



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

Specific Design Plan

SDP-0318-05

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Preserve at Piscataway, Edelen Village North and South Location: South of Floral Park Road, east of its intersection with Piscataway Road and west of its intersection with Danville Road Applicant/Address: Woodlawn Development Group 8614 Westwood Center Drive, Suite #900 Vienna, VA. 22182	Planning Board Hearing Date:	06/28/12
	Staff Report Date:	06/13/12
	Date Accepted:	04/04/12
	Planning Board Action Limit:	N/A
	Plan Acreage:	169.92
	Zone:	R-L
	Dwelling Units:	265
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
	Planning Area:	84
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	09
	Election District:	05
	Municipality:	N/A
200-Scale Base Map:	218SE03	

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Revision to single-family detached lot widths to add ten lots, add townhouse architecture, and update landscaping.	Informational Mailing:	09/07/11
	Acceptance Mailing:	04/04/12
	Sign Posting Deadline:	05/29/12

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Kosack, Jill Phone Number: 301-952-4689 E-mail: Jill.Kosack@ppd.mncppc.org	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-05
Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-046-04-02
Preserve at Piscataway - Edelen Village, North and South

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

EVALUATION

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

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the Residential Low Development (R-L) Zone.
- b. Conformance to Basic Plans A-9869 and A-9870.
- c. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306 and its revisions.
- d. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027.
- e. The requirements of Specific Design Plan SDP-0318 and its revisions.
- f. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- g. The requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
- h. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** This application proposes a revision to lot widths to add ten single-family detached residential lots, new townhouse architecture, the Waldorf and a front-loaded garage elevation for the previously approved Lafayette, and revisions to the landscaping in Edelen Village North. The plan specifies that none of the lots within Edelen Village South are being revised with this SDP as they are either already constructed or under separate ownership.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-L	R-L
Use(s)	Single-family residential	Single-family residential
Acreage	169.92	169.92
Square Footage/GFA	0	N/A
Dwelling Units:		
South Village		
Attached	approx. 62	62
Detached	approx. 10	58
North Village		
Attached	0	45
Detached	0	100
Total Dwelling Units	0	265

3. **Location:** The Preserve at Piscataway is located in Planning Area 84, south of Floral Park Road, east of its intersection with Piscataway Road and west of its intersection with Danville Road. This specific design plan revision for Edelen Village North and South is located in the central portion of the Preserve at Piscataway, north and south of Floral Park Road. Approximately 75 acres of land located on the north side of Floral Park Road, adjacent to the Tinkers Creek Stream Valley Park, are part of this application and are proposed to be conveyed to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC).

4. **Surrounding Uses:** Edelen Village is located southeast of Bailey’s Village, east of Glassford Village and north and west of Lusby Village, all of which are other villages in various stages of construction in the Preserve at Piscataway. The proposed golf course open space parcels that are part of the Preserve at Piscataway are located adjacent to the site to the north, west, and southwest.

5. **Previous Approvals:** On September 14, 1993, the Prince George’s County District Council adopted CR-60-1993 approving the September 1993 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A and 85B*. The sectional map amendment, in conjunction with Zoning Map Amendments A-9869 and A-9870, rezoned 858.7

acres in the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone to the R-L Zone and 19.98 acres to the L-A-C Zone. The rezoning was approved with 39 conditions and 11 considerations.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306 (Villages of Piscataway) was approved by the Planning Board on March 24, 1993. On November 18, 2004, the Planning Board adopted an amendment to the CDP resolution, PGCPB Resolution No. 94-98.

On June 7, 2007, the Planning Board approved CDP-9306-01, a revision to increase the maximum permissible height of townhouses within the project to 40 feet. On October 9, 2008, the Planning Board approved an additional revision, CDP-9306-02, modifying the minimum required roof pitch in all of the villages, except for Bailey's Village.

On June 17, 2003, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027 for The Preserve for 836 dwelling units, which includes the area that is the subject of this application. Variation requests for impacts to sensitive environmental features and a revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP-I/9/94-02, were included in that approval.

Specific design plans have been approved for all of the lots in the Preserve at Piscataway. The layout for Edelen Village was approved in Specific Design Plan SDP-0318, which was approved by the Planning Board on June 10, 2004, PGCPB Resolution No. 04-135. This plan approved lots for 148 new single-family detached houses and 108 townhouses, for a total of 256. Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-01, approved by the Planning Board on January 19, 2006, PGCPB Resolution No.06-14, proposed eight models of townhouse architecture for use on any of the townhouse lots in the village. Specific Design Plan SDP 0318-02, approved by the Planning Board on May 4, 2006, PGCPB Resolution No. 06-103, proposed the design for the community building, two swimming pools and recreation area that are located within the land area of Edelen Village North. The associated Departure from Parking and Loading Standards, DPLS-310, was approved at the same time to allow for a reduction in the parking requirement from 108 to 65 spaces. The subsequent "03" and "04" revisions to the SDP were approved by the Planning Director to add new townhouse architecture, the "Norwood" and "Lafayette" models respectively.

6. **Design Features:** The first proposed new townhouse model is the Waldorf, an NVR Homes product. The townhouse is a standard 24 feet-wide and 25.24-feet-high, has a base finished floor area of 2,360 square feet, and a total finished floor area including all options of 2,809 square feet. Each unit has two floors above ground with a standard one-car, front-loaded garage on the ground floor level. The Waldorf townhouse architecture proposed with this application can be used on any of the 45 townhouse lots previously approved in Edelen Village North. All of the proposed side building elevations feature vinyl siding and three window features, including one bay window, a single small window, and a double standard window, arranged in a balanced and symmetrical composition with shutters and enhanced trim. The proposed front building elevations include a paneled one-car garage door on each unit and a balanced, symmetrical arrangement of standard single and double windows with shutters on the top floor, and enhanced trim on the ground floor. Enhanced door trim and lintels, a mix of brick and vinyl horizontal siding façades, and a variety of reverse gable arrangements on the asphalt-shingled roof complete the colonial appearance on the front elevations. The proposed rear elevations, some of which are walk-outs, include a balanced arrangement of single, standard windows, and vinyl horizontal siding façades, and each unit includes a single door off of the ground level and the basement level where it exists.

The second proposed townhouse model is a front-loaded garage elevation for the Lafayette, a Ryan Homes product, which was previously approved with only a rear-loaded garage elevation in the SDP-0318-04 revision. The house is a standard 24 feet wide and 37.5 feet high, has a base

finished floor area of 2,156 square feet, and a total finished floor area including all options of 2,899 square feet. Each unit has three floors above ground with a standard two-car, front-loaded garage on the ground floor level. The Lafayette townhouse architecture proposed with this application can be used on any of the 45 townhouse lots previously approved in Edelen Village North. The proposed side building elevations include either a full horizontal vinyl siding finish, a ground level brick finish with the two upper stories finished in vinyl siding, or a full brick veneer finish. Regardless of finish materials employed, all of the side elevations feature a range of five to nine single standard windows, including options for shutters and enhanced trim, arranged in a balanced and symmetrical composition. The proposed front building elevations include a paneled two-car garage door and main entrance door with decorative trim and hood on each unit and a balanced, symmetrical arrangement of standard single or double windows and at least one decorative window, including round, oval, small square or bay windows, with a mix of shutters and/or enhanced trim. A mix of brick and vinyl horizontal siding façades, and a variety of reverse gable or dormer arrangements on the asphalt-shingled roof complete the colonial appearance on the front elevations. The proposed rear elevations, all of which are a full three levels above-grade, include a balanced arrangement of standard and small windows and vinyl horizontal siding façades, and each unit includes a sliding glass or double patio door off of the second and ground levels.

