

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on July 19, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-00043 for Belvidere Estates, the Planning Board finds:

- 1. The Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, 4-96001, approved on May 30, 1996 (PGCPB No. 96-149) required, per Condition 1, that prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1, 3, 7, 11, 12 and 20 of Belvidere Estates, a Limited Detailed Site Plan shall be approved. The conditions of approval are as follows:
 - Aa. The siting of the units on the lots to ensure that usable, private rear yards are provided. The houses on Lots 3 and 11 shall be sited so that the rear yards are not visible from the historic site.
 - Ab. The architecture and landscape planting proposed on Lots 3 and 11 to ensure compatibility with the historic site. All elevations visible from the historic site shall be designed with as much attention to detail as the front elevation. The use of chain-link, stockade and board-on-board fencing will not be permitted on these lots, unless approved by the Historic Preservation Commission.
 - Ac. The required building setback and landscape buffers on Lots 1, 3, 11, and 12.
 - Ad. The siting of the houses on Lots 7b and 20 to ensure a good visual and functional relationship with adjoining lots and to ensure that the rear yards are usable and screened from public view.@
- 2. The subject application proposes the development of 20 single-family detached homes using the lot size averaging design concept.
- 3. Following is the site development data:

| | |
|---|----------------------|
| Zone | R-R |
| Gross Tract Area | 18.94 acres |
| Minimum lot size allowed | 20,000 sq. ft. |
| Minimum lot size allowed using lot size averaging | 15,000 sq. ft. (50%) |
| Minimum Lot Size Permitted | 15,000 sq. ft. |
| Minimum Lot Size Proposed | 15,000 sq. ft. |
| Maximum Lot Size Proposed | 42,000 sq. ft |

| | |
|---------------------------|------------------|
| Minimum lot width at BRL | |
| 30,000 sq. ft. lot | 80 ft. |
| 40,000 sq. ft. lots | 80 ft. |
| Minimum lot width at R/W | 70 ft. |
| Minimum yard requirements | |
| Front | 25 ft. |
| Side | 17 ft./8ft. min. |
| Rear | 20 ft. |
| Maximum coverage | 25 % |

4. This application includes 11 architectural models, the Ashton, Belair, Fairview, Kentmorr, Lancaster, Olney, Villager IV, Villager V, Villager VI, Waterford II, and Waterford III by K & P Builders. These house types have standard two-car and three-car garages and have between 1,856-3,295 base finished square feet of living space.

Square footage of proposed architecture:

| House Type | Base Square Footage | Square Footage with all options* |
|--------------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|
| Ashton | 1,856 sq. ft. | 2208 sq. ft. |
| Waterford II | 1,928 sq. ft. | N/A |
| Waterford III | 1,928 sq. ft. | N/A |
| Fairview | 2,197 sq. ft. | 2,472 sq. ft. |
| Belair | 2,650 sq. ft. | 2,992 sq. ft. |
| Olney - English Basement | 2,752 sq. ft. | 2,996 sq. ft. |
| Villager IV | 2,638 sq. ft. | 3,979 sq. ft. |
| Villager V | 3,011 sq. ft. | 4,358 sq. ft. |
| Villager VI | 2,956 sq. ft. | 4,538 sq. ft. |
| Lancaster | 2,828 sq. ft. | 3,630 sq. ft. |
| Kentmorr | 3,295 sq. ft. | 5,746 sq. ft. |

* *Finished square footage*

The Ashton and Fairview models are one-story homes, and encompass 1,856 square feet and 2,197 square feet of base finished area and the roof pitches are 7:12 and 10:12 respectively. The Fairview model is acceptable as submitted. The Ashton architecture should be revised to either include a single window with shutters which matches the other front windows or brick on the return areas of the garage. Roof pitches on remaining elevations are a minimum of 8:12, with varying pitches and roof styles on the remaining rooflines and elevations. The exterior finish materials are a combination of brick veneer and siding. The side elevations meet the requirement of two standard endwall features. It should be noted that the Planning and Preservation Section has concerns pertaining to the proposed architecture. See Finding # 9 .

5. The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated April 27, 2001 (Finch to Whitmore), stated the following concerns:
 - Aa. The remaining section of right-of-way to Glendale Road adjacent to the site, and the correct configuration of Parcels 84 and 85 on the other side of the road.
 - Ab. The preparation of a Quit Claim Deed for the remainder of the public right-of-way of Old Glendale Road.
 - Ac. The location of the overhead electrical utility crossing Lots 16 through 20 and the location of all utility rights-of-way.
 - Ad. Identification of the lots being addressed in the Limited Detailed Site Plan.
 - Ae. Amount of woodland and the specimen tree canopy coverage included in woodland preservation, all specimen trees and critical root zones.
 - Af. The relocation of woodland conservation outside of all utility easements.@

Comment: The above concerns have been addressed and the Environmental Planning Section approved TCPII/106/00 on May 30, 2001.

6. The Park Planning and Development Division, in a memorandum dated November 21, 2000 (Asan to Whitmore), offered no comments.
7. The Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated November 22, 2000 (Wilkerson to Whitmore), indicated that this application raises no Master Plan issues.
8. The Subdivision and Permit Sections had several referral comments which have been addressed.
9. The Planning and Preservation Section, Community Planning Division, in a memorandum dated December 4, 2000 (Higgins to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

The following recommendations are made in order to ensure that the siting, massing and architectural style of the new houses are in harmony with the character of Belvidere (Historic Site 73-5).

The sheathing material used on the west elevations of Lots 1 and 3 and the rear elevation of Lot 11 should be traditional building materials. Acceptable materials are brick, wood, or wood composite siding. Vinyl siding, aluminum siding, and other synthetic materials are not acceptable. Brick colors should be traditional ranging from light brown to common red. Light color bricks or the use of multiple brick colