

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George’s County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on May 7, 2015 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-09030 for Addison’s Addition to Cedar Hill, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The purpose of the subject limited detailed site plan (DSP) application is for approval of house placement, architecture, and landscaping for three new single-family homes, as required by Condition 8 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	R-R	R-R
Use(s)	Single-Family Residential	Single-Family Residential
Acreage	3.88	3.88
Lots	0	4
Parcels	1	0
Dwelling Units	1	4
Gross Floor Area	3,414 sq. ft.	12,714 sq. ft.

3. **Location:** The subject site is located east of Old Chapel Road, on the north side of South Homestake Drive, approximately 85 feet east of its intersection with West Vein Road, in Planning Area 71A and Council District 04.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is surrounded by residentially-developed, Rural-Residential (R-R)-zoned properties located within the Prospect Knolls subdivision.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The site is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007 (PPS), for Cedar Hill, Addison’s Addition, which was originally adopted by the Prince George’s County Planning Board on September 25, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-126). The PPS remains valid until December 31, 2015. Approval of final plats is required prior to the expiration of the PPS.

Condition 8 requires a limited detailed site plan on the subject site as follows:

8. **Prior to final plat, a limited detailed site plan review shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee. The review shall include the following:**

- a. **To ensure the compatibility of the new construction with the character of Cedar Hill, the dwellings on Lots 1–3 shall address the siting of the new houses to ensure that they are located as far away from Cedar Hill as possible, the massing, design and materials of the rear and side elevations to ensure compatibility with the façade of each new house and the character of Cedar Hill.**
- b. **The applicant shall submit a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation if recommended by the Phase I. Prior to the approval of the limited detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner.**
- c. **Depending upon the significance of findings (at Phase I, II, or III level), the applicant shall provide interpretive signage. The siting, contents, and triggers for installation shall be determined by the limited detailed site plan.**

This detailed site plan has been submitted to fulfill the above requirement. See Finding 8 for discussion.

6. **Design Features:** The existing 3.88-acre site contains an existing two-story structure, known as Cedar Hill. The house and a stand-alone garage are located on a hilly and partially-wooded site. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007 was approved to allow the existing 3.88-acre lot to be subdivided into four lots, for the construction of three new single-family dwellings. Three 3,100-square-foot single-family detached dwellings are proposed to front South Homestake Drive. Each lot has proposed driveway access to South Homestake Drive. For more specific discussion of the siting and architecture of the proposed buildings see Finding 8.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The Planning Board finds that the subject application complies with the requirements of the R-R Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-441(b), Table of Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in residential zones.
 - b. The DSP shows a site layout that is consistent with Section 27-442, Regulations regarding lot area and building setbacks. The following additional information is provided:

		REQUIRED	APPROVED
Lot 1	Net Lot Area	20,000 sq. ft.	21,440 sq. ft.
	Lot Coverage	25% (max)	17.01%
	Front Street Line	70 ft.	80 ft.
	Front Building Line	80 ft.*	80 ft.
	Front Setback	25 ft.	30 ft.
Lot 2	Net Lot Area	20,000 sq. ft.	20,332 sq. ft.
	Lot Coverage	25% (max)	17.95%
	Front Street Line	70 ft.	75 ft.
	Front Building Line	80 ft.*	80 ft.
	Front Setback	25 ft.	30 ft.
Lot 3	Net Lot Area	20,000 sq. ft.	20,651 sq. ft.
	Lot Coverage	25% (max)	17.67%
	Front Street Line	70 ft.	75 ft.
	Front Building Line	80 ft.*	80 ft.
	Front Setback	25 ft.	30 ft.
Lot 4	Net Lot Area	20,000 sq. ft.	106,991 sq. ft.
	Lot Coverage	25% (max)	3.35%
	Front Street Line	70 ft.	75 ft.
	Front Building Line	80 ft.*	302 ft.
	Front Setback	25 ft.	288 ft.
	Side Yard (total of both yards/minimum of either yard)	17 ft./8 ft.	212 ft./100 ft.

*Section 27-442(d), Footnote 2, states that a front building line of 80 feet is permitted for sites served by a public or other approved water supply system.

Prior to certification of the DSP, the front building lines shall be indicated on the plans in conformance with Section 27-442(d).