The remaining revisions proposed with this SDP include reducing the minimum lot widths in order to add ten additional single-family detached lots and updating the landscaping in Edelen Village North to be in conformance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. These issues are discussed further in Findings 7. b. and 12. below, respectively. All architecture for the single-family detached lots is reviewed under the separate Specific Design Plan SDP-0202, The Preserves at Piscataway, Umbrella Application for Architecture.

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-L Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
- a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-514.08, Purposes; Section 27-514.09, Uses; Section 27-514.10, Regulations; and Section 27-514.11, Minimum Size Exceptions governing development in the R-L Zone. The proposed residential lots are a permitted use in the R-L Zone.
 - b. Section 27-480(a) allows that certain development regulations, such as lot frontage, can be established for a property as shown on an approved Specific Design Plan. The original SDP-0318 approval established a 70-foot minimum lot width at the front street line and an 80-foot minimum lot width at the building line for single-family detached lots between 8,801 square feet and 22,000 square feet. The subject SDP revision proposes to change that to 50 feet minimum at the front street line and 65 feet minimum at the building line. This is being done without reducing the overall lot size range, the minimum yard depths, or the maximum lot coverages, and without impacting the adjacent open space parcels, while using house types that have already been approved with the overall umbrella architecture SDP. Additionally, the ten lots gained through this width revision are allowed within the number of lots approved with the overall Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, PPS 4-03027. Therefore, staff finds that this revision will have minimal impact on the appearance or design of the village and recommends approval of this decrease in minimum required lot widths.
 - c. Section 27-528 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following criteria for the approval of a specific design plan:

(a) **Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

(1) **The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, and except as provided in Section 27-528(a)(1.1), for Specific Design Plans for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the applicable design guidelines for townhouses set forth in Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11), and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) and, as it applies to property in the L-A-C Zone, if any portion lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail station, the regulations set forth in Section 27-480(d) and (e);**

Comment: Conformance with the approved comprehensive design plan is discussed below in Finding 9. The site is in conformance with the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, as discussed in Finding 12 below. The design guidelines and regulations for townhouses referenced in Sections 27-274(a)(1)(B) and 27-274(a)(11), and 27-433(d) of the Zoning Ordinance include the following standards that warrant discussion at this time:

Section 27-274(a)(1)(B):

The applicant shall provide justification for, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, the reasons for noncompliance with any of the design guidelines for townhouses and three-family dwellings set forth in paragraph (11), below.

Section 27-274(a)(11) Townhouses and three-family dwellings.

(A) **Open space areas, particularly areas separating the rears of buildings containing townhouses, should retain, to the extent possible, single or small groups of mature trees. In areas where trees are not proposed to be retained, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council, as applicable, that specific site conditions warrant the clearing of the area. Preservation of individual trees should take into account the viability of the trees after the development of the site.**

Comment: This guideline applies to the layout of the rears of townhouse lots, none of which are being revised with the subject application. However, generally, the compact design of Edelen Village does not propose that internal tree preservation areas be provided, instead concentrating tree preservation around the edges of the Village.

(B) **Groups of townhouses should not be arranged on curving streets in long, linear strips. Where feasible, groups of townhouses should be at right angles to each other, and should facilitate a courtyard**

design. In a more urban environment, consideration should be given to fronting the units on roadways.

Comment: Although no revisions are proposed to the townhouse lot layout with the subject application, the majority of townhouse lots are arranged at right angles to each other to facilitate a courtyard design.

- (C) Recreational facilities should be separated from dwelling units through techniques such as buffering, differences in grade, or preservation of existing trees. The rears of buildings, in particular, should be buffered from recreational facilities.**

Comment: The previously approved community center and swimming pools on Parcel S-2, located in the middle of Edelen Village North are separated from dwelling units by proposed landscape buffering and the preservation of existing trees.

A portion of the golf course is currently shown to the east of the proposed townhouses in Edelen Village North, but would be buffered from the townhouses by the intervening stream area.

- (D) To convey the individuality of each unit, the design of abutting units should avoid the use of repetitive architectural elements and should employ a variety of architectural features and designs such as roofline, window and door treatments, projections, colors, and materials. In lieu of this individuality guideline, creative or innovative product design may be utilized.**

Comment: The proposed townhouses feature a substantial variety of architecture, including different front façade materials (brick or vinyl siding), window and door treatments, and roof features.

- (E) To the extent feasible, the rears of townhouses should be buffered from public rights-of-way and parking lots. Each application shall include a visual mitigation plan that identifies effective buffers between the rears of townhouses abutting public rights-of-way and parking lots. Where there are no existing trees, or the retention of existing vegetation is not practicable, landscaping, berming, fencing, or a combination of these techniques may be used. Alternatively, the applicant may consider designing the rears of townhouse buildings such that they have similar features to the fronts, such as reverse gables, bay windows, shutters, or trim.**

Comment: As previously approved, the proposed townhouse lot layout buffers the rear of townhomes from public rights-of-way and parking lots.

- (F) Attention should be given to the aesthetic appearance of the offsets of buildings.**

Comment: The subject townhouse architecture provides for a two-foot offset between buildings with varying trims and materials, which provides for an attractive appearance.

Section 27-433(d) Dwellings.

- (1) All dwellings shall be located on record lots shown on a record plat.**

Comment: All of the proposed dwellings will be located on record lots shown on a record plat.

- (2) There shall be not more than six (6) nor less than three (3) dwelling units (four (4) dwelling units for one-family attached metropolitan dwellings) in any horizontal, continuous, attached group, except where the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, determines that more than six (6) dwelling units (but not more than eight (8) dwelling units) or that one-family semidetached dwellings would create a more attractive living environment, would be more environmentally sensitive, or would otherwise achieve the purposes of this Division. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than six (6) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width.**

Comment: The Planning Board approved Specific Design Plan SDP-0318 on June 10, 2004, PGCPB Resolution 04-135. At that time, the Planning Board made the necessary findings to permit some of the townhouse groups to contain as many as eight attached units.

- (3) The minimum width of dwellings in any continuous, attached group shall be at least twenty (20) feet for townhouses, and twenty-two (22) feet for one-family attached metropolitan dwellings. Attached groups containing units all the same width and design should be avoided, and within each attached group attention should be given to the use of wider end units.**

Comment: As approved in SDP-0318 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-135), all of the townhouses are proposed to be at least 24 feet wide. The subject Waldorf and Lafayette townhouse units are proposed to be 24 feet wide.

- (4) The minimum gross living space, which shall include all interior space, except garage and unfinished basement or attic area, shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet for townhouses, and two thousand two hundred (2,200) square feet for one-family attached metropolitan dwellings.**

Comment: The townhouses proposed with this SDP revision have a minimum base finished floor area of 2,156 square feet for the Lafayette model and 2,360 square feet for the Waldorf model.

