

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Comprehensive Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on May 15, 2003, regarding Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0203 for Homeland (Formerly Kingsview) the Planning Board finds:

1. This comprehensive design plan for Homeland proposes 303 single-family detached units and is located north of Billingsley Road, south of Independence Road, and is bordered on the west and southeast by Charles County. The site is bounded to the east by R-A-zoned land, currently used as a school by the Operating Engineers of America, which provides training for operating earth moving equipment. To the south are Mattawoman Creek and the Prince George's County and Charles County lines. To the west are the county line and vacant land owned by the applicant. To the north is R-R-zoned property, developed with single-family detached housing.
2. The comprehensive design plan, as proposed by the applicant, includes 303 single-family detached units on approximately 281 acres of land in the R-S Zone. Of the 281 acres of land, 129 acres are within the 100-year floodplain. The applicant proposes to dedicate approximately 133 acres of land to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for the Mattawoman Creek Stream Valley Park. This case is proposed below the base density of the R-S Zone, therefore, no density increment analysis is required for this development.
3. On September 15, 1992, the District Council approved the zoning map amendment and accompanying Basic Plan Application No.A-9854 for the subject property. This zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A Zone to the R-S Zone. The basic plan is subject to 49 conditions, 10 considerations, and the following land use types and quantities:

**Land Use Types (R-S Zone):**

Single-family detached dwellings  
Recreation center  
Other recreational facilities  
Accessory uses

**Land Use Quantities (R-S Zone)**

|                                     |                    |
|-------------------------------------|--------------------|
| Gross acreage                       | 281.3              |
| Less one-half floodplain acreage    | 54.0               |
| Adjusted gross acreage              | 227.3              |
| Base density (1.6 d.u./ac.)         | 363 dwelling units |
| Recommended density (1.54 d.u./ac.) | 350 dwelling units |

**Gross Land use Quantities:**

|   |             |
|---|-------------|
| Gross Area  | 281.3 acres |
| Single-family detached dwellings<br>and associated right-of-way | 131.3 acres |
| Floodplain  | 108 acres   |
| Other open space/recreation                                     | 42 acres    |

4. Since the approval of the basic plan, the area calculations have changed. The following provides a summary of land use proposals for the CDP:

**Development Data: Homeland CDP-0203**

|                                     |               |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|
| Zone                                | R-S (1.6-2.6) |
| Gross Tract Area                    | 281.0 acres   |
| Area within the 100-year floodplain | 129.0 acres   |
| Net tract area                      | 152.0 acres   |

**Density calculation**

|  |                    |
|--|--------------------|
| Gross tract area minus one-half of the 100-year floodplain |                    |
| 281.0-(129.0/2)  | 216.5 acres        |
| Base Density (1.6)   | 346 units          |
| Proposed Density   | 303 units          |
| Minimum lot size required                                  | 10,000 square feet |

**Findings Required by Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance (Findings 5-15 below)—  
Findings 5-15 below are required by Section 27-521 before the Planning Board may approve a  
Comprehensive Design Plan.**

5. Section 27-521(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board finds that the comprehensive design plan conforms with the basic plan. The approved basic plan provides the primary criteria for review of this CDP application. There are several areas where the application is different from that illustrated on the basic plan. Notably, the proposed access is different. The basic plan indicates access through the site from both north and south, while the CDP indicates

access is only from the north. The basic plan shows three local access points from Prince George's County to Charles County. None of these local access points is located so as to cause environmental impacts in Charles County. A local access point is shown on the proposed CDP along the western property line between the two counties. If constructed as shown, the roadway would cause impacts to a stream in Charles County. After consultation with staff of the Transportation Planning Section, the Environmental Planning Section recommends that the 50-foot-wide access to Charles County as shown be moved southeast several hundred feet or be deleted entirely. The single 60-foot-wide connection is sufficient to serve the small area of Charles County north of the stream near the boundary of the counties. This change will uphold the basic plan sensitivity to the development of the site.

One of the environmental concepts of the basic plan was the preservation of the continuous swath of woodlands that exist on the area of severe slopes that run from the eastern to the western property line in the center of the site. These severe slopes (25 percent and greater) divide the site into two distinct development pods on the basic plan. The CDP might appear to bring this concept forward, but a review of the tree conservation plan shows that the lot layout proposed and the associated clearing results in the elimination of most of the preserved area shown on the basic plan. Condition (b) below will result in preservation of the woodlands and bring the CDP into conformance with the basic plan.

Recommended conditions included in the recommendation section of this report:

- a. Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and the Type I TCP shall be revised to either eliminate or relocate the northernmost access road between Prince George's County and Charles County to eliminate direct impacts to the stream in Charles County.
- b. Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and the Type I tree conservation plan shall be revised to be in conformance with the basic plan by providing for the preservation of the severe slope area 150 feet wide at the Charles County line, to be expanded to 200 feet wide where it crosses the road that connects the upper and lower development pods. The slope preservation area shall continue on the east side of the road at a minimum width of 200 feet. No lots shall be located on the access road where the slope preservation area meets the road.

The recreation facilities on the basic plan were indicated on the southern part of the property, whereas the CDP shows them to the north. In fact, the recreational facilities are shown off site on an adjacent R-R zoned property. The comprehensive design plan text states the following (on page 2):

"Recreational amenities will be provided within the community. The highlight of these recreational amenities will be the Community Center located in the northwest corner of the site. It will include a swimming pool, tennis courts, bath house and associated parking." The staff does not object to the placement of the recreational facilities on the adjacent property because it is within close proximity and will appear to be within the overall community.

The differences between the proposed comprehensive design plan (CDP) and the previously approved basic plan are minor and, if the conditions of approval are adopted, the CDP will be in conformance with the basic plan.

6. The following specific conditions and considerations (in bold type) warrant discussion regarding conformance of the comprehensive design plan with the basic plan and are considered below:

1. **Automatic Fire Suppression systems shall be provided in all residential and non-residential structures and in accordance with the National Fire Protections Association Standards 13 and 13D and all other applicable laws.**

*Comment:* The condition is reiterated as a condition of approval of the plans to be fulfilled as a note on the specific design plan.

5. **All development pods and recreational features shall be connected into the main trail network on site by feeder trails. Due consideration shall be given to security for the residents of the subdivision.**

*Comment:* Condition 5 recommends that all development pods and recreational facilities shall be connected to the main trail network via feeder trails. There is no indication of this in the submitted plan. In order to ensure fulfillment of this condition, it is recommended that a comprehensive network of feeder trails and sidewalks be reflected on the CDP and the SDP. Per Condition 5, the internal open space should be utilized not only for the preservation of natural features, but also for the provision of feeder trail connections.

