preliminary plan of subdivision and has no comments to offer.

*[16]17. **Public Utility Easement (PUE)**—In accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, when utility easements are required by a public utility company, the subdivider should include the following statement in the dedication documents recorded on the final plat:

“Utility easements are granted pursuant to the declaration recorded among the County Land Records in Liber 3703 at Folio 748.”

For Parcel A, the preliminary plan of subdivision correctly delineates a ten-foot public utility easement along the public right-of-way as requested by the utility companies. ~~*[For Parcel B, the applicant shall provide a ten-foot public utility easement or alternative easement acceptable to all applicable utilities, prior to final plat approval.]~~

*[17]18. **Historic**—A Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the above referenced 15-acre property located ~~*[at 2011 Brooks Drive]~~ in Capitol Heights, Maryland. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. The subject property has been previously graded and disturbed. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources, or documented properties.

*[18]19. **Use Conversion**—This preliminary plan was analyzed based on the proposal for residential development. The analysis includes access, mandatory dedication, and public facilities, specifically related to the multifamily dwelling land use proposed with this application. While the subject application is not proposing any nonresidential development, if such a land use were proposed, a new preliminary plan shall be required.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board’s action must be filed with Circuit Court for Prince George’s County, Maryland within thirty (30) days following the date of notice of the adoption of this Resolution.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Squire, with Commissioners Washington, Squire, Bailey, Shoaff and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 12, 2012, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 2nd day of February 2012.

*This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey, Shoaff and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Geraldo absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 20, 2012, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

*Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 24th day of January 2013.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:QN:arj

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language