- (5) **Side and rear walls shall be articulated with windows, recesses, chimneys, or other architectural treatments. All endwalls shall have a minimum of two (2) architectural features. Buildings on lots where endwalls are prominent (such as corner lots, lots visible from public spaces, streets, or because of topography or road curvature) shall have additional endwall treatments consisting of architectural features in a balanced composition, or natural features which shall include brick, stone, or stucco.**

Comment: All of the proposed side elevations of the subject townhouse architecture propose a minimum of three standard architectural features, arranged in a balanced and symmetrical composition. There are also optional side elevations, which will be used on prominent endwalls, that propose partial or full brick veneer and shutters and enhanced trim on the windows.

- (6) **Above-grade foundation walls shall either be clad with finish materials compatible with the primary facade design, or shall be textured or formed to simulate a clad finished material such as brick, decorative block, or stucco. Exposed foundation walls of unclad or unfinished concrete are prohibited.**

Comment: Some of the proposed townhouse lots will have partially above-grade foundation walls, but the provided architectural elevations do not specify the finishing of these walls. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring labels showing conformance with this specification.

- (7) **A minimum of sixty percent (60%) of all townhouse units in a development shall have a full front facade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors) of brick, stone, or stucco. Each building shall be deemed to have only one “front.”**

Comment: The proposed townhouse architecture consistently shows at least 60 percent of the units in each stick with a full front brick façade; however, this note has been added as a condition to this plan to ensure it is done.

- (1.1) **For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies all requirements for the use in Section 27-508 of the Zoning Ordinance;**

Comment: The subject project is not a regional urban community. Therefore, the requirements of this subpart are not applicable.

- (2) **The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development;**

Comment: The proposed development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time by public facilities, as was established in the approval of Specific Design Plan SDP-0318. Approval of revised townhouse architecture,

lotting pattern and landscaping will have no effect on the Planning Board's previous finding in this regard.

- (3) Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties;**

Comment: Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water, as was established in the approval of SDP-0318. Approval of revised townhouse architecture, lotting pattern and landscaping will have no effect on the Planning Board's previous finding in this regard.

- (4) The plan is in conformance with an approved Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan;**

Comment: The plan is in conformance with approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-046-04-02. No changes to the TCPII are proposed with this revision; however the Environmental Planning Section requires a few technical revisions and those are included as conditions in this approval.

- (5) The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features are preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible.**

Comment: The subject application is grandfathered from this requirement as the applicable TCPII was approved prior to the effective date of this requirement and it has not expired.

8. **Basic Plan Conformance:** The specific design plan for Edelen Villages, North and South, as modified by the conditions, will be in conformance with the Basic Plan for Zoning Map Amendments A-9869 and A-9870 and with the 39 conditions and 11 considerations of County Council Resolution CR-60-1993. There are no specific conditions that warrant discussion regarding conformance of this Specific Design Plan Revision, SDP-0318-05, with the Basic Plan.
9. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306:** This CDP was approved for the 878.68-acre area of the Villages of Piscataway with 37 conditions of approval contained within PGCPB Resolution No. 94-98(C)(A). Two revisions were approved in 2007 and 2008, increasing the maximum height for townhouses to 40 feet and reducing the minimum roof pitch, except in Bailey's Village. The conditions of the original CDP still apply to the subject application, except as modified by the two revisions. The following conditions of approval are relevant to the review of this revision:
1. **Prior to signature approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan, the following revisions shall be made or information supplied:**
 - b. **The following architectural standards for civic and institutional buildings, for structures in Bailey Village, and for all residential and commercial structures surrounding village greens shall be added to the text:**
 - (3) All buildings shall be designed with special attention to architectural details which evoke the image of a traditional town. At least half of the structures located facing a village green in any village which are also located at the intersection of two streets shall include special**

architectural details or special treatment of the corners which will distinguish them visually from adjacent houses, such as round turrets, bay windows or wrap-around porches.

Comment: The submitted architectural elevations provide special attention to architectural details. The architecture is only for lots which do not face a village green and are not located at the intersection of two streets, so no special corner treatments are required.

c. The following standard shall be added to the text:

- **No typical residential-style decks constructed of pressure-treated pine or other wood left to weather naturally shall be attached to a house, if the deck would be visible from the street, the golf course or any other public space. (This restriction does not apply to Danville Estates.)**
- **Open decks shall only be permitted on rears of units.**
- **Any deck visible from the street, the golf course, or any other public space shall be stained or painted to complement the color of the house.**
- **Any deck visible from these areas shall incorporate design features and details which are evocative of traditional town architecture.**
- **Any deck built above ground level shall have the undercroft screened from view by decorative lattice or other screening of similar durability and visual interest, if the undercroft is four feet or less in height.**

Comment: Decks are offered as an option with the proposed townhouse architecture. The provided detail shows that the undercroft of the decks will be more than four feet in height and that the railing design is evocative of traditional town architecture. However, no specifications were provided for the deck material or treatment; therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring this to be noted.

d. No fences constructed of pressure-treated or other wood left to weather naturally shall be permitted in North Glassford Village, Bailey Village or where visible from public streets, parkland or the golf course. Chain-link fences generally used to enclose recreation facilities shall be black vinyl-coated. All fences shall be painted or stained.

Comment: No new fences are proposed in this SDP revision application.

e. The following standard shall be added to the text: All detached residential lots 50 feet wide or less at the street line shall be provided with one of the following: (1) an alley (if allowed by the Subtitle 24, Subdivisions, and other applicable provisions of the County Code) providing access to a garage (one- or two-car, detached or attached) to prevent garage doors from becoming an

overly dominant element of the streetscape; or (2) a one-car garage accessed from the front street, with the front edge of the garage set back a minimum of 10 feet from the most recessed front façade plane of the house.

Comment: All single-family detached lots on this SDP revision are a minimum of 50 feet wide, so this condition does not apply.

- f. The provision of alleys with access to detached garages shall be encouraged (if allowed by Subtitle 24, Subdivisions, and other applicable provisions of the County Code) for single-family attached units. If alleys are allowed, the use of front-loaded garage townhouse units shall be prohibited on the main spine roads, the village greens, and in Bailey Village. If alleys are not allowed, the use of front-loaded garages shall be prohibited on the village greens and within Bailey Village.**

Comment: The proposed single-family attached townhouse architecture is for front-loaded garages. Front-loaded townhouse lots are allowed in some areas of Edelen Village, as approved previously, generally though these lots are not facing the village green or accessed off the main spine road.

- g. The following revisions shall be incorporated into the Architectural Guidelines Section of the CDP text:**

Note: (The following are revisions to various sections on pp. 33–37 of the CDP text.)

- 1. Residential Architectural Guidelines for the Villages and Danville Estates**

ARCHITECTURAL ELEMENTS

- Façade Modulation/Articulation: Façade Modulation/Articulation shall reference the historic scale, façades and details in the historic architecture of the region. Architectural details or elements such as reverse gables, offsets, front, rear and side porches, both screened and unscreened, sunrooms, bay windows, and multiple wall planes should be combined and utilized to provide architectural character within the community.**

Comment: The proposed architecture makes use of reverse gables and bay windows, with slight offsets of the attached houses to provide multiple wall planes.

- Front and side façades of any one building on a corner lot shall be made of the same materials, similarly detailed. Corner lots are those at the intersection of streets with alleys, the golf course and parkland.**

Comment: The proposed townhouse architecture will not be used on any corner

lots.

- **Gables atop brick façade walls shall be finished in brick, wood, stucco or a dryvit type material.**

Comment: The proposed elevations show gables atop brick façade walls finished with matching brick.

