

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 July 24, 2003, regarding Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9303/01 for Villages at Campus Way, Tartan South the Planning Board finds:

1. **Location:** The subject property is located approximately 1,000 feet northeast of the intersection of Lottsford Road and Landover Road (MD 202). The site is bounded to the west by the Campus Way North right-of-way. To the north of the subject site is the Balk Hill property, zoned R-S. To the east is the Collington Episcopal Care Center, an existing facility approved as a Special Exception in the R-R Zone. To the south is a property zoned R-H, which is currently being developed as an extension of the Collington Episcopal Life Care Center, a planned retirement community.
2. **The Proposed Development:** The subject Comprehensive Design Plan application is for the limited purpose of eliminating the stubbed road portion of Dunrobin Drive in order to align a connection between the subject development with the Balk Hill development approximately 200 feet east of the stubbed portion. This revision will minimize the disturbance on the environmentally sensitive areas on the Balk Hill site. As a result of the road realignment, the previous road dedication will generate a fee-simple lot, Lot 29, with a gross tract area of 9,528 square feet.
3. **Background:** On July 24, 1990, the District Council adopted CR-71-1990, an ordinance approving the Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 73, the Largo-Lottsford area of Prince George's County. CDZ Amendment 4 (Campus Way, A-9611) of this ordinance rezoned the subject property to the R-S (1.6-2.6) Zone.
4. **The Approved Comprehensive Design Plans:** On October 27, 1994, the Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9303 (Resolution PGCPB No.94-330) for the subject site. CDP-9303 proposes 162 single-family detached dwelling units on 67.58 acres and is in accordance with the conditions and considerations of CDZ Amendment 4 of Council Resolution CR-71-1990.
5. **The Approved Basic Plan:** On July 24, 1990, the District Council approved Basic Plan A-9611 concurrently with the Largo-Lottsford area Sectional Map Amendment subject to two conditions, five CDP considerations, two SDP considerations and the following land use types and quantities:

Land Use Types:

Single-family detached dwellings
Garages with other accessory structures commonly associated with residences
Home occupations
Parks, playgrounds and other outdoor recreation areas
All other land uses are prohibited

Land Use Quantities:

Gross Area:	69.64 acres	
Base Density:	(1.6 du/acre)	111 units
Increment	<u>+70</u> units	
Maximum Density:	(2.6 du/acre)	181 units*

*The actual number of dwelling units will be determined during the Comprehensive Design Plan review based upon an assessment of the proposed public benefit features in accordance with Section 27-513(b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

6. Findings Required by Section 27-521, Required findings for approval of a Comprehensive Design Plan:

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

- (1) The plan is in conformance with the approved Basic Plan.**
- (2) The proposed plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations.**
- (3) Approval is warranted by the way in which the Comprehensive Design Plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities, and satisfies the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project.**
- (4) The proposed development will be compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings;**
- (5) 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.**
 - (B) Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses.**
 - (C) Circulation access points.**
- (6) 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.

- (7) **The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities.**
- (8) **Where a Comprehensive Design Plan proposal includes an adaptive use of a Historic Site, the Planning Board shall find that:**
 - (A) **The proposed adaptive use will not adversely affect distinguishing exterior architectural features or important historic landscape features in the established environmental setting.**
 - (B) **Parking lot layout, materials, and landscaping are designed to preserve the integrity and character of the Historic Site.**
 - (C) **The design, materials, height, proportion, and scale of a proposed enlargement or extension of a Historic Site, or of a new structure within the environmental setting, are in keeping with the character of the Historic Site.**
- (9) **The Plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle, and where townhouses are proposed in the Plan, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the requirements set forth in Section 27-433(d).**
- (10) **The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.**

Comment: The Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-9303/01, is in general conformance with the above criteria of approval because the CDP proposes only to eliminate a portion of roadway as discussed in Finding 2 and replace it with one lot for a single-family detached home. This revision will have no impact on the previous findings by the Planning Board in CDP-9303 (PGCPB Resolution 94-330, Findings 3–14) that the Comprehensive Design Plan fulfills all criteria for approval set forth in Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance.

7. **Density Increment Analysis:** Most of the Comprehensive Design Zones include a list of public benefit features and density or intensity increment factors. If a development proposes to include a public benefit feature in a development, the Planning Board may grant a density increment factor that increases the dwelling unit density or building intensity. The value of the public benefit feature determines the size of the density or intensity increase.

In this case, the applicant is not requesting any density increments. The land use types and quantities as approved in Basic Plan A-9611 are still in full effect.

8. **Development Standards:** The subject CDP proposes no revision to the development standards as

approved with CDP-9303.

9. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are previously approved Tree Conservation Plans. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/12/97-01, was submitted with the application. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/12/97-01, subject to conditions as written in the Recommendation section of this report.