- c. The DSP is consistent with all applicable site design guidelines. The proposed grading limits disruption to the existing topography.

- 8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007 (PPS) for Cedar Hill, Addison's Addition, was originally adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board on September 25, 2008 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-126). The PPS remains valid until December 31, 2015. Approval of final plats is required prior to the expiration of the PPS. The resolution of approval contains eight conditions and the following conditions relate to the review of this application:

5. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan No. 2838-2008-00 and any subsequent revisions.**

The Planning Board finds that the detailed site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept.

7. **The Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties form for Cedar Hill, No. 71A-8, shall be updated to reflect current conditions at the property, such as additions, alterations, or changes to the setting. The updated form shall be reviewed by Historic Preservation Section staff prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision.**

The Planning Board finds that the above condition has been met.

8. **Prior to final plat, a limited detailed site plan review shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee. The review shall include the following:**
 - a. **To ensure the compatibility of the new construction with the character of Cedar Hill, the dwellings on Lots 1-3 shall address the siting of the new houses to ensure that they are located as far away from Cedar Hill as possible, the massing, design and materials of the rear and side elevations to ensure compatibility with the façade of each new house and the character of Cedar Hill.**
 - b. **The applicant shall submit a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation if recommended by the Phase I. Prior to approval of the limited detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner.**
 - c. **Depending upon the significance of findings (at Phase I, II, or III level), the applicant shall provide interpretive signage.**

Additionally, Finding 15 of the resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-126) requires the submission of a limited detailed site plan and states the following:

A limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee for the subject site to address specific concerns outlined in the Archeology/Historic Preservation finding regarding a Phase I archeological study, interpretive signage and the architectural compatibility of the existing residence, identified as Cedar Hill, to the new construction of homes on the three proposed lots. This includes attention to and preservation of the historical setting through the use of landscape buffers. A Phase I archeological

study should occur prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, due to any possible impact further archeological studies may have on the proposed development.

The subject detailed site plan has been submitted in fulfillment of Condition 8. This subject limited detailed site plan was referred to the Historic Preservation Section for review and comment.

As required by Condition 8(a), the proposed dwellings on Lots 1–3 have been cited as far away from the existing residence, known as Cedar Hill, as possible, while maintaining appropriate setbacks from the street. The closest proposed residence will be approximately 220 feet from Cedar Hill. Furthermore, between the proposed dwellings and Cedar Hill, the applicant proposes a buffer of existing and proposed trees that has a minimum width of 50 feet. On proposed Lots 1 and 2, the provided buffer varies from 120 to 150 feet in width. While Cedar Hill does not have a historic site designation, the proposed buffering is equal to greater than buffering that would generally be required by the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* between designated historic properties and other uses.

The massing, design, and materials of the proposed residences have been designed to be compatible with the design of Cedar Hill. Cedar Hill is a 3,414-square-foot, two-and-one-half story house, built in 1916 in the colonial revival style. The structure has a symmetrical front façade and features: dormers, windows with shutters, white siding, and a fully articulated front and rear. The provided architectural plans depict three proposed houses of similar massing, materials, and general details. The houses include the use of vinyl siding in neutral colors, windows with shutters, and two of the three proposed houses include dormers on the front and rear. During the review of the detailed site plan, the proposed elevation for Lot 3 was revised to include an enhanced entry porch or portico treatment.

Conditions 8(b) and 8(c) relate to possible Phase II and Phase III archeological investigations. As this limited detailed site plan does not propose any impacts to the significant portions of archeological site 18PR958, no additional archeological investigations are required at this time. The Planning Board finds that Condition 8 has been satisfied in its entirety.

9. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual Requirements:** Proposed Lots 1–3 conform to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). Permits pertaining to the existing single-family home on proposed Lot 4 are exempt from the requirements of the Landscape Manual pursuant to Section 1.1(e).
 - a. **Section 4.1, Residential Requirement**—Proposed Lots 1–3 are between 20,000 square feet and 40,000 square feet in size and are required to be planted with a minimum of four major shade trees and three ornamental or evergreen trees per lot. The Landscape

Manual recommends that one major shade tree be provided within the front yard, on the south and/or west side, of each lot. Prior to signature approval, compliance with this standard shall be indicated for Lots 1 and 3. Currently, only ornamental trees are shown in the front yard of these lots.