ARCHITECTURAL MATERIALS

Building walls may be built of:

1. **Smooth cut cedar shingles (4"-6"exposed to the weather)**
2. **Wood Clapboard (4"-6" inches exposed to the weather)**
3. **Wood beaded siding (7"exposed to the weather)**
4. **Wood board and batten siding**
5. **Masonite superside hardboard siding, or equal, with smooth or textured pine finish, (not more than 7"exposed to the weather)**
6. **Brick in a horizontal running band pattern with no more than "raked joints [sic]**
7. **Fieldstone set in an uncoursed ledgerstone pattern.**
8. **Dryvit or equal**
9. **Restoration Series vinyl siding, or equal (4"-6"exposed to the weather)**
10. **Alcoa Aluminum siding, or equal (4"-6"exposed to the weather)**

Comment: The building walls are proposed to be finished with brick or a vinyl horizontal siding.

- **Rooflines: Roofs shall be simple and symmetrically pitched (except in the case of a true salt box). The roof pitch on the main structure shall be between 8:12 and 14:12. Intermixing of gable and hipped roofs is required to promote a visually exciting and animated streetscape. Roofs shall overhang a gable end a minimum of 8 inches; however, larger overhangs shall be provided on larger houses in the development. Skylights, solar panels, vent stacks, and other roof protrusions shall not be placed on a roof facing a street nor shall they be visually obtrusive from nearby streets.**

Comment: The basic roofline of the proposed townhouse models is a simple and symmetrical gable style, with an 8:12 roof pitch and an overhang of eight inches.

- **Roofs may be built of cedar shakes, standing seam, slate, copper, artificial slate or asphalt composition shingle in black, dark brown, dark grey or grey/green colors.**

Comment: The proposed roofs are composed of asphalt shingles in dark grey or black colors.

ARCHITECTURAL MATERIAL DETAIL

Note: (item numbers below refer to sections on page 35 of CDP text)

3. **Retaining walls shall be brick or stone in all yards which face a street or public area (excluding the golf course, except the area near the clubhouse). All other retaining walls not within view of a public area may be built of brick, stone, new timbers or finished concrete modular units.**

Comment: The proposed retaining walls on-site are located behind the rear yards of townhomes, out of view of public areas, and are proposed to be constructed with finished concrete modular units.

5. **Chimney enclosures which protrude from a façade shall be brick, stone or stucco.**

Comment: The proposed townhouse architecture does not show any chimney enclosures.

6. **A consistent vocabulary of window types shall be used for each house or building. For the most part, windows will be square or vertical in proportion. No more than one semi-circular, circular, octagonal, or hexagonal shall be used in any one façade. Bay windows on façades which face a street shall not be permitted on the second floor.**

Comment: The elevations of the houses utilize a consistent vocabulary of windows, with regularly sized and proportioned rectangular windows.

9. **House foundation walls may be built of brick, fieldstone, parged block, or painted brick-form poured concrete. House foundation walls built of parged block, or painted brick-form poured concrete that are within public view from a street, or within view of the golf clubhouse, may be exposed up to two feet above the ground.**

Comment: Some of the proposed townhouse lots will have partially above-grade foundation walls, but the provided architectural elevations do not specify the finishing of these walls. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring labels showing conformance with this specification.

PORCHES

- **Location**—Porches may be located on the front, side and rear of units.
- **Scale and Style**—Porches should be of a scale and style that is compatible with the house. All sitting porches shall be functional and be a minimum of six feet deep. The undercroft of porches shall be skirted with wood or vinyl lattice.
- **Material**—Porches shall be made of wood, concrete faced on three sides with stone or brick or be a combination of brick or stone piers and wood.
- **Color**—Porches should utilize simple color schemes which are compatible with the colors of the house.

Comment: Porches are not proposed with the subject architecture.

GARAGES AND OUTBUILDINGS

- **All single-family detached lots shall have garages. Garage doors shall not exceed nine feet in width if accessed from a street or 18 feet if accessed from an alley. Garage openings onto an alley shall be provided with a light fixture and a photo cell.**

Comment: All single-family detached lots shown on this SDP have garages. Architecture for these lots is approved under the separate SDP-0202, Umbrella Application for Architecture.

PATIOS, FENCES, WALLS AND WALKS

- **Fences may be built of wood pickets, wood lattice, wood board, steel or wrought iron. The use of chain-link fencing on any lots other than those with community recreational facilities shall be prohibited. Fences shall be constructed so that the right side faces outward. All terminal posts in fences (corners, openings, ends, etc.) shall be more substantial in height and width than typical posts.**
- **All fences shall be painted or stained when facing streets, the golf course, parks or other public open spaces. Fences built of steel or wrought iron shall be painted black. No board on board or stockade type fences, or unpainted fences built of pressure treated or other wood left to weather naturally shall be permitted.**
- **Fences along streets on neighboring lots are encouraged to be of different designs.**

Comment: Fences are not proposed in this application.

- **Patios on single-family detached lots may only be located in side and rear yards not facing a public street.**

- **The use of hedges to define lot lines shall be encouraged.**
- **Lead walks shall be brick when connecting to a public brick sidewalk. Other walks and paths (other than those on park land or golf cart paths which may be asphalt) shall be brick, stone or concrete.**

Comment: The lead walks for the proposed houses lead to a standard sidewalk and could, therefore, be constructed with concrete.

10. **Preliminary Plan Conformance:** The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027, PGCPB Resolution No. 03-122, adopted by the Planning Board on June 17, 2003. The preliminary plan was approved with 47 conditions. The following conditions apply to the review of this SDP.

8. **The following items shall be addressed prior to the approval of the SDP that includes the following:**

d. **The single-family detached units located along the main spine road through the development should front on the spine road.**

Comment: The single-family detached units located along the main spine road through the development front on the spine road.

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

Comment: Standard sidewalks are provided along both sides of all internal roads on the SDP.

41. **The Specific Design Plan shall address specific issues of circulation and access raised by the Planning Department staff and DPW&T and shall review for consideration the following:**

d. **All townhouses (except Bailey Village Lots 22-30, Block D) fronting on public streets shall, if a garage is provided, have the garage fronting on and receiving access from a private alley.**

Comment: All townhouses either front upon private streets or have garages served by private alleys, in accordance with the requirements of this condition.

11. **Conformance to Specific Design Plan SDP-0318 and Revisions:**

a. **Specific Design Plan SDP-0318:** The Planning Board approved SDP-0318 on June 10, 2004 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-135) with 25 conditions, of which the following warrant discussion:

2. **In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to inadequate service, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's**

County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

Comment: This requirement has been noted on the submitted SDP.

8. Prior to signature approval of the plan, the following modifications shall be made:

a. The width of all private streets shall be dimensioned as no less than 22 feet and alleys shall be dimensioned as no less than 18 feet wide.

Comment: The submitted SDP provides dimensions as required.

b. Each sheet of the SDP shall provide reference to all parcels and to whom the parcel is to be dedicated.

Comment: The submitted SDP labels each parcel as required on each sheet.

c. At least 50 percent of the single-family detached units in the village that are 65 feet or less in width at the street line shall have a fence in the front yard. At least one-third of the model lots shall include this feature.