6. **All main trails within the proposed development shall be handicapped accessible with hard surfaces. At the time of the comprehensive design plan review, the location of the trails, paths and sidewalks proposed will be evaluated on their interrelationship within the entire development site with respect to pedestrian movement.**

*Comment:* Condition 6 requires that at the time of the CDP, the location of all trails, paths, and sidewalks be evaluated on the interrelationship within the entire development site with respect to pedestrian movement. In order to fulfill this requirement, staff requests the provision of a plan showing comprehensively all master plan trails, feeder trails, and sidewalks to be provided. Only the master plan trails are currently shown. This map will help to ensure that the entire development is connected via a trail and sidewalk network, as required in Condition 5 of the basic plan, above.

10. **A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP) in accordance with the County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Program is required for review by the Natural Resources Division to be approved by the Planning Board prior to CDP approval. In addition, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be reviewed by the Natural**

**Resources Division prior to Specific Design Plan approval. A 20 percent minimum woodland retention area is recommended due to the environmental sensitivity impact of the project area.**

*Comment:* The Type I Tree Conservation Plan is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below. The R-S zoning requires a 20 percent woodland conservation threshold.

11. **A minimum of a 50-foot buffer shall be shown along the banks of all streams within the property and the buffer shall include the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetland, steep slopes of 25% or greater, and steep slopes of 15-25 percent, having soil erodibility factors of 0.35 and greater. Such a buffer shall be reviewed by the Natural Resources Division prior to Specific Design Plan approval.**

*Comment:* Although the condition states that this issue is to be resolved prior to the SDP, the same areas are designated as priority woodland preservation areas by the “Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy Document,” and therefore, must be shown and addressed during the review of the Type I Tree Conservation Plan. The stream buffer and related features are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

14. **A minimum 50’ wide undisturbed buffer shall be provided and clearly delineated along the northern property line adjacent to the “Earth Moving Training Facility.”**

*Comment:* A 50-foot buffer has been provided on the plans.

15. **The applicant shall perform a signal warrant analysis for the traffic forecast at the intersection of MD 210 and Shiloh Church Road (located 300 feet south of the Prince George’s/Charles County line) as part of the submission of the Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP). The New Intersection Analysis as documented in the ITE publication *Manual of Traffic Signal Design* should be used with the traffic forecast. If a traffic signal appears to be warranted, the staging for the installation of the signal shall be determined at the time of CDP, in consultation with the SHA. In lieu of a signal, the SHA may require the developer to make geometric improvements at the MD 210/Shiloh Church Road intersection. If needed, the staging of such geometric improvements shall be determined at the time of CDP. However, the improvements necessitated by this development shall be on the basis of the buildout of the projected development of the subject property and to be completed by buildout.**

*Comment:* This condition requires a signal warrant study at MD 210/Shiloh Church Road at the time of CDP and the installation of a traffic signal or the proffering of geometric improvements at that location. The signal warrant study is a part of the traffic impact analysis. No signal was determined to be warranted; however, extensive geometric improvements will be a part of establishing this location as the main entrance to the

subject property. Staff deems this condition to be met with the analyses submitted and the conditions placed on the CDP and the preliminary plan.

16. **A signal warrant analysis for the traffic forecast at the intersection of MD 210 and Livingston Road (located 900 feet north of the Prince George's/Charles County line) shall be performed prior to the submission of the Specific Design Plan, and submitted to the SHA. If a traffic signal appears to be warranted, the developer shall participate in proportionate funding as agreed to with the SHA based on the traffic counts in this record as to the amount of traffic contributed by this development.**

*Comment:* This condition requires a signal warrant study at MD 210/Livingston Road at the time of SDP. The signal warrant study is a part of the traffic impact analysis. No signal was determined to be warranted. No further action is required from the applicant regarding this condition.

17. **A signal warrant analysis for the traffic forecast at the intersection of MD 210 and Farmington Road shall be performed prior to the submission of the Specific Design Plan, and submitted to the SHA. If a traffic signal appears to be warranted, the developer shall participate in proportionate funding as agreed to with the SHA based on the traffic counts in this record as to the amount of traffic contributed by this development.**

*Comment:* This condition requires the submission of a traffic signal warrant study at the MD 210/Farmington Road intersection. The intersection is signalized now, and has been for several years. No further action is required from the applicant regarding this condition.

18. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the left turn bay along westbound MD 373 at its approach to MD 210 shall be bonded for improvements to lengthen it to at least 425 feet in length. The design for this improvement shall be subject to the review and approval of the SHA.**

*Comment:* This condition requires improvements along the westbound leg of the MD 210/MD 373 intersection to lengthen the left-turn lane. The applicant is now proffering more extensive improvements at this location, including a dual left-turn lane, which will address the issue identified.

19. **In order to provide for the efficient delivery of County public services to the development, and particularly in order to minimize response times for emergency services, such as police, fire, and rescue services, the applicant shall ensure that the MD 210/Shiloh Church Road entrance is available for access at time of commencement of development of the subject property and shall remain available at all times during development and construction.**

*Comment:* This condition would ensure that the site access from MD 210 opposite Shiloh Church Road is available when development of the site begins and during all ensuing phases. This is now the main entrance and there is no existing secondary entrance to the site; staff believes that this condition will be fully met. However, staff will continue to monitor this condition as development proceeds.

- 20. As part of the submittal of the CDP, the applicant shall include a conceptual layout of water and sewerage service to the site, and an analysis of the impact of the construction of these facilities. The applicant, Technical Staff and WSSC shall work together using the best practical effort to minimize the impact of construction of water and sewer lines on those areas of the subject property remaining in open space or dedicated for recreational use.**

*Comment:* The design and layout of water and sewer service to the site cannot be adequately reviewed at this time. During the review of the SDP, the location and clearing for specific utility lines will be minimized by the proposed design. A condition has been included in the recommendation section of this report.

- 21. Applicant shall file an amended Basic Plan with the Office of Zoning Hearing Examiner for approval prior to any further approvals, pursuant to this decision.**

*Comment:* As of the writing of this report, the applicant is in the process of filing the basic plan with the Zoning Hearing Examiner.