- b. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—The proposed single-family residential uses are compatible with the existing adjacent single-family residential uses, therefore, additional buffering is not required pursuant to the Landscape Manual. Cedar Hill is not a designated historic site; therefore, Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, does not apply. Nevertheless the applicant’s landscape design would meet the intent of Section 4.7 between the proposed single-family homes and a historic site.

The plan shall eliminate references to proposed Section 4.7 bufferyards.

- c. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—The site is subject to Section 4.9, which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. Prior to certification of the plan, the planting schedule and 4.9 schedule shall be consistent with regard to native plantings. All of the required landscaping in the reforestation areas is required to be native.

Prior to certification of the DSP, all of the proposed landscape material shall be labeled with standard alphanumeric plant identifiers.

10. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the 1989 Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance (WCO) because there are previously approved tree conservation plans for the site. The site is not subject to the environmental regulations in Subtitles 25 and 27 that became effective on September 1, 2010 and February 1, 2012, because the site has a preliminary plan and TCPI approved prior to the current legislations associated with this DSP request. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-009-14) was submitted with the review package.

The woodland conservation threshold (WCT) for this 1.22-acre property is 20 percent of the net tract area or 0.78 acre. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing proposed is 0.95 acre. This requirement is proposed to be satisfied by 0.71 acre of on-site preservation and 0.31 acre of on-site reforestation.

The reforestation areas are proposed at the rear of Lots 1–3. The applicant proposed to plant larger plant material than would typically be required by the WCO in order to provide a buffer that meets the design guidelines contained in the Landscape Manual.

A number of technical revisions are required to the TCPII to improve the legibility of the plan. The Planning Board finds that these revisions shall be provided prior to certificate of approval of the TCPII.

11. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance came into effect on September 1, 2010. The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on properties that require a grading permit. Properties zoned R-R is required to provide a minimum of fifteen percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The amount of tree canopy required on the subject site is 25,352 square feet. This requirement is met and exceeded by through woodland conservation on the subject site. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the tree canopy coverage worksheet on the plan shall be updated to reflect the approved woodland conservation on the site.

12. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The limited detailed site plan was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The Planning Board adopts the following:
 - a. **Historic Preservation**—The Planning Board adopts the following historic preservation-related findings:
 - (1) The two-and-one-half story house on the subject property was built in 1916 on the site of an earlier structure, known as Cedar Hill. The earlier house was destroyed in the early twentieth century. Cedar Hill was first recorded on a Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties (MIHP) form (71A-008) in 1974 and was updated in 1985. The current house was built by local carpenter Millard Schafer for the family of Joseph Addison, a descendant of the Bowie Family who lived at Cedar Hill in the nineteenth century. Cedar Hill resembles two other similar Colonial Revival style houses, Boyden House (71A-034) and Boxlee (70-039), both built by carpenter Shafer in the vicinity. The Boyden House and Boxlee are County Historic Sites. Cedar Hill was recommended for review to the Historic Preservation Commission, sitting as the Citizen’s Advisory Committee (CAC) in 1990 as part of the Historic Sites and Districts Plan Amendment. In 1990, Cedar Hill was found to meet four of the criteria for classification as a Historic Site. However, the then owner of Cedar Hill, William B.C. Addison, was opposed to the designation of the property as a County Historic Site.

 - (2) An earlier house known as Cedar Hill existed on the subject property until the early twentieth century. James William Lock Weems and his family resided on a plantation consisting of land in the Darnall’s Grove and Widow’s Purchase tracts in the eighteenth century. He and his family members are buried in a small family cemetery located to the west of and outside of the subject property. Robert and Margaret French Bowie lived on the Cedar Hill property in the nineteenth century. Robert Bowie of Cedar Hill was active in the County Agricultural Society and in the movement toward the construction of the Baltimore and Potomac Railway, the bed of which is located to the west of and near the subject property. A slave quarter that was associated with the earlier Cedar Hill house was referred to in the 1974 MIHP form, but it was not located within the subject property.

- (3) The street-facing elevation for the proposed house on Lot 3 has been refined to include an enhanced entry porch or portico treatment for the main door commensurate with those proposed for the houses on Lot 1 and Lot 2. This treatment provides needed enhancement to this elevation and results in three related but varied and compatible houses.

b. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board adopts the following:

- (1) **Site Description:** The 3.88-acre site, in the R-R Zone, is located on the north side of South Homestake Drive, approximately 85 feet east of West Vein Road. The site contains an existing two-story structure and a stand-alone garage, and is approximately 30 percent wooded. There are no streams, wetlands, or floodplain on the property, which is located in the Horsepen Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin. According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the principal soils on this site are in the Collington series. Marlboro clay and Christiana soils do not occur in this area. Areas of steep slopes of 15 percent or greater are found along the edges of the property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, rare, threatened, or endangered species do not occur on this property or on adjacent properties. No designated scenic or historic roads will be affected by the proposed development. The site is not located in the vicinity of any roadway regulated for noise and the proposal is not expected to be a noise generator. The site is not located in the JB Andrews Imaginary Runway Surface. The site is currently located within the Environmental Strategy Area 2 (formerly the Developing Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*.

- (2) **Natural Resources Inventory:** An approved Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-085-07, was submitted with the application and was reviewed with PPS 4-08007. The NRI notes there are no streams, wetlands, or 100-year floodplain on the subject property. The TCPII and the Detailed Site Plan are in conformance with the NRI.

The Simplified FSD indicates a total of 1.22 acres of woodland and the presence of 26 specimen trees on-site, many of which are tulip poplars. Mature tulip poplars are difficult to preserve during the construction process because of their sensitivity to soil compaction. There are no high priority woodlands on-site.

Although the Natural Resource Inventory (NRI) was approved over five years ago, a revised NRI is not required at this time because the site is grandfathered from the current environmental regulations contained in Subtitle 27. Similarly, no additional information is required with regard to the existing Forest Stand Delineation. The Planning Board finds that no significant changes have occurred

to any regulated environmental features onsite since 2007 based on aerial imagery from 2007–2011 and environmental GIS layers found using PGAtlas.

- (3) **TCPII Revisions:** All existing and proposed utilities and associated easements are required to be shown on a Type II TCP; however, none appear to have been labeled or identified on the TCPII plan and legend. All existing and proposed utilities and associated easements need to be added to the TCPII prior to signature approval as required.

The purpose for the location of the proposed reforestation that was approved on the TCPI, located at the rear boundary, was to establish an on-site woodland area contiguous with existing off-site woodlands adjacent to the rear of Lot 4. The current application shows the majority of this reforestation area being relocated from the rear of proposed Lot 4 to the rears of proposed Lots 1–3 and along the front portion of proposed Lot 4 instead. The original approved location of reforestation was to support a scenic buffer on the rear of proposed Lot 4 along the boundary of Lot 14, Block D. The reforestation has been relocated into three areas; one to the north of the proposed Lot 4 driveway adjacent to a proposed woodland preservation area that borders adjacent Lots 2 and 3, the second reforestation area has been relocated south of the driveway along the rear of proposed Lot 3 crossing into the front of proposed Lot 4 that is contiguous with an additional woodland preservation area, and a third has been placed adjacent to a proposed woodland preservation along the northwestern boundary of proposed Lot 4. The proposed reforestation areas are deemed adequate for meeting the minimum size requirements for woodland conservation when combined with adjoining woodland preservation.

A landscaping exhibit has been included on Sheet 2 of the TCPII. This landscape exhibit includes a landscape plan and a landscape planting schedule; however, such an exhibit detailing conformance to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, is not required to be shown on a TCP. The exhibit and landscape planting schedule shall be removed from the TCPII. A reforestation planting schedule shall be added to the TCPII.

The symbol currently used on the TCPII plan to represent proposed reforestation on-site is obscuring underlying text on the plan making it difficult to read. This symbol must be changed such that all underlying text is clearly legible on the plan. The standard symbol for reforestation in the Environmental Technical Manual shall be used for this purpose.

A conflict exists between the LDSP Landscape Plan and the TCPII plan. Landscaping shown on the LDSP Landscape Plan overlaps the same area as where reforestation is indicated on the TCPII plan. It is not clear if the minimum stocking requirements are being met for each area to meet conformance with the

approved TCPI. These areas shall be shown on the TCPII as reforestation areas and shall demonstrate that the area meets the minimum stocking requirements at 1,000 seedlings/acre or the equivalent. In addition, not all of the species being proposed to be planted in these areas are native as required by the Maryland Forest Conservation Act. Specifically, kousa dogwood (*Cornus kousa*), and Azalea species are non-native and cannot receive credit towards meeting reforestation requirements. Furthermore, specifying a flowering cherry sp. (*Prunus sp.*) is too general, as it could refer to either native or non-native species. In order to receive full credit towards meeting reforestation requirements on-site, show only native plant material in the reforestation areas, and demonstrate that the stocking requirements required by A Technical Manual for Woodland Conservation with Development in Prince George's County, effective May 1990 are being met on the TCPII.

The TCPII shows several trees within the proposed limits of disturbance (LOD) that will be removed during grading. Additionally, there are several other trees just outside of the proposed LOD on-site that have the potential to become fall hazards if they are to remain on-site, due to significant grading being proposed within their critical root zones (CRZs). Currently, the TCPII does not differentiate between those trees to be saved from those trees to be removed with the proposed development of this site. Because the project is grandfathered, a variance request to remove the specimen trees is not required; however, the trees proposed to be removed are required to be indicated on the Specimen Trees List, on the TCPII plan, and in the legend.

The proposed tree protection devices are not visible on the plan. Clearly identify where each of these devices are to be proposed on the TCPII plan. Identify the detail for the "T-P-D" by labeling it with the same title as in the legend.

- (4) **Stormwater Concept:** The site has a Stormwater Management Concept approval letter. The associated plan was also submitted. Stormwater will be managed through the use of two drywells on each proposed lot. The drywells are also shown on the TCPII.
- (5) **Soils:** According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the principal soils on the site are in the Collington series. The Prince George's County Department of the Environment (DOE) may require a soils report in conformance with CB-94-2004 during the building permit process review.

c. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board adopts the following:

- (1) The subject property is composed of an acreage parcel recorded by deed in Liber 35243 at Folio 123 in the Land Records of Prince George's County. The property is located on Tax Map 37 in Grid A-4, and is 3.88 acres. The property is

improved with a single-family dwelling and an associated garage. The applicant has submitted a limited detailed site plan for three additional single-family dwellings.

- (2) The revised detailed site plan is in substantial conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007. Failure of the site plan and record plat to match (including bearings, distances, and lot sizes) will result in permits being placed on hold until the plans are corrected.
- d. **Permit Review**—The Planning Board finds that most of the requested revisions to the plans have been made. Additionally the building elevations shall include the house type label “Cedar Hill.”
- e. **Prince George’s County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated October 24, 2014, the Health Department staff stated that the Environmental Engineering Program of the Prince George’s County Health Department had completed a health impact assessment review of the subject DSP and had the following recommendations:
- (1) There are no grocery stores within a one-half mile radius. Research has found that the presence of a supermarket in a neighborhood predicts higher fruit and vegetable consumption and a reduced prevalence of overweight and obesity.

This comment appears to be for informational purposes.

- (2) Living in proximity to green space is associated with reduced self-reported health symptoms, better self-rated health, and higher scores on general health questionnaires. The site proposes a 16 percent tree canopy coverage area; this will be an added health benefit to the surrounding community.
- (3) 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 and positioned so as to minimize light trespass caused by spill light.

Any proposed street lights will be required to meet the standards of the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

- (4) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. 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.

A note to this effect shall be provided on the plan.

- (5) During the demolition/construction phases of this project, noise should not be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

A note to this effect shall be provided on the plan.

- f. **Prince George's County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated September 24, 2014, the Prince George's County Police Department staff stated that after visiting the site, there are no crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) issues.
- g. **The Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In comments dated June 9, 2014, DPIE provided an evaluation of the subject proposal, summarized as follows:
 - (1) Conformance with the Department of Public Works and Transportation's (DPW&T) street tree and street lighting specifications and standards is required.
 - (2) Sidewalks are required along the roadways within the property limits and frontage.
 - (3) The detailed site plan should show drywells consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept No. 2838-2008.

The Planning Board finds that the detailed site plan has been revised to reflect the approved drywell locations. The applicant's approved Stormwater Management Concept No. 2838-2008 is valid until November 25, 2016.