Comment: Some of the lots to be revised with this application are 65 feet wide or less and they do not show the fences in the front yards as required by this condition. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring this to be done prior to certification.

d. The specifications and details for the fences in the front yards shall be agreed upon by the applicant and staff and shown on the plans.

Comment: The submitted SDP provides a detail for the fences in the front yards as was previously approved.

9. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for the construction of single-family attached units, or the community building, the applicant shall file a revision to the plans as follows:

a. Submit the architecture proposed for the single-family attached units.

Comment: The submitted SDP includes new architectural models for the single-family attached units. Other architectural models were approved in the previous SDP revisions.

13. Prior to the issuance of building permits, plans shall indicate that houses on corner lots shall front on the most heavily traveled street, where possible.

Comment: The submitted SDP shows houses on corner lots fronting on the most heavily traveled streets, where possible.

- 17. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide sidewalks along both sides of internal public streets.**

Comment: The submitted SDP shows sidewalks along both sides of internal public streets.

- 18. Provide a sidewalk along one side of the private road serving Lots 1–17 on Parcel A-1.**

Comment: The submitted SDP shows a sidewalk along one side of the private road serving Lots 1 – 17 on Parcel A-1.

- 19. Provide a sidewalk along one side of the private road serving Lots 1–8 on Parcel B-1.**

Comment: The submitted SDP shows a sidewalk along one side of the private road serving Lots 1–8 on Parcel B-1.

- 20. The following is a list of additional development standards that shall be included and added to the cover sheet of this SDP:**

- a. Setbacks for garages and accessory buildings on through lots.**

Comment: The submitted SDP lists the standard setbacks for garages and accessory buildings on through lots.

- b. Minimum distance between end buildings for the townhouses.**

Comment: The submitted SDP lists the minimum distance between end buildings for the townhouses.

- c. Setback requirements for open decks and porches.**

Comment: The submitted SDP lists the setback requirements for open decks and porches.

- d. Amount of encroachment allowed for bay windows, chimneys, vestibules, areaways (above grade), etc...into the building restriction lines.**

Comment: The submitted SDP lists the allowed amount of encroachment for bay windows, chimneys, vestibules, and areaways.

- 22. The townhouse lots appear to have single-car garages, many of which do not have the minimum setback of 19 feet for a second parking space. Revise the plan to accommodate a second parking space.**

Comment: The submitted SDP shows all townhouses having a minimum setback of 19 feet for the second parking space.

- 23. Revise plans to include driveway aprons and/or the curb cuts for all of the**

townhouse units.

Comment: The submitted SDP shows driveway aprons or curb cuts for all townhouse units.

24. The 25-foot minimum distance between end buildings (see Table 2) has not been met between Lots 6 and 7, Block C; Lots 21 and 22, Block D; Lots 15 and 16, Block D; Lots 27 and 28, Block E; Lots 22 and 23, Block E; and Lots 4 and 5, Block B. Revise the plan accordingly.

Comment: The submitted SDP shows a 25-foot minimum distance between end buildings on townhomes.

b. **Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-01:** The Planning Board approved SDP-0318-01 on January 19, 2006 with one condition, which warrants the following discussion:

1. **Prior to signature approval of the plans the following revisions shall be made to the plans:**

a. **A detail showing an eight-inch overhang for the gables of end units shall be provided.**

Comment: The proposed architectural elevations all indicate an eight-inch overhang is to be provided on the gables of end units.

b. **All town homes facing a village green in any village which are also located at the intersection of two streets, namely the townhouse units on Lot 1, Block C; Lot 26, Block D; and Lots 19 and 32, Block E, shall be constructed of brick on their front and side façade. The side shall include special architectural details such as bay windows, special treatment of the corners, or other features that will distinguish them from adjacent houses. Side elevations shall be revised to make the fenestration more regular or symmetrical on such units. The Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board shall approve final design of the end walls.**

Comment: The specified lots are not included in the subject SDP revision and additionally, the proposed townhouse architecture will not be used on the specified lots.

c. **All deck details and specifications shall be shown on the plans and the decks shall be indicated to be stained. Decks shall be a standard feature on the rear load garages.**

Comment: The applicant did provide a deck detail; however, it did not indicate that it is to be stained. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring this.

d. **No fences constructed of pressure-treated or other wood left to weather naturally shall be permitted where visible from public streets. Chain-link fences shall be prohibited in these areas. A fence**

detail shall be shown on the plans and shall indicate the fence is to be stained. Fences shall be prohibited on the rear load garages.

Comment: No new fences are proposed with the subject application. The previously approved wooden fence detail shows it being stained.

e. The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate the following as exterior finish material on the plans:

- (1) Hardie-Plank**
- (2) Brick in a horizontal running bond pattern with no more than raked joints. Variations for soldier coursing will be permitted.**
- (3) Restoration Series vinyl siding, or equal (four to six inches exposed to weather).**

Comment: The submitted architectural elevations for townhomes indicate exterior finish materials as either a horizontal brick veneer or vinyl siding.

f. Roofs shall overhang a gable end-wall a minimum of eight inches

Comment: The proposed architectural elevations all indicate an eight-inch overhang is to be provided on the gables of end units.

g. The following lots shall have brick end walls:

- Lots 1, 10 and 17, Block A**
- Lots 1, 8, 47 and 66, Block B**
- Lot 12, Block C**
- Lot 9, Block D**
- Lots 1 and 18, Block E**

Comment: Some of the specified lots will use the architecture models proposed with this SDP revision. The Lafayette provides an optional all brick side elevation to fulfill this condition; however, the Waldorf architecture elevations do not. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring this.

c. Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-02: The Planning Board approved SDP-0318-02 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-103) for the design of the community recreational area and building on May 4, 2006 with one condition, which does not affect the subject application.

d. Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-03 and 04: The Planning Director approved these two revisions to the subject SDP in 2008, with no conditions, to add new townhouse architecture, the “Norwood” and “Lafayette” models, respectively.

12. ***Prince George's County Landscape Manual:*** The proposed single-family residential lots in the R-L Zone are subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- a. Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, requires a minimum of three shade trees and two ornamental or evergreen trees per one-family detached lot between 9,500 and 19,999 square feet, and a minimum of two shade trees and two ornamental or evergreen trees per one-family detached lot smaller than 9,500 square feet. North Village, the subject area of this SDP revision, proposes 100 single-family detached lots, so the requirement would have to be calculated based on their sizes. The submitted SDP provides the appropriate schedules for this requirement; however, the incorrect number of lots is listed, so the calculations are incorrect. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring these schedules to be revised. For the 45 townhouse lots, a minimum of 1.5 shade trees and one ornamental or evergreen tree is required per dwelling, but these can be located on lots or in common open space. The submitted SDP provides a sufficient number of trees to fulfill this requirement.
 - b. Section 4.6, Buffering Developments from Streets, requires that, when rear yards of single-family detached or attached dwellings are oriented toward a street, a buffer area shall be provided between the development and the street. On the subject application, there are multiple lots in the North Village that have such a condition. The appropriate schedules and plant materials have been provided for all such cases.
 - c. Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, requires a buffer between adjacent incompatible land uses; however, Edelen Village is completely surrounded by open space parcels, part of the Preserve at Piscataway property, which is considered a compatible use when adjacent to residential lots.
 - d. Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, requires certain percentages of native plants be provided on-site, along with no invasive plants, and no plants being planted on slopes steeper than three-to-one. The landscape plan provides the appropriate schedule showing the requirements being met.
13. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The project is subject to the requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 3: The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, as there is no grandfathering and building and grading permits for areas greater than 1,500 square feet are still required for the subject development. The requirement for the subject property is twenty percent for the R-L-zoned gross tract area of 169.92 acres, or a total of 33.99 acres of tree canopy coverage. A worksheet was provided for the tree canopy coverage (TCC) requirement showing the site being short of meeting the requirement; however, under further review, multiple mistakes were discovered on the provided worksheet, including the square footage of existing trees, which should be 30.53 acres to match the TCPII, the credit allowed per shade tree, which should be 225 square feet, instead of 50, and the inclusion of proposed street trees. Therefore, a condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report requiring the TCC worksheet be corrected for all errors and to show the TCC requirement being met on-site.
14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. **Community Planning South Division**—In comments dated May 14, 2012, the Community Planning South Division offered the following summarized comments:

The Preserve, comprised of approximately 879 acres originally known as the Villages at Piscataway, is identified as within the Developing Tier by the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial Centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable.