REFERRAL COMMENTS

Referral requests concerning sufficiency of public facilities and compliance with current ordinances and regulations of the subject CDP have been sent to internal divisions and sections of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and other governmental agencies that have planning jurisdiction over the subject site. The following text summarizes major comments and responses.

Internal Divisions and Sections: The following are summaries of major comments regarding this application from the internal divisions and sections of M-NCPPC:

**Planning and Preservation Section, Community Planning Division
Environmental Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division
Transportation Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division
Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section, Countywide Planning Division
The Department of Parks and Recreation**

10. The Community Planning Division (Fields to Zhang, June 6, 2003) has stated that there are no Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Master Plan or General Plan issues raised through the review of this application.
11. The Environmental Planning Section (Markovich to Zhang, May 13, 2003) has stated that CDP-9303/01 and TCPI/12/97-01 generally address the environmental issues for this site and are recommended for approval subject to conditions that have been incorporated in the Recommendation section of this report.
12. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Zhang, July 2, 2003) has concluded that the proposed CDP revision will not be an unreasonable burden on transportation facilities which exist, are under construction, or for which 100 percent construction funding is contained in the county CIP or the state CTP. The transportation planner recommends approval of the subject CDP.

The Transportation Planning Section (Shaffer to Zhang, June 26, 2003, regarding Comprehensive Design Plan Review for Master Plan Trail Compliance) has provided a detailed background review of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan. The trails planner recommends one condition of approval as incorporated in the Recommendation section of this report.

13. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (Izzo to Zhang, May 14, 2003)

has concluded that the changes proposed in CDP-9303/01 will have no effect upon the previous comments concerning public facilities in this case.

14. The Department of Parks and Recreation (Asan to Zhang, July 19, 2003) has recommended the approval of CDP-9303/01, subject to conditions that have been incorporated in the recommendation section of the report.

Other Agencies include:

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)
The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)
Prince George's County Health Department
Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources
Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation

15. The Maryland State Highway Administration (McDonald to Zhang, May 8, 2003) reviewed the application and indicated that the roads in question are within the jurisdiction of Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). Access to the site is subject to the rules and regulations of DWP&T.
16. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (Thacker to Zhang, May 23, 2003) has indicated that there is an approved authorization within the limits of this site and offered no further comment.
17. The Health Department (Maki to Zhang, June 5, 2003) has offered no comment.
18. The Department of Environmental Resources (DER) (De Guzman to Zhang, June 5, 2003) has stated that the site plan for Village at Campus Way, Tartan South is consistent with the stormwater management concept plan (#948000680) for the site. DER has no objection to the additional lot.
19. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) (Mathur to Zhang, June 27, 2003) has indicated that the Director of DPW&T recommended approval of the vacation in a memorandum to the Prince George's County Planning Board dated May 6, 2003.
20. Approval of CDP-9303/01 modifies, but does not supercede, CDP-9303. Except as explicitly modified by CDP-9303/01, the approved CDP-9303 (as expressed in PGCPB No. 94-330), remains in full force and effect.

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/12/97-01), and further APPROVED the Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9393/01, Villages at Campus Way, Tartan South for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Label sheet 2 of 2 for the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/12/97-01, as a Type I Tree Conservation Plan.
 - b. Provide a site plan note to indicate the size of the additional lot, Lot 29.
2. Prior to issuance of any additional permits for Lot 29, Block “C” or Parcels “J” and “I”, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/69/97, shall be revised in accordance with the approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9303/01.
3. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall construct an 8-foot-wide, hard-surface trail running west to east internally along interior streets and open space from Campus Way North along one side of Dunrobin Drive and Nicol circle, where it will end at the park property.
4. The applicant shall convey to M-NCPPC, 9,750 square feet of open space as designated on Exhibit “A.” The land to be conveyed shall also be subject to the conditions of Exhibit ‘B,’ attached to the memorandum of the Department of Parks and Recreation.
5. Prior to approval of the final plat of subdivision, the applicant shall prepare plats showing the property to be exchanged. Those plats shall be approved by DPR prior to submission of the final plan of subdivision.
6. Subject to the approval of the Commission, the Planning Board authorizes the Executive Director to dispose of 1,650 square feet of park property as shown on attached Exhibit “A.”
7. The applicant shall prepare deeds for the properties to be exchanged (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) and submit them to the Department of Parks and Recreation for their review at least four weeks prior to submission of the final plat of subdivision. A title report shall accompany the deed for the land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC. Following approval by DPR, the deed for the property to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section along with the final plat of subdivision. Upon receipt of a recorded deed, DPR staff will take necessary actions to convey the 1,650 square feet of parkland to the applicant. The applicant shall record the deeds in the land records of Prince George’s County.
8. Following approval by DPR, the applicant shall revise the SDP- 9702 for Tartan South to reflect these changes.

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 Eley, with Commissioners Scott, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Lowe absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 24, 2003, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 4th day of September 2003.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:HZ:rmk