### **Comprehensive Design Plan Considerations**

- 3. A variety of lot sizes shall be provided throughout the development. The intent is that in general minimum lot sizes along the spine road shall be 15,000 square feet. The minimum lot size in the overall development shall be no less than 8,000 square feet. Any lots of less than 10,000 square feet should, to the extent possible, be located adjacent to major open space areas. The setbacks and lot coverages shall be established at the time of the CDP review but should allow, wherever possible, for the preservation of existing trees in the front, side and rears of lots unless clearing can be justified on the grounds of maintaining safety.**

*Comment:* This consideration takes into account the issue of providing a variety of lot sizes in order to create an environment of diversity. Variation in lot sizes avoids the appearance of sameness in a development, similar to the concept of providing a variety of architectural styles in order to create diversity. The proposed plan does not provide for a clear variation in lot sizes. The basic plan had a clear spine road layout; the comprehensive design plan has diluted that concept, however, the plan does provide for a clear 60-foot right-of-way that will serve both the upland portion of the development, cross the swath of woodland preservation on the slope, and continue to the lots located near the floodplain. The staff recommends that the specific design plan will provide for

the concept contained within the consideration above. Instead of all the lots along the spine road being 15,000 square feet, staff recommends that the corner lots along the spine road strictly meet this requirement, but interior lots along the spine road could be less than the 15,000 minimum as long as the street frontage is a minimum of 75 feet wide. This will create the impression of larger lot sizes along the spine road, but will give the applicant some flexibility in the actual sizing of the lots. A discussion of the recommended setbacks and lot coverage is included in a comprehensive analysis in Finding No.21.

**4. Street layout shall, to the extent possible, create interconnections and reduce cul-de-sacs, with the objective of creating interesting, distinctive and recognizable community spaces and for ease of access for emergency vehicles.**

*Comment:* This consideration requires a street layout that will, in part, allow ease of access for emergency vehicles. The transportation staff believes that the current plan is a reasonable response to the environmental constraints and meets the requirements of the consideration.

The comprehensive design plan for Homeland, when modified by the conditions described within the recommendation section of this report, will be in conformance with the conditions and considerations of Zoning Application No. A-9854.

7. Section 27-521(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board find that the comprehensive design plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under standard regulations. From the standpoint of the natural environment only, the plan and text as submitted do not address the minimum requirements of other regulations and need to be revised in order to make the finding required by Section 27-521(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. For example, there are design changes needed to the TCP. Because Comprehensive Design Zones are to be held to the highest standards (Section 27-521(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance), forest fragments (areas less than 1.0 acre) cannot be used to meet woodland conservation requirements and, at a minimum, the woodland conservation threshold must be met on site. Required revisions are noted in the environmental review section in finding #15 below.

Viewing the environment created by the development from a broader perspective, the proposed comprehensive design plan will result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations because the development is proffering a number of recreational facilities to be built off site but immediately adjacent to Homeland. These facilities include:

- a. club house
- b. pool
- c. tennis courts
- d. associated parking facilities

These proposed facilities should be linked to the subject development so that construction of the

facilities will coincide with the development of the housing units. In other words, as the development proceeds so should the recreational facilities. However, it is unclear how many homes these facilities will serve, knowing that the applicant has a proposal to develop land for residential use in Charles County. Generally, the inclusion of a pool in a residential development of 300 homes would not be encouraged, because the cost associated with the maintenance of the facilities would become a burden on the community. A minimum of 500 homes is the general rule before a swimming pool is recommended in a community. The staff recommends that at the time of the first specific design plan for the project, the applicant also submit a plan of development for the recreational facilities. A detailed site plan should be submitted for the development of the homeowners association recreational use in accordance with Section 27-445. This plan of development should identify the number of units the facility will be ultimately serving. The recreational facilities should be provided for each population category, including tots, preteens, teens, adults and seniors.

8. Approval is warranted by the way in which the comprehensive design plan includes design elements, facilities and amenities. Among the distinctive design elements of the Homeland plan are the preservation of woodland through the center of the development, the provision of the master plan trail for the development, and the provision of recreational facilities for the future residents. A community center will be built as a significant element for use by the homeowners. These facilities, as well as the land to be dedicated for public parks and an extensive trail system, will satisfy the needs of the residents, employees or guests of the project.
9. The proposed development will be compatible with existing land use, zoning and facilities in the immediate surroundings. The site is bounded to the north by R-A zoned property, which is a private school for the operating engineers. The basic plan required a 50-foot buffer along the entire property line. At the time of the specific design plan, the need for the addition of evergreen trees in this areas will be analyzed. The remaining portion of the property is buffered to the south by an enormous floodplain. To the west is property slated to be developed in Charles County, and the to north are single-family detached homes in the R-R Zone.
10. Land uses and facilities covered by the comprehensive design plan will be compatible with each other in relation to:
  - a. Amounts of building coverage and open space.

The building coverage proposed on each lot is reasonable considering that the maximum lot coverage is proposed at 45 percent. This will ensure adequate open space in the lotted areas comparable to that provided in other contemporary residential developments. Significant open space will be provided elsewhere on the site for use by the homeowners. However, the basic plan clearly states that 42 acres of land within the R-S-zoned property should be reserved for "open space/recreation." The plan clearly states that 41 acres of land will be reserved for open space. However, the conditions of approval of the Environmental Planning Section, if adopted by the Planning Board, will result in

additional land being placed into open space. A condition of approval has been included in this report to ensure conformance to the basic plan and in order to make this finding.

b. Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses.

The CDP proposes residential standards for setbacks from streets a minimum of 20 feet from internal subdivision roads, side yard setbacks a minimum of five feet, and rear yard setbacks of 20 feet. This project is very similar to the development of land within the R-R Zone as a cluster development, in that the minimum size of lots is 10,000 square feet. The provisions for the R-R Zone, a 25-foot front yard setback, minimum eight-foot side yard setback with a minimum of 17 feet combined, and a 20-foot rear yard setback should clearly be used as a basis for the development of this project. The staff recommends that these setbacks be substituted for the proposal by the applicant in this case.

c. Circulation access points.

The proposed plan will have adequate circulation access points to the surrounding road network.

11. Each staged unit of the development (as well as the total development) can exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability.

12. The staging of the Homeland development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities as required by Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance if the application is approved subject to the proposed conditions in the recommendation section of this report. The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and in a memorandum (Masog to Lareuse) dated April 28, 2003; the following information was provided in support of this conclusion:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 281 acres of land in the R-S Zone. The property is located south of MD 210 and north of Billingsley Road, southeast of the intersection of MD 210 and Independence Road. The subject property is roughly a triangular shape, with the Charles County line on the southwest side and Mattawoman Creek on the southeast side. The applicant proposes a residential development consisting of 303 single family detached residences.

The applicant has submitted a traffic study dated December 2002. During review of the application, strong concerns were raised about the use of Independence Road for primary access, as was assumed by the study. Furthermore, the applicant determined that all the properties needed to implement needed improvements to Independence Road could not be obtained. Therefore, a revised and superceding traffic study, dated March 2003, was submitted. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by the staff of the Transportation Planning

Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. The study has been referred to the appropriate operating agencies and comments from the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA) are attached.

### **Growth Policy—Service Level Standards**

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

**Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better.

**Unsignalized intersections:** The *Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

### **Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts**

The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study in support of the application using new counts taken in September 2002. With the development of the subject property, the traffic consultant has determined that adequate transportation facilities in the area can be attained. The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections:

- MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road
- MD 210/MD 228
- MD 210/Independence Road/Livingston Road (unsignalized)
- MD 210/Shiloh Church Road/site access (unsignalized)
- Independence Road/Beech Lane (unsignalized)
- Independence Road/Gabriel Drive (unsignalized)
- Beech Lane/Shanna Drive (unsignalized)

The original study did not include the fourth intersection above, but showed traffic impacts to the last three intersections. The current plan will not utilize Independence Road and proposes no connection to it. Therefore, because they are no longer critical and to simplify the review, staff will merely note that the last three intersections above are in the traffic study, but undertake no further review in this memorandum.

The following conditions exist at the critical intersections:

| <b>EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>   |                                   |       |                                    |    |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|----|
| Intersection   | Critical Lane Volume<br>(AM & PM) |       | Level of Service<br>(LOS, AM & PM) |    |
| MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road  | 1,422                             | 1,519 | D                                  | E  |
| MD 210/MD 228  | 960                               | 969   | A                                  | A  |
| MD 210/Independence Road/Livingston Road   | 28.3*                             | 63.5* | --                                 | -- |
| MD 210/Shiloh Church Road/site access  | 28.0*                             | 57.9* | --                                 | -- |
| *In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy. |                                   |       |                                    |    |

The list of nearby developments is extensive. Traffic along MD 210 includes a factor of one percent annually to account for growth in through traffic. There are no funded capital improvements in the area, so the resulting transportation network is the same as was assumed under the existing traffic. Given these assumptions, the following background traffic conditions were determined:

| <b>BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>   |                                   |       |                                    |    |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|----|
| Intersection   | Critical Lane Volume<br>(AM & PM) |       | Level of Service<br>(LOS, AM & PM) |    |
| MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road  | 1,582                             | 1,840 | E                                  | F  |
| MD 210/MD 228  | 1,120                             | 1,112 | B                                  | B  |
| MD 210/Independence Road/Livingston Road   | 32.7*                             | 81.9* | --                                 | -- |
| MD 210/Shiloh Church Road/site access  | 31.8*                             | 71.7* | --                                 | -- |
| *In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy. |                                   |       |                                    |    |

The site is analyzed in the traffic study as a residential development of 300 residences. Environmental and design factors have resulted in the plan being revised, and the current plan shows 303 single family detached residences. The resulting site trip generation would be 227 AM peak-hour trips (45 in, 182 out) and 273 PM peak-hour trips (179 in, 94 out). With site traffic, the following operating conditions were determined:

| TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS   |                                   |        |                                    |    |
|--|-----------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|----|
| Intersection   | Critical Lane Volume<br>(AM & PM) |        | Level of Service<br>(LOS, AM & PM) |    |
| MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road  | 1,635                             | 1,892  | F                                  | F  |
| MD 210/MD 228  | 1,199                             | 1,153  | C                                  | C  |
| MD 210/Independence Road/Livingston Road   | 41.9*                             | 117.1* | --                                 | -- |
| MD 210/Shiloh Church Road/site access  | 88.3*                             | 230.6* | --                                 | -- |
| *In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy. |                                   |        |                                    |    |

The traffic analysis identifies inadequacies at the signalized intersection of MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road during both peak hours, and at each unsignalized intersection during at least one peak hour. The study identified improvements at these intersections that would provide adequacy:

**At MD 210 and MD 373/Livingston Road**, install a free right turn along the westbound approach to the intersection. Also, install a second left turn lane along the westbound approach. These improvements are offered as a transportation facilities mitigation plan in accordance with Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Ordinance and will be more thoroughly discussed and analyzed later in this memorandum.

**At MD 210 and Shiloh Church Road/site access**, provide a westbound approach from the site with a shared through/left turn lane and an exclusive right turn lane. This must also include a southbound left turn lane and acceleration/deceleration lanes along northbound MD 210.

**At both unsignalized intersections**, staff has determined that the minimum delay for any movement exceeds 50.0 seconds in at least one peak hour. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal if it is deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency. The warrant study is, in itself, a more detailed study of the adequacy of the existing unsignalized intersection. In these circumstances, the traffic study includes the needed signal warrant studies and concludes that signals are not warranted.

SHA and DPW&T both reviewed the traffic study. DPW&T noted that the applicant must design and construct an acceptable termination at the end of Independence Road prior to construction on the site. As the non-impact of the site on Independence Road is a major factor in the traffic study and staff concurs that having construction vehicles using

Independence Road would be a severe impact on operations, staff will recommend a condition in this regard. SHA had more extensive comments on the study, as outlined below:

**At the MD 210 and Shiloh Church Road/site access intersection**, SHA has noted that potentially another 95 residences in Charles County could be served by the new site access roadway. While SHA did not agree or disagree with the study finding that a signal was not warranted at this location, SHA did indicate that an updated study at this intersection would be required prior to approval of the 95 residences by Charles County. Also, SHA determined that further design of storage lane areas, acceleration lanes, deceleration lanes, and tapers would be needed, along with intersection lighting.

**At the MD 210 and MD 373/Livingston Road intersection**, SHA expressed concern about the buildability of the improvements given the limited right-of-way available at this intersection. The applicant's traffic consultant has indicated, however, that the improvements are on the westbound (east) leg of the intersection, where there is currently sufficient right-of-way for their construction.

At the MD 210 and MD 373/Livingston Road intersection, the applicant has proposed the use of mitigation in accordance with Section 24-124(a)(6). The Subdivision Ordinance indicates that "consideration of certain mitigating actions is appropriate..." in accordance with the *Guidelines for Mitigation Action* and the requirements of that portion of Section 24-124. The applicant proposes to employ mitigation by means of criterion (d) in the *Guidelines for Mitigation Action*, which was approved by the District Council as CR-29-1994. Criterion (d) allows mitigation at intersections along MD 210 outside of the Beltway (among other facilities), and was not superceded by the approval of the 2002 Prince George's County General Plan.

Procedurally, staff recognizes that mitigation is specifically a subdivision process. Staff would note, however, that the required finding for a comprehensive design plan is not a strict adequacy finding, but rather a finding that a development "will not be an unreasonable burden" on area transportation facilities. It has been the general practice of the Transportation Planning Section that if a given development can meet the strict transportation adequacy requirements of Subtitle 24, it will consequently not be a burden that is unreasonable and can be approved for transportation adequacy as a comprehensive design plan. Staff would note that there is a concurrent subdivision application for the subject property, and the transportation staff is reviewing adequacy issues for both applications with the identical degree of detail.

At the MD 210 and MD 373/Livingston Road intersection, the applicant recommends the improvements described below to mitigate the impact of the applicant's development in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 24-124(a)(6). The improvements include:

1. The addition of a westbound right turn lane along MD 373.
2. The addition of a second westbound left turn lane along MD 373.
3. These two modifications would allow the westbound approach to function with an exclusive right turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and dual left turn lanes.