The subject property was retained in the R-L Zone in the 2009 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (CR-61-2009, approved September 9, 2009). The future land use designated for the subject site in the master plan is “residential low – transition area.” There are no additional General Plan or master plan issues.

The proposed development is located within the Mount Vernon Viewshed Area of Primary Concern. An evaluation for potential impairment of the Mount Vernon viewshed determined that the proposed development will adversely affect the historic view from Mount Vernon due to its location and the elevations of the proposed dwelling units. The ideal manner of protecting the viewshed would be to locate development in shadow areas of the site (i.e. areas screened from view from Mount Vernon by their location on lee slopes or valleys and other low areas), where development would have no visual impact. The attached map shows areas of the viewshed (in pink) where a 36-foot-tall building will be visible from Mount Vernon if vegetation that presently provides screening is removed. Areas with no color are the “shadow areas.” The newly proposed buildings are more than 25 and 37 feet in height. To the extent possible, to minimize visual impacts the following is recommended:

- (1) Sheets 8, 9, 10
 - (a) Retain the approved building widths for lots in the more vulnerable lower portions of Wheel Wright Place (i.e. lots on Sheet 10 and the southern section of Sheet 9) and place the proposed new lots closer to the intersection of Wheel Wright Place and St. Mary’s View Road, where development will impair the viewshed less.
 - (b) Place Waldorf, Livingston, and Fairgate units at the lower topographic elevations of Wheel Wright Place starting approximately 600 feet south of St. Mary’s View Road, where existing tree cover will more effectively screen the buildings. Restrict the other dwelling units to portions of the subject site that are in viewshed shadow areas, where the additional building height will not impair the viewshed.

Comment: In regards to the previous two comments, the specific architecture discussed, and proposed with this application, is for townhouse units, whereas all of the proposed lots along Wheel Wright Place and St. Mary’s View Road are for single-family detached units. The architecture for single-family detached units is per the separate Specific Design Plan SDP-0202, Umbrella Application for Architecture, which only includes houses that are no more than approximately 25 feet high. Hence, they will lie beneath the 36-foot-high level of vulnerable viewshed that may be within these areas. Additionally, most of the existing forest

around these proposed lots is to be retained to further screen these houses. Therefore, the additional proposed lots should not impact the viewshed any more than the amount of previously approved lots and no restrictions need to be placed on the townhouse architecture proposed with this revision.

- (c) Use dark earth tones for the siding materials and roof tops of all buildings that cannot be screened from the view from Mount Vernon.

Comment: As discussed above, this SDP revision does not include any architecture for lots that lie within the vulnerable viewshed area for Mount Vernon.

(2) Sheet 4

- (a) Increase the amount of landscaping where possible for all development on Lucas Run Way, Vintage Lane, Admiral Ridge Road and Medinah Ridge Road to screen development.

Comment: All of the areas mentioned are located within Edelen Village South, which is not being revised with this SDP as they are either already constructed or under separate ownership.

- (b) Include large caliper planting stock (e.g. four-inch diameter or greater) where possible.

Comment: As mentioned above, the revisions to landscaping only involve Edelen Village North, which is outside of the vulnerable viewshed area and so large caliper planting stock is unnecessary.

- (c) Plant areas west of Admiral Ridge Road (e.g. Parcel GC-1, SDP-0608) and east of Vintage Lane to provide long-term screening.

Comment: Again, all of the areas mentioned are located within Edelen Village South, which is not being revised with this SDP as they are either already constructed or under separate ownership, or within the area for the separate SDP-0608 for the golf course.

Although outside the purview of this site plan, it is important to stress retention of the forested area north of Vintage Lane (Sheet 3) to provide continued screening for the planned development along Wheel Wright Place and existing development to the east.

Comment: As mentioned, the specified land area north of Vintage Lane does not lie within this SDP area, but rather within the area for Specific Design Plan SDP-0608 for the golf course, so the retention of forested area will have to be reviewed with that SDP.

- b. **Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated May 9, 2012, the Subdivision reviewer offered the following summarized comments:

This application is specifically for Edelen North Villages 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 7 in The Preserve at Piscataway subdivision. The site plan shows the entire property boundaries and acreage of The Preserve at Piscataway subdivision. The applicant submitted a

specific design (SDP-0318-05) plan to reduce the lot widths at the front street line from 90 feet to 65 feet wide to accommodate an additional eight single-family detached lots in Block D and an additional two single-family detached lots in Block E. The property is currently unimproved.

Block D was recorded in Plat Book PM 224-52 on November 9, 2007 and Block E was recorded in Plat Book PM 216-16 on November 3, 2006. Both record plats contain the same notes, but in different order. For the purpose of this review, Plat 224-52 is referenced. The record plats contain 14 notes and the following notes (**in bold**) relate to the review of this application:

- 1. Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 8008470-1994-02 approved August 1, 2003.**

General Note 2 of the site plan indicates that the plan was prepared in accordance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 8008470-1994-02.

- 3. Development of this property must conform to the Specific Design Plan which was approved by the Planning Board on June 24, 2004, SDP-0318, Resolution No. 04-135 or as amended by any subsequent revisions thereto.**

Conformance to the site development plan, SDP-0318, and subsequent revisions is discussed in Finding 11 above.

- 4. Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/9/94-02) which precludes any disturbance or installation of structures within specified areas. Failure to comply with an approved Tree Conservation Plan is a violation requiring mitigation under the Woodland conservation/Tree Preservation Policy. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved prior to the issuance of any grading/building permits.**

See discussion in Finding 14. d. below.

- 7. All structures on this site shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with Article 13 of the National Fire Protection Association Standards.**

The site plan, in General Note 12, provides appropriate notice.

- 8. Prior to the issuance of each residential building permit, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide evidence of contribution of \$400.00 to the Piscataway Preservation Grant and Loan Fund.**

- 12. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a fee to Prince George's County, which shall serve as a fair-share contribution toward the construction of the Brandywine Special Study Area Station and acquisition of an ambulance and paramedic unit. The fee amount is based upon the construction cost of the station (\$1,275,00) and the purchase price of an ambulance (\$129,000) and paramedic unit (\$129,000) divided by the total amount of population and employees within the proposed service area at projected building in 2006 (10,024). The fair-share fee for residential**

development is \$479 per dwelling unit and shall be paid prior to the approval of each permit, and the fair-share for commercial/historic uses is \$7,646.50 and shall be paid prior to the issuance of the first building permit for nonresidential uses. The community building for purposes of this condition is considered residential use.