- h. **The City of Bowie**—The City of Bowie determined that the subject application has no impact on the city and provided no comment.
13. **Public Hearing Request:** The application was accepted for Planning Director Level review with the requirement for sign posting on January 16, 2014. Pursuant to County Council Bill CB-42-2012, the site was posted with notice signs on January 23, 2014. County Council Bill CB-42-2002 allows any person to request a Planning Board hearing during the 20-day sign posting period. In an e-mail dated February 4, 2014 (Butler to Fields), a request for a public hearing was submitted. On September 22, 2014, the application was accepted for Planning Board Level review.

In an e-mail dated October 9, 2014 (Hester to Fields) a revised list of questions and concerns was submitted. Those questions and concerns, followed by Planning Board findings, are provided below:

- a. “Three houses, each with two-car garages, are proposed. This would indicate an additional six cars, minimum, would be added to local traffic. Is a traffic study required/ has one been done?”

A traffic study is not required for the subject site. The Planning Board found during the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-08007 for the subject site that based on the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” the three new single-family homes will generate an additional 2 AM peak-hour trips and 3 PM peak-hour trips. Pursuant to provisions in the guidelines, the Planning Board found that the traffic impact is *de minimus*. A *de minimus* development is defined as one that generates five trips or fewer in any peak period.

Based on the fact that the traffic impact for the subject application is considered to be *de minimus*, adequate transportation facilities were found to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George’s County Subdivision Regulations.

- b. “Will additional street lighting be guaranteed?”

Improvements within the public right-of-way including street trees and street lights along South Homestake Drive are under the purview of the Department of Public Works and Transportation’s (DPW&T). A referral from The Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) states that conformance with the DPW&T street tree and street lighting specifications and standards is required. This will be addressed at time of permit by DPIE and DPW&T.

- c. “Will the existing sidewalks on either side of the Addison property along South Homestake Drive be joined with the exception of the 75-foot frontage reserved for the current gravel driveway? Could the sidewalks be extended from each side right up to the current gravel driveway?”

Continuous sidewalks are proposed along the property frontage. There will be no gaps in the sidewalk along the frontage.

- d. “Is an additional fire hydrant proposed?”

No additional fire hydrant is shown on the plan. The site plan locates an existing fire hydrant across from the subject site on South Homestake Drive. If the existing fire hydrant is insufficient to serve the subject site, upgrades can be addressed by the Prince George’s County Fire Department at the time of building permit.

- e. “Storm water run-off is a concern. The run-off to the left of the Addison driveway (as you look at it from the street) will go in the direction of a Chesapeake Watershed drain... Has a study been done? Will all three houses have French drains/some provision to keep run-off to a minimum?”

The stormwater has been evaluated, and the development proposal has a valid approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (2838-2008). The plan approved the use of dry wells on the three proposed lots. Stormwater management is under the authority of DPIE, and not the Planning Board. At the public hearing, community members related concerns regarding existing drainage patterns in the neighborhood. These concerns should be direct to the appropriate district engineer with DPIE for resolution.

f. “The proposed lots are all one-half acre. This extends Lot #3 along the entire back of, and to the far corner of, existing Lot #42 (6512 South Homestake Dr.). The site plans (dated 5-23-07) show plantings of new trees in approximately the back one-third of Lot #3, and the site engineer claims this back one-third ‘cannot be used’ by the residents of Lot #3, the idea being that these new plantings will shield the existing Addison house from the house on Lot #3.”

(1) “How is ‘you can’t use one third of your property’ enforced? What is to keep the owner of Lot #3 from placing a shed, gazebo, or additional structures in that back portion of the property? Can this non-use provision be stipulated in the deed to the property for Lot #3?”

Landscaping at the rear of Lots 1, 2, and 3 is being provided pursuant to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance (WCO). Reforestation areas are proposed. These areas are required to be protected from disturbance. These areas will be fenced and signage is required to state that disturbance of the areas is prohibited. The WCO also requires notification requirements to purchasers and property owners, so the future property owners are aware of their limitations.

(2) “These new plantings must be maintained/replaced by the owners of Lot #3 for only one year. How is that enforced? Can the time be extended to three or more years?”