The impact of the mitigation actions at this intersection is summarized as follows:

| <b>IMPACT OF MITIGATION</b>           |                          |        |                             |      |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------|-----------------------------|------|
| Intersection                          | LOS and CLV<br>(AM & PM) |        | CLV Difference<br>(AM & PM) |      |
| MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road         |                          |        |                             |      |
| Background Conditions                 | E/1582                   | F/1840 |                             |      |
| Total Traffic Conditions              | F/1635                   | F/1892 | +53                         | +52  |
| Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation | E/1456                   | D/1739 | -179                        | -153 |

As the CLV at MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road is between 1,450 and 1,813 during the AM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 150 percent of the trips generated by the subject property during the AM peak hour, according to the guidelines. Also, as the CLV is greater than 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 100 percent of the trips generated by the subject property during the PM peak hour and bring the CLV to no greater than 1,813. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate more than 150 percent of site-generated trips during the AM peak hour, and it would mitigate at least 100 percent of site trips during the PM peak hour, bringing the CLV below 1,813. Therefore, the proposed mitigation at MD 210 and MD 373/Livingston Road meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.

The mitigation plan was reviewed by DPW&T and SHA. Comments from both agencies were provided earlier in this memorandum. SHA agreed that the mitigation was acceptable. DPW&T did not raise objection to the mitigation that was proposed.

#### **Plan Comments**

The subject plan has undergone a number of revisions since the initial application. The current plan is indeed acceptable from the standpoints of access and circulation. The applicant has made major revisions to the internal street network, and these are acceptable. We continue to have a couple of concerns:

- a. The main entrance roadway is within Charles County and subject to that county's

review processes. Staff wants to ensure that the main entrance roadway is actually built in a similar configuration to that shown on the CDP; that is, the roadway will be built within a 120-foot right-of-way and at least four lanes (two each direction), with a median, intersecting MD 210 across from existing Shiloh Church Road.

- b. Two stub streets are shown into Charles County, one a 60-foot right-of-way and one a 50-foot right-of-way. There are currently no approved platted streets in Charles County to which these streets would connect. Regardless of where these streets are located or if the smaller of the two streets is eliminated, staff would want to ensure as the subject development moves forward that there is connectivity between the Charles and Prince George's County portions of the site.

### **Transportation Staff Conclusions**

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed development will not be an unreasonable burden on transportation facilities that are existing, under construction, or for which 100 percent construction funding is contained in the county CIP or the state CTP. Therefore, the transportation staff believes that the requirements pertaining to transportation facilities under Section 27-521 of the Prince George's County Code would be met if the application is approved with the conditions contained in the recommendation section of this report.

- 13. The staging of the Homeland development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities as required by Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance if the application is approved subject to the proposed conditions in the recommendation section of this staff report. The subject application was referred to the Public Facilities Planning Section, and in a memorandum (Harrell to Lareuse) dated March 25, 2003, the following information was provided in support of this conclusion:
  - a. The existing fire engine service at Accokeek Fire Station, Company 24, located at 16111 Livingston Road has a service travel time of 5.92 minutes, which is beyond the 5.25-minute travel time guideline.
  - b. The existing ambulance service at Accokeek Fire Station, Company 24, located at 16111 Livingston Road has a service travel time of 6.25 minutes, which is within the 6.25-minute travel time guideline for Block A, Lots 1-8; Block C, Lots 1-5 and Lots 10-15; and Block D, Lots 1-3, 11 and 12. All other lots are beyond.
  - c. The existing paramedic service at Allentown Road Station, Company 47, located at 10900 Fort Washington Road has a service travel time of 18.77 minutes, which is beyond the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

The above findings are in conformance with the Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990 and the Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.

In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate engine service discussed, the Fire Department recommends that a fire suppression system be installed in all residential structures in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George's County laws. This is included as a condition of approval.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has concluded that only 33 of the 300 dwelling units proposed are within response time standards for ambulance service to Company 24, Accokeek. Furthermore, there are no programmed or proposed projects that would mitigate this inadequacy. However, the subject 281-acre property is located at the southwesternmost corner of Prince George's County, approximately two miles from a facility (Bryan Road) in Charles County. The subject property straddles the Prince George's/Charles County line with a significant amount of the property (not in this application) within Charles County. The issue we have is that the property is deemed inadequately served, in part due to excessive response time based upon existing and planned facilities in Prince George's County.

Therefore, as an option, we are seeking assurance that the Bryans Road Fire Station (Charles County), in accord with the approved (July 1981) mutual aid agreement, is able and willing to provide first arrival services (engine and ambulance) to the subject property. Upon agreement with the Charles County station, the Accokeek Fire Station, Company 24, would retain first due responsibility as the closest fire station in Prince George's County, although the Bryans Road facility is significantly closer to the development than Company 24.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has concluded that the entire development is beyond the recommended response times from existing facilities that provide paramedic service. This finding is based on using the existing road system and existing stations. Further, there are no programmed or proposed projects that mitigate these inadequacies. The existing Accokeek Emergency Services Facility (Company 24) would be the first due station that would provide paramedic service to this development if the station had paramedic service. In order to mitigate the paramedic response time deficiencies, the staff recommends that the applicant participate by providing a contribution toward the provision of the paramedic vehicle. The fee amount of \$130,000 is based on the cost of a paramedic unit.

Based upon the above analysis, the Public Facilities Planning Section has concluded that the proposed comprehensive design plan will meet the required findings for adequate public facilities subject to conditions No. 12 through 14 as contained in the recommendations section of this report.

14. The plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance in the type of general, schematic plan represented by the subject CDP.
15. The CDP must be in conformance to an approved Type I tree conservation plan, which is companion to this application. As explained below, the Environmental Planning Section is able to recommend approval of TCPI/5/03 only if it is approved subject to the proposed conditions in the recommendation section of this staff report below. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan,

TCPI/5/03, has been reviewed. The plan contains errors and omissions and information contrary to that provided in the CDP text.

Although Condition 11 of Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992 regarding stream buffers is to be reviewed prior to the approval of the specific design plan, the same areas are designated as priority woodland preservation areas by the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy document, and, therefore, must be shown and addressed during the review of the Type I tree conservation plan. Expanded stream buffers are correctly shown on the TCP and CDP plan. In addition to stream buffers, the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy document includes wooded severe slopes and steep slopes with highly erodible soils as priority areas and discourages forest fragmentation. The comprehensive design plan process also requires that the project provide a better environment than what would be achieved through a conventional design.