Conformance to Notes 8 and 12 will be determined at the time of building permits. Notes 8 and 12 will be reflected on the final plats, and is provided here for notice to the applicant.

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027, which was approved for 794 lots, 66 parcels, and a total of 836 dwelling units. The resolution was adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board on July 17, 2003 (PGCPB Resolution No. 03-122). The validity period for the preliminary plan was extended to December 31, 2013, pursuant to County Council Bill CB-8-2011. The applicant is shifting dwelling units from another section of the overall preliminary plan and adding them to an area that has already been the subject of a record plat. A new final plat is required to reflect the additional lots for Blocks D and E and must be accepted by M-NCPPC before the preliminary plan expires or a new preliminary plan will be required for any lots that have not been platted. The applicant may ask for an extension of the validity period for the preliminary plan beyond December 31, 2013. The resolution for the approved preliminary plan contains 47 conditions, which are discussed further in Finding 10 above.

Prior to the approval of the DSP:

1. DSP cover sheet should be revised to:
 - a. Add the proposed lots to the key map.
 - b. Create a tracking table to show all of the previously approved SDPs by name and number, the number of units approved in SDP by type, number of units approved in Preliminary Plan by type, a subtotal of each type, the total number of approved units, a notation of currently proposed under this SDP, and the totals with this SDP approval. (A sample copy of the tracking table was given to the applicant at SDRC).
 - c. Revise the zoning requirements for Note 7 to include the maximum lot widths and the minimum lot depths.
 - d. Add the plat references (MMB 233-87) on the lot data on the drawing.

Recommended Condition:

1. Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant, heirs, successors and/or assigns shall obtain approval of final plats pursuant to Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations:
 - a. Replace the previously recorded plats REP 216-16 and PM 224-52 to incorporate the new lots as shown on the approved SDP.

The Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-05 is in substantial conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027 and the recorded final plats, if the above comments have been addressed. It should be noted that the bearings, distances, lots, and blocks as reflected on the final plats must be shown and match. Failure of the site plan and record plats to match will result in the building permits being placed on hold until the plans are corrected. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

Comment: The appropriate comments that still apply have been included as conditions of approval in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- c. **Permit Review Section**—In a memorandum dated May 3, 2012, the Permit Review Section offered several comments, which are either not applicable at this time, have been addressed through revisions to the plans, or are addressed through proposed conditions of approval of this specific design plan.
- d. **Environmental Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated May 22, 2012, the Environmental Planning Section provided a comprehensive review of the SDP’s conformance with the previously approved conditions relating to environmental issues, along with the following summarized comments:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the revised Specific Design Plan for The Preserve at Piscataway – Edelen Village, SDP-0318-05, and the revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-046-04-02, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on April 4, 2012. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of SDP-0318-05 and TCPII-046-04-02 subject to one condition.

The subject application is not subject to the environmental regulations that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because the site has a previously approved preliminary plan and specific design plan. The application is not subject to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, Subtitle 25, Division 2, which became effective September 1, 2010, because there are previously approved Type 1 and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plans. The application is subject to Subtitle 25, Division 3, Tree Canopy Coverage which became effective February 1, 2012.

- (1) This site contains regulated environmental features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. Impacts to these buffers are prohibited by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the Planning Board grants a variation to the Subdivision Regulations in accordance with Section 24-113. All of the impacts proposed on SDP-0318-05 were granted variations by the Planning Board during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027.

Section 27-528(a)(2)(5)-Planning Board Action

(a) **Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

- (2) **The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development;**

(5) The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features are preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).

The current application is consistent with the level of impacts approved at time of preliminary plan and no new impacts to regulated environmental features are proposed.

- (2) This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the entire site is more than 40,000 square feet in size and has more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required.

A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was reviewed with Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306, and a revised Forest Stand Delineation was reviewed with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94017. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-009-94, was approved with CDP-9306. An "01" revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan was approved with 4-94017, and a second revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan was approved with 4-03027. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan provides for all woodland conservation requirements to be met on-site and does not allow woodland conservation areas on lots less than 20,000 square feet in area, the use of fee-in-lieu, or the use of off-site woodland conservation easements.

A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-046-04-02, was submitted with this application. This TCPII includes 169.92 acres of the entire 878.72-acre project. The revised TCPII submitted with the current application indicates that the site contains 76.45 acres of upland woodland and 51.46 acres of wooded floodplain. The revised plan proposes clearing 45.92 acres of upland woodland, 0.58 acres of wooded floodplain and clearing 3.70 acres off-site woodland. The plan proposes preservation of 30.53 acres and no afforestation on-site for a total of 30.53 acres.

The quantities of land types associated with the current TCPII revision are not entirely consistent with the quantities approved with the "01" revision. The gross tract and 100-year floodplain have dropped slightly in area, while there has been a considerable reduction in the quantity of existing wooded floodplain. In general, these types of fluctuation in baseline data should not occur unless development phase boundaries have been reconfigured, or a revised FSD is submitted in support of such changes.

The design of the woodland conservation areas is in general conformance with TCPI-009-94/02, except for areas where variation requests were approved during the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027 and all priority woodland areas were to be preserved. Many areas where grading and clearing impacts to woodland within expanded stream buffers were approved will be reforested.

An Overall Woodland Conservation Summary Worksheet has been used as a tracking chart that clearly calculates the overall woodland conservation for the

project, and how it will be fulfilled in accordance with the conditions of approval. The overall project remains in compliance with Consideration 4 of Zoning Map Amendments A-9869 & A-9870, and County Council Resolution CR-60-1999 dated September 14, 1993, and provides for woodland conservation of more than 35 percent and the preservation of a large contiguous wooded area in the southern portion of the site. The approval of the text amendment to the Zoning County Code to remove the golf course from this project has resulted in the potential for additional preservation and afforestation on the permanent open space provided on the site, which may result in as much as 52 percent of on-site woodland conservation.

There are minor technical revisions required to the TCPII prior to certification. These include the justification of baseline numbers for the gross tract area, 100-year floodplain, existing net tract woodlands, and existing wooded floodplain, where there are inconsistencies with previous approvals. Minor revisions to the Individual TCPII Worksheet and for the Overall Woodland Conservation Worksheet are required. Each plan sheet should include a legend. The redundant TCPII approval block should be removed from the cover sheet. The plan must be signed by the qualified professional who prepared it. The TCPII is also lacking in the required detail and notes which are necessary for implementation of the plan.

- (3) Marlboro Clay is known to occur on the site. A soils report was submitted with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96047. That study indicated that Marlboro Clay occurs on the site between elevations 40 to 55. A more detailed study was submitted with Specific Design Plan SDP-9804. Because of the elevation of the clay and local topography, slope failure is not an issue. Footers for foundations cannot be set in Marlboro Clay. Marlboro Clay is unsuited as a sub-base material for roads. Due to the elevation in this portion of the property, Marlboro clay should not be a factor for foundations or roads.
- (4) Floral Park Road and Piscataway Road were previously designated as historic roads. Danville Road was also designated as a historic road with the approval of the MPOT in December 2009. Proposed applications on or adjacent to scenic and historic roads are reviewed for conformance with Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads prepared by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

As noted in Condition 4 of the Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP 9306) for the subject property known as the Villages at Piscataway as described in PGCPB Resolution No. 94-98(C), all permits for road construction in this area are subject to review and approval by the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC).