Section 25-120(c) contains the inspection and enforcement provisions of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. Section 25-120(c)(1)(I) states the following:

(I) Prior to release of any bond or security related to woodland conservation, an inspection shall be conducted by the County inspector to ensure that all the requirements of the TCP2 have been met. If afforestation or reforestation areas are part of the TCP, the release of the bond or security shall not occur until the four-year management plan has been fulfilled and the County inspector has verified the work is complete.

The required reforestation areas will be bonded. These bonds are held until the applicant demonstrates that a four-year management plan for the proposed plantings has been fulfilled.

- (3) “Request numerous additional evergreens and deciduous trees be planted along the east side of Lot #3 to shield the properties of existing Lots 44, 43 and 42 (6506, 6508 and 6512 South Homestake Drive) from the proposed house for Lot #3.”

The applicant’s proposed landscaping meets the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Additionally the buffering is provided to screen the rear of the proposed lots from the front of the Cedar Hill house. While some of these plant materials are provided along the property lines of Lots 41 and 42, buffering the proposed single-family lot from the existing single-family lots (44, 43, and 42) is not required, as these are considered compatible uses. Furthermore, buffering the entire east property line would affect the ability to develop Lot 3 with the intended use.

- (4) “What size trees are being planted? What is the diameter at breast height? Request at least 4 inches DBH.”

The Landscape Manual recommends that landscape plantings be planted at 2.5–3 inch caliper. Plantings a minimum of 4-inch caliper are not recommended as the survivability of these larger plants is reduced.

- (5) “Has an arborist been consulted about the best types of trees to plant on the proposed lots and that portion of the property surrounding the existing Addison house (most likely to not just survive, but thrive in the existing environment)?”

The woodland conservation plan is required to be prepared by a “qualified professional.” The application proposes the extensive use of native planting on the site, which the Planning Board supports.

- g. “The three proposed houses are listed on the site plan as two-story houses. The separate front elevation plans (not dated and no ref. number) clearly show at least two of the houses with three stories and dormers.”

- (1) “What are the actual front, side and back actual setbacks of the houses? All three proposed houses appear to have side setbacks that are much smaller than the existing side setbacks in the existing neighborhood.”

The setbacks are described in Finding 7 of this report. The setbacks exceed the minimum requirements of the R-R Zone.

- (2) “There is no other house in the neighborhood with dormers. The site engineer claims the dormers match the existing Addison house. The Addison house cannot be seen from the street, even in wintertime, and the site engineer claims the trees between the Addison house and the street will not be disturbed... houses with dormers do not match the existing architecture of the neighborhood. This is inappropriate to the style of the neighborhood.”

“The two proposed houses with dormers will be three-story houses. That is more imposing than any house on the street, especially at the very crest of the hill. This is not a match with existing houses and inappropriate to the style of the neighborhood.”

The Planning Board finds that the subject limited detailed site plan was required to enhance visual compatibility with the proposed residences and the character of Cedar Hill. During the review, in consultation with the Historic Preservation Section, the applicant was encouraged to employ architectural design techniques consistent with those on Cedar Hill, including dormers and shutters, as required by Condition 8. The addition of dormers does not change the massing or height of the buildings.

Architectural compatibility with other residences in the existing neighborhood, outside of Cedar Hill, is outside of the scope of the limited detailed site plan. Nevertheless, the record shows that there are a variety of house styles in proximity of the proposal, and the approved architectural elevations are not inconsistent with these styles.

- h. “The house plans also show all three proposed houses with windows on the sides. No other house in the existing neighborhood has such windows (they have only front facing and rear-facing windows). Side windows in these houses, especially at the crest of the hill and with the proposed elevations, would greatly reduce privacy in the neighborhood. This is inappropriate to the style and privacy of the neighborhood.”

Historically, the Planning Board has encouraged windows on the sides of residences. Windows generally make buildings more attractive and visually interesting. They break up the design of large elevations; and, from a security standpoint, homeowners should be able to view the side and rear yards of their properties through well-placed windows as a technique of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). The elimination of windows is not recommended.

- i. “The proposed three houses have larger footprints than the existing surrounding homes. The house at 6512 South Homestake Drive has a footprint of approximately 1,100 square feet, which is the approximate footprint of every house on South Homestake Drive and West Vein. The site plan indicates the proposed houses will have footprints approximately double that. This is not a match with existing houses and inappropriate to the style of the neighborhood.”