There are design changes needed to the TCP. Because comprehensive design zones are to be held to the highest standards (Section 27-521(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance), forest fragments (areas less than 1.0 acre) cannot be used to meet woodland conservation requirements, and, at a minimum, the woodland conservation threshold must be met on site. The plan proposes clearing 101.90 acres of the existing 128.50 acres of upland woodland, which results in the retention of only 26.60 acres of forest (17.5 percent of the net tract). The area calculated as retained is below the 20 percent threshold for the R-S Zone and is less than the 20 percent retention required by Condition 10 of Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992. The 26.60 acres calculated as retained is an overestimate because it does not allow for clearing to construct facilities required by Condition 3 and Condition 4 of Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992 and, furthermore, proposes using woodland retained on land to be dedicated to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation to meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. As such, the TCP as submitted does not meet the standards required by Section 27-521(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance or those established by Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992.

The design will be improved by the redesign required in one of the earlier stated conditions regarding preservation of the severe slopes. Additionally, the shortening of cul-de-sacs or use of retaining walls can provide additional preservation of the large wooded slope that is a major design feature of the project. Finally, a minimum of 30.40 acres on site must be conserved to meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and Condition 10 of Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992.

Also, technical plan changes are required, including matching the existing tree line and the forest stand boundaries on the TCP, provision of the standard Type I TCP notes, and provision of the new Environmental Planning Section approval block.

The staff recommends a condition of approval to address the outstanding issues of the Type I tree conservation plan prior to certification of the TCP.

## Referral Responses

16. **Environmental Planning**—The Environmental Planning Section has provided in a memorandum (Stasz to Lareuse) dated April 28, 2003, the following detailed review of the environmental aspects of the application that have not yet been discussed above:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the revised comprehensive design plan for Homeland, CDP-0203, and the revised Type I tree conservation plan, TCPI/5/03, stamped as accepted for processing on April 11, 2003. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CDP-0203 and TCPI/5/03 subject to the conditions listed at the end of this report.

The Environmental Planning Section has previously reviewed A-9854 for the subject property. The current proposal is for 303 lots and 13 parcels in the R-S Zone. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02124, for the same property, is under concurrent review. According to Section 27-270 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Comprehensive Design Plan must be approved before the preliminary plan of subdivision can be approved.

The 281.0-acre property in the R-S Zone is located one-half mile south of the intersection of Independence Road and MD 210. The overall parcel straddles the Prince George's/Charles County line to the west and is adjacent to the Charles County line to the east. According to current air photos, about 90 percent of the site is wooded. The site contains streams, wetlands and floodplain associated with Mattawoman Creek in the Potomac River watershed. The topography of the site is unique in that the western half of the site is relatively flat, then in the central portion of the site there is an area of severe slopes that transition down to a lower plateau on the eastern portion of the site. The Subregion V Master Plan indicates that there are substantial areas designated as natural reserve on the site. No species listed by the State of Maryland as rare, threatened or endangered are known to occur in the general region. No designated scenic or historic roads are affected by this proposal. There are no nearby sources of traffic-generated noise. The proposed use is not expected to be a noise generator. The *Prince George's County Soils Survey* indicates that the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Keyport, Matapeake, Othello and Sassafra series. Marlboro Clay does not occur in this area. The site is in the Developing Tier according to the adopted General Plan.

### Environmental Review

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.

The forest stand delineation (FSD) has been reviewed. The FSD text indicates that there are three large field areas on the site and the FSD plan shows an existing tree line suggesting that there are clearings; however, the forest stand boundaries do not follow the existing tree line, which suggests that the site is entirely forested. The soils chart contains missing and incorrect information. Only Aura, Beltsville, Elkton, Keyport and Othello soils are highly erodible. Aura, Matapeake and Sassafra soils are in the B-hydric series; Beltsville and Keyport soils are in the C-hydric series;

and Bibb, Elkton and Othello soils are in the D-hydric series. Stream, wetland and floodplain buffers should not be shown on an FSD. Stand summary sheets were not included in the FSD text.

*Recommended Condition:* Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the forest stand delineation (plan) shall be revised to:

- a. Show all forest stand boundaries correctly and measure each stand to the nearest one-hundredth of an acre.
- b. Correct the soils table to provide correct erodibility and hydric characteristics.
- c. Remove all buffers.
- d. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

*Recommended Condition:* Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the forest stand delineation (text) shall be revised to include stand summary sheets.

The CDP text referencing slopes (page 34), alluding to Condition 11 of Zoning Ordinance No. 39-1992, correctly notes that areas of steep slopes adjacent to streams and the mandated buffer are required to be preserved; however, it fails to note that the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy document includes wooded severe slopes (25 percent and greater) and steep slopes (15 to 25 percent) with highly erodible soils as priority preservation areas.

The CDP text referencing forest conservation (page 36) contains incorrect and misleading information. The woodland conservation area required, assuming a net tract of 152 acres and the clearing of 94 acres of woodland, is about 55 acres, not 77.42 as stated in the text. The TCP worksheet indicates 35.6, not 35.7 acres, of on-site preservation as stated in the text. The off-site obligation is closer to 20 acres, not 41.7 acres as stated in the text.

*Recommended Condition:* Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the text shall be revised to:

- a. Correct the text on page 34 regarding slopes to include a reference to the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy document, which states that wooded severe slopes and steep slopes with highly erodible soils are priority preservation areas.
- b. Correct the text on page 36 to conform with the acreages noted on the Type I tree conservation plan.

This site contains natural features required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The Subregion V Master Plan indicates that there are substantial areas designated as natural reserve on the site. As noted on page 136 of the Subregion V Master Plan:

“The Natural Reserve Area is composed of areas having physical features which exhibit severe constraints to development or which are important to sensitive ecological systems. Natural Reserve Areas must be preserved in their natural state.”

The Subregion V Master Plan elaborates on page 139:

“The Natural Reserve Areas, containing floodplain and other areas unsuitable for development should be restricted from development except for agricultural, recreational and other similar uses. Land grading should be discouraged. When disturbance is permitted, all necessary conditions should be imposed.”

For the purposes of this review, these areas include the expanded stream buffer and any isolated sensitive environmental features. All disturbances not essential to the development of the site as a whole is prohibited within stream and wetland buffers. Essential development includes such features as public utility lines (including sewer and stormwater outfalls), streets, and so forth, which are mandated for public health and safety. Nonessential activities are those such as grading for lots, stormwater management ponds, parking areas, and so forth, which can be designed to eliminate the impacts. Impacts for essential development features require variations to the Subdivision Regulations.

The plan proposes impacts to stream buffers and wetland buffers. 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. As part of the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision, a variation request needs to be submitted and must have a separate justification statement, a map of each impact on 8.5- x 11-inch paper, and note the quantities of impacts proposed for each individual impact.

*Comment:* This information is provided for the applicant’s benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this Comprehensive Design Plan review.