Edelen Village does not directly front on any of the designated historic roads.

- (5) The subject property is located in the Mount Vernon Viewshed Area of Primary Concern, which has been delineated as an evaluation tool for the protection of the Mount Vernon Viewshed. Properties located within the Area of Primary Concern are generally referred to the National Park Service, National Capital Region, for analysis of the location and elevation of the subject property, the elevation of structures proposed on the site, and the potential for vegetative screening

between the subject property and Mount Vernon as the viewpoint.

Some of the past development at the Preserve at Piscataway, particularly that previously constructed in Edelen Village South, which was placed at a ground level elevation of 180 feet msl, has been found to be highly visible from Mount Vernon due to a sudden rise in elevation which occurs along the Piscataway Creek stream valley. A careful evaluation of the height of the proposed construction, the ground level elevation, and retained areas of vegetation to determine the potential visibility of the proposed structures is appropriate. If an evaluation determines that there is potential for visibility related to the Viewshed of concern, an additional level of woodland conservation/landscaping and architectural review would be appropriate.

Because this area is platted with approved architecture, but not yet constructed, the proposed materials for the structures should be evaluated. Earth toned colors with limited reflectivity for siding, trim and roofing are preferred. In addition, opportunities to retain existing trees and plant new trees and landscape to provided buffering is also recommended.

An evaluation of the topography of Edelen Village North indicates that it is actually lower in elevation than Edelen Village South, which provides visual shielding of the area now proposed for construction. In addition, with the possible elimination of the golf course, the band of woodland located between Edelen Village North and Edelen Village South will now be retained as woodlands, providing additional vegetative screening of structures proposed within the viewshed. Based on the increased amount of vegetative screening that will be provided, and the extensive architectural review requirements placed on development within this site, the impacts to the viewshed are found for the most part successfully mitigated.

Comment: No further evaluation of the potential impacts within the Mount Vernon Viewshed Area of Primary Concern is required with this application.

- (6) The *Prince George's County Soil Survey* indicates that the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Galestown, Othello, and Sassafras soils series. Condition 17 of PGCPB Resolution No. 94-213, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94017, June 24, 1994 was specifically included to require future review of areas where highly erodible soils occur on slopes in excess of 15 percent. Aura, Beltsville, Elkton, and Othello soils are highly erodible.
- (7) A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, CSD#8008470-1994-01, was approved by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources in 1994.

Comment: The recommended environmental condition has been included as a condition of approval in the Recommendation Section of this report.

- e. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department, in a memorandum dated April 27, 2012, provided standard comments regarding fire apparatus, hydrants, and lane requirements. Those issues will be enforced by the Fire Department at the time of the issuance of permits.

- f. **Prince George's County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated April 20, 2012, the Police Department provided the following comments:

A site visit was conducted for this property with a particular focus on the Community Center, pool, basketball court and children's playground area (Sheet 12). An initial concern is the lack of a landscape plan, as well as lighting plan for this portion of the property. On scene contact was made with the builder of the Community Center who indicated he would have the developer, Justin, contact me with a copy of the landscape/lighting plan. I am apprehensive about the location of the basketball court and children's playground as well as their proximity to each other. These locations border woods to the rear and it would be beneficial to see if the landscape/lighting plans account for natural surveillance (seeing and being seen) and proper efficient lighting. Once I have had a chance to review those plans I will be able to provide you with more comprehensive concerns, if there are any.

Comment: The Community Center design and layout is not being revised with this SDP and therefore, is not under full review; however, the applicant indicated verbally that they would make contact with the Police Department regarding the lighting and landscaping.

- g. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated April 27, 2012, the Health Department provided the following summarized comments:

- (1) There are no supermarkets or grocery stores within one-half mile of the project. A 2008 report by the UCLA Center for Health Policy Research found that the presence of a supermarket in a neighborhood predicts higher fruit and vegetable consumption and a reduced prevalence of obesity.
- (2) There is an increasing body of scientific research suggesting that community gardens enhance nutrition and physical activity and promote the role of public health in improving quality of life. The developer should consider setting aside space for a community garden.
- (3) The plan should indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
- (4) No photometric plan or information about proposed light fixtures was provided for review. There is an increasing body of scientific research suggesting that artificial light pollution can have lasting adverse impacts on human health. Indicate that all proposed exterior light fixtures will be shielded so as to minimize light trespass caused by spill light.
- (5) The plan should indicate how sidewalks will be connected to the proposed hiker, biker, and equestrian trail.

Comment: As the Health Department recognized, this fifth revision to the SDP is limited in scope; therefore some of the comments, such as proposed exterior light fixtures, grocery stores and trail connections, are not subject to evaluation at this time, while others will be addressed by other review agencies at the time of permitting.

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 Specific Design Plan SDP-0318-05, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-046-04-02 for The Preserve at Piscataway-Edelen Village, North and South, subject to the **following conditions**:

1. Prior to signature approval of the specific design plan, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows:
 - a. Correct the following technical errors:
 - (1) Revise the zoning requirements in Note 7 to include the minimum lot depths.
 - (2) Add the plat references (MMB 233-87) on the lot data on the drawing.
 - (3) Revise the number of lots listed for Edelen North in General Note 7, so that they equal the 145 lots proposed.
 - (4) Add a note that a minimum of 60 percent of all townhouse units shall have a full front façade of brick, stone or stucco.
 - b. Revise the Section 4.1 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* schedules for the one-family detached lots to show the requirements being met for the number of lots that are the subject of this SDP.
 - c. Revise the Tree Canopy Coverage (TCC) worksheet to provide all the correct credits, including the square footage of existing trees to match the 30.53 acres shown on the TCPII, and to show the TCC requirement being met on-site.
 - d. Add a note to the SDP that all decks shall be stained to complement the color of the house.
 - e. Show fences in the front yards of at least 50 percent of the single-family detached units that are 65 feet or less in width at the street line.
 - f. Revise the architectural elevations as follows:
 - (1) All above-grade foundation walls shall be labeled as being built of brick, fieldstone, parged block, or painted brick-form poured concrete. House foundation walls built of parged block, or painted brick-form poured concrete that are within public view from a street, or within view of the golf clubhouse, may be exposed up to two feet above the ground.
 - (2) Provide an optional full brick side elevation for the Waldorf architecture.

2. Prior to signature approval of the specific design plan, the applicant shall revise the TCPII plans as follows:
 - a. Inconsistencies between baseline site quantities on the “01” revision and the “02” revision shall be justified and/or reconciled.
 - b. The Individual TCPII worksheet shall be corrected to reflect the plan.
 - c. The Overall Woodland Conservation Summary Worksheet shall be revised to correctly reflect the plan.
 - d. The redundant TCPII approval block shall be removed from the cover sheet.
 - e. Provide woodland conservation signage and mounting details.
 - f. Provide woodland conservation signage locations graphically on the plan.
 - g. After all revisions are made, the plan shall be signed by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
3. Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors and/or assignees shall obtain approval of final plats pursuant to Section 24-111 of the Subdivision Regulations:
 - a. Replace the previously recorded plats REP 216-16 and PM 224-52 to incorporate the new lots as shown on the approved SDP.