The proposed buildings have footprints with an approximate dimension of 52 feet in width by 32 feet in depth and, including bump outs, are 1,766 square feet. The building footprint is a component of lot coverage. Other components of lot coverage include driveways and outbuildings. The amount of lot coverage that is permitted is an effect of the size of the lot, and is regulated by the Zoning Ordinance. In the R-R Zone, up to 25 percent lot coverage is permitted by-right. Proposed Lots 1–3 are approximately one-half acre in size. The adjacent lots within the Prospect Knolls Subdivision, platted in 1967, are generally smaller and range from one-quarter to one-third an acre in size, which likely has an effect on the size of the building footprints that have been constructed in the neighborhood. While the proposed building footprints may be larger, they are permitted by-right due to the larger size of the lots. The size of the proposed lots was set with the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, and is outside of the scope of this limited detailed site plan. The new lots are generally the minimum size permitted under today’s R-R Zone regulations.

- j. “There are concerns about the intended use of the remaining acreage around the existing Addison house. According to the site plan, a 75-foot frontage along South Homestake Drive (approximately where the existing driveway is, and extending for many feet on either side) is being retained for “access to the existing house.” A 75-foot wide swath is also enough to put a road through, demolish the existing Addison house, and build at least four more houses on the Addison property. What does the County Planning Board know about this? This would mean more run-off, more traffic, more environmental damage, more stress on water and electrical supply.”

The record does not include any plans to demolish the Addison House and construct additional dwelling units.

- k. “There are concerns about damage to the environment and the impact on existing wildlife – coyotes, deer, foxes, raccoons, owls, vultures and woodpeckers in particular. What can be done to mitigate destruction of habitat?”

The site plan includes a Type II tree conservation plan, which has been submitted and is recommended for approval. It proposes 0.71 acre of woodland preservation, and 0.31 acre of reforestation. This conserved woodland will function as habitat.

- 14. Based upon the foregoing, and as required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board finds that the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George’s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-009-14) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan 09030 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the following information shall be provided, notes added, or revisions made:
 - a. Revise the building elevations to include the house type label "Cedar Hill."
 - b. Remove the historic site label from Lot 4.
 - c. Label all of the proposed landscape material with standard alphanumeric plant identifiers.
 - d. Provide a shade tree in the front yard of Lots 1 and 3. The ornamental trees currently proposed in the front yard may be replaced with the required major shade tree.
 - e. Remove references to, and delineations of, Section 4.7, of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* requirements.
 - f. Update the planting schedule and 4.9, Sustainable Landscape Requirements schedule, as necessary, to provide 100 percent native plantings within the reforestation areas.
 - g. Revise the tree canopy coverage worksheet on the plan to reflect the approved woodland conservation on the site.
 - h. Provide a note on the plan to indicate the applicant's intent to comply with construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
 - i. Provide a note on the plan to indicate the applicant's intent to comply with construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.
 - j. Indicate conformance to the required front building line on the plan.
2. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Show all existing and proposed utilities and easements (water, sewer, stormdrain, etc.)

- b. Indicate all trees proposed for removal on the Specimen Trees List, and identify them on the plan and legend.
- c. Remove the landscaping exhibit and landscape planting schedule from Sheet 2 of the TCPII.
- d. Add a reforestation planting schedule to the TCPII.
- e. Update the symbol currently used on the TCPII plan used to represent proposed reforestation onsite to match the standard symbol format currently used in The Environmental Technical Manual, effective September 1, 2010 (the standard symbol for reforestation in this manual should be used for this purpose).
- f. Revise any landscaping plant materials specified in reforestation areas to be solely of native species suitable for the areas to be planted.
- g. All reforestation areas shall meet the minimum required stocking rate at 1,000 seedlings per acre.
- h. Identify the "Tree Protection Device" detail on Sheet 2 and clearly show the location of all tree protection devices on the plan.
- i. Revise the worksheet as necessary.


BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, and Bailey voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioners Hewlett and Shoaff absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 7, 2015, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.


Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 21st day of May 2015.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By 
Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:MF:rpg

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY


M-NCPPC Legal Department

Date 5/12/15