The *Prince George’s County Soils Survey* indicates that the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Keyport, Matapeake, Othello and Sassafras series. Aura, Beltsville, Elkton, Keyport and Othello soils are highly erodible. Bibb soils are associated with floodplains. Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Keyport and Othello soils may experience seasonally high water tables. Sassafras soils pose no special problems for development. Bibb, Elkton, Keyport and Othello soils are unsuited for use of infiltration methods of stormwater management.

*Comment:* This information is provided for the applicant’s benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this comprehensive design plan review. A soils report may be required by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources during the permit process review.

A stormwater management concept approval letter has not been submitted with this application.

*Comment:* A copy of the stormwater management concept approval will be required for the review of the preliminary plan.

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CDP-0203 and TCPI/5/03, subject to the conditions in the recommendation section of this report.

17. The Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has provided a memorandum regarding the revised plans submitted by the applicant. The memorandum is attached and the information will be presented at the Planning Board hearing with the companion Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-02124.
18. **Community Planning** —The Community Planning Division has provided a memorandum (Rovelstad to Lareuse) dated March 24, 2003 , in which it provided the following data from the General Plan and the applicable master plan:
  - a. 2002 General Plan: Developing Tier.
  - b. Master Plan: 1993 Subregion V Master Plan
  - c. Planning Area/Community: PA 83/Accoakeek
  - d. Land Use: Suburban-Estate/Low-Density planned neighborhood development and M-NCPPC stream valley and community parks.
  - e. Environmental: The natural features and environmental facilities map shows a natural reserve area on the southeastern third of the property, adjacent to the Charles County boundary. The map indicates that the site was primarily wooded in 1990. A major sewer line exists along Mattawoman Creek and the property boundary.
  - f. Historic Resources: No historic sites or resources are indicated on or adjacent to this site.
  - g. Transportation: Independence Road is a narrow, local residential street that intersects with Indian Head Highway approximately one-half mile to the north. There are no master plan roads that directly serve this property.
  - h. Public Facilities: No master plan public facilities are indicated on or adjacent to this site.
  - i. Parks and Trails:
    1. An M-NCPPC stream valley park is proposed on the southeast side of the property along Mattawoman Creek.

2. A 30-acre M-NCPPC community park is proposed along the northeast side of the property adjacent to the stream valley park (text. p.166).
3. A hiker-biker-equestrian trail is proposed in the stream valley park proposed along Mattawoman Creek, and
4. A pedestrian bikeway is proposed along Independence Road through the subject property and connecting to the Mattawoman stream valley park.

The 1993 Subregion V SMA retained this property in the R-S Comprehensive Design Zone (Residential-Suburban Development) as approved by rezoning application A-9854-C on September 22, 1992. The companion preliminary plan is required to find conformance to the master plan.

19. The Trails Planning staff of the Transportation Planning Section reviewed the comprehensive design plan for conformance with the countywide trails plan and the master plan, and in a memorandum (Shaffer to Lareuse) dated May 5, 2003, the following analysis and recommendations were provided:

Two master plan trail recommendations impact the subject property. There is a master plan, multi-use stream valley trail proposed along Mattawoman Creek. This is reflected on the submitted CDP. A master plan trail/bikeway is also proposed along Independence Road. This is reflected on the CDP as an eight-foot wide trail/sidewalk along internal roads within the subject site. Staff supports the conceptual location of both of these trails. In addition, it is recommended that a trail connection be provided within homeowners association land from the trail along the internal roadway to the end of Independence Road (as reflected on the plan). This will ensure bicycle and pedestrian access from the communities to the north to the master plan trails on the subject site. The staff recommends trail conditions within the recommendation section of this report be adopted.

20. The comprehensive design plan includes the following development standards, which will govern development for all specific design plans within the subject comprehensive design plan. The following chart lists both the applicant's and the staff's recommended development standards:

### Lot Standards

|                                  | Applicant                     | Staff Recommendation                             |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Lot size in square feet (min.)   | 10,000 square feet. SFD       |  |
| MAX LOT COVERAGE                 | 35%-40%                       | 35%  |
| YARD REQUIREMENTS                |                               |  |
| a. Minimum front yard            | 20                            | 25'  |
| b. Minimum side yard             | 5' one side<br>10' both sides | 8' one side<br>17' both sides                    |
| c. Minimum rear yard             | 20'                           | 20'  |
| d. Decks                         | none<br>line                  | 8' from side, 15 feet from<br>rear property line |
| MAXIMUM HEIGHT                   | 30 feet                       | 35 feet  |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH AT<br>STREET LINE | 50 feet                       | 65 feet<br>(75 feet along spine road)            |
| MIN. LOT WIDTH AT FRONT B.R.L.   | none                          | 50 feet  |

Staff recommends the following:

1. Variations to the above Standards may be permitted on a case-by-case basis by the Planning Board at the time of Specific Design Plan if circumstances warrant.
2. Minimum lot width at streetline of flag lots will be 25 feet.
3. Minimum lot widths at street on cul-de-sacs shall be 35 feet.

The staff recommends that the standards under “staff recommendation” above be adopted as conditions of approval.

#### 22. Additional Findings Relating to Urban Design Concerns

- a. The CDP application does not include a general scheme and standards for treatment of the streetscape. Staff is particularly concerned with the location of sidewalks. To ensure an attractive and consistent streetscape treatment and to promote a walking neighborhood throughout Homeland, staff believes that a comprehensive approach to providing sidewalks throughout the development is appropriate. Therefore, it is recommended that sidewalks (minimum five feet wide) on both sides of all primary roads and sidewalks (minimum four feet wide) on both sides of all secondary roads be provided.
- b. The CDP text does not include any discussion with regard to the proposed signage, and other defining, place-making elements. The specific design plan should provide for a comprehensive signage design approach and provide for any elements that will contribute to this development such as fountains, waterfalls, etc.

- c. The most visible side elevations of single-family detached or attached units on corner and other lots whose side elevation is highly visible to significant amounts of passing traffic should have a minimum of three architectural features such as windows, doors, and fireplace chimneys, and these features shall form a reasonably balanced and harmonious composition.
- d. The Urban Design Section also recommends that the open space parcels proposed within the development pods be reviewed for appropriateness of size, shape, and function at the time of the specific design plan. These parcels may become buildable lots if deemed appropriate.

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 I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/15/03), and further APPROVED the Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0203, Homeland (Formerly Kingsview) for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to the approval of the specific design plan, the following note shall be added to the plans:

“All residential structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with the National Fire Protection Standard (NFPA) 13D and all applicable county laws.”
- 2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall have full financial assurances, have been permitted for construction, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA/DPW&T:
  - a. At the MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road intersection, provide an exclusive westbound right turn lane along MD 373.
  - b. At the MD 210/MD 373/Livingston Road intersection, provide a second westbound left turn lane along MD 373.
  - c. The two modifications in a. and b. above would allow the westbound approach to function with an exclusive right turn lane, an exclusive through lane, and dual left turn lanes.
- 3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the applicant shall provide a roadway connection between the subject site and the existing MD 210/Shiloh Church Road intersection in Charles County. This connection shall have, at a minimum, the following characteristics:
  - a. A 120-foot right-of-way.

- b. Four lanes (two in each direction) with a median and two westbound approach lanes at MD 210—one exclusive right turn lane, and a shared through/left-turn lane.
- c. A southbound left turn lane along MD 210 at that location.

The intersection at MD 210 is subject to the requirements of SHA for design of left turn storage lane areas, acceleration lanes, deceleration lanes, and tapers, along with intersection lighting, signage, and markings.

- 4. Prior to the issuance of grading permits on the site, the applicant shall design a temporary widening to Independence Road to provide a 22-foot wide travel way for construction traffic. The temporary widening shall be constructed to DPW&T standards
- 5. The northernmost access road between Prince George's County and Charles County shall only be constructed in the location shown on the CDP if that location is approved by Charles County if approved by Charles County.
- 6. Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and the Type I tree conservation plan shall be revised to be in conformance with the basic plan by providing for the preservation of the severe slope area 150 feet wide at the Charles County line, to be expanded to 200 feet wide where it crosses the spine road that connects the upper and lower development pods. The slope preservation area shall continue on the east side of the spine road at a minimum width of 200 feet. No lots shall be located on the spine road where the slope preservation area meets the road.
- 7. Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the forest stand delineation (plan) shall be revised to:
  - a. Show all forest stand boundaries correctly and measure each stand to the nearest one-hundredth of an acre.
  - b. Correct the soils table to provide correct erodibility and hydric characteristics.
  - c. Remove all buffers.
  - d. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
  - e. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- 8. Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the forest stand delineation (text) shall be revised to include stand summary sheets.
- 9. Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the Type I tree conservation plan shall be revised to:

- a. Use only standard Type I TCP notes.
  - b. Add the Environmental Planning Section approval block.
  - c. Use areas larger than 1.0 acre as woodland conservation areas and eliminate forest fragmentation.
  - d. Remove woodland conservation from land to be dedicated to the Department of Parks and Recreation.
  - e. Provide for additional clearing to construct facilities on land to be dedicated to the Department of Parks and Recreation.
  - f. Revise the design to be in conformance with the basic plan by preserving the severe slope that runs east/west through the middle of the project.
  - g. Provide the woodland conservation threshold on site.
  - h. Revise the worksheet to address the above comments.
  - i. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
10. Prior to certification of the comprehensive design plan, the comprehensive design plan text shall be revised to:
- a. Correct the text on page 34 regarding slopes to include a reference to the “Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Policy document” which states that wooded severe slopes and steep slopes with highly erodible soils are priority preservation areas.
  - b. Correct the text on page 36 to conform with the acreages noted on the Type I tree conservation plan.
11. Prior to the approval of the specific design plan:
- a. All HOA feeder trails shall be a minimum of six feet wide and made of asphalt. The provision of additional feeder trails within the internal open space may be required to meet the intent of Condition 5 of the basic plan.
  - b. Provide a comprehensive trail and sidewalk map showing the proposed location of all master plan trails, feeder trail connections, and sidewalks, per Condition 6 of the basic plan. This network should reflect feeder trails within HOA land, where feasible.
  - c. Provide sidewalks (minimum five feet wide) on both sides of all primary roads and

sidewalks (minimum four feet wide) on both sides of all secondary roads.

- d. All trails shall be assured dry passage. If wet areas must be traversed, suitable structures shall be provided.
  - e. Any open space parcels located within the pods of development shall be reviewed for appropriateness of size, shape, urban design elements, and function. These open space parcels may become building lots if determined to be appropriate.
12. Prior to acceptance of the first specific design plan for the project:
- a. The applicant shall submit a plan of development for the private recreational facilities. A detailed site plan shall be submitted for the development of the homeowners association recreational use in accordance with Section 27-445. This plan of development shall identify the number of units the facility will be ultimately serving. The recreational facilities included shall be provided for each population category including tots, preteens, teens, adults and seniors and shall provide for all-season opportunities.
  - b. The applicant shall submit an overall open space plan indicating 42 acres of open space outside the 100-year floodplain right-of-way with calculations for areas of tree preservation, wetlands, and floodplain to ensure preservation of areas approved as open space per the basic plan. A determination of the need for additional plantings of evergreens along the Operating Engineers property shall be made.
13. The specific design plan shall include residential architecture that is attractively and creatively designed with an emphasis on high quality and natural materials. Where siding is employed, high quality vinyl and decorative trim shall be required. At least 50 percent of all units shall have brick fronts. A strong emphasis shall be placed on details such as jack arches, lintel, creative window and door treatment, cornice lines, quoins, reverse gables, dormer windows, and varied roof lines. Roofing material shall consist of standing seam metal, or the high quality dimensional asphalt shingles. The minimum roof pitch for all dwelling units shall generally be 8/12. A minimum ceiling height for the first floor shall be nine feet. A minimum of three features shall be provided on highly visible end walls; all others shall have at least two end wall features.
14. The private recreational facilities shall have bonding and construction timing to be determined at the first SDP/DSP. All recreational facilities shall be incorporated in recreational facilities agreements (as specified in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*) prior to final plat of subdivision.
15. All play areas shall comply with the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act and with the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

16. Lot Standards:

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Lot size in square feet (min.)  | 10,000 square feet                               |
| Max lot coverage  | 35%  |
| Yard requirements   |  |
| a. Minimum front yard   | 25'  |
| b. Minimum side yard  | 5' one side<br>10' both sides                    |
| c. Minimum rear yard  | 20'  |
| d. Decks  | 5' from side, 15 feet from<br>rear property line |
| Maximum height  | 35 feet  |
| Min. Lot width at Street line   | 65 feet, (75 feet along<br>spine road)           |
| Min. Lot width at front B.R.L.  | 50 feet  |
| 1. Variations to the above Standards may be permitted on a case-by-case basis by the Planning Board at the time of Specific Design Plan if circumstances warrant. |  |
| 2 Minimum lot width at streetline of flag lots will be 25 feet.   |  |
| 3. Minimum lot widths at street on cul-de-sacs shall be 35 feet.  |  |

17. The specific design plan shall provide for 15,000 square-foot lots on all corner lots along the spine road. Interior lots along the spine road shall have a minimum lot width of 75 feet.

18. The specific design plan shall provide for a comprehensive sign design approach and provide for elements that will contribute, such as a fountain, waterfall, or other water feature.

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 Scott, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Scott, Lowe, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 15, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 5th day of June 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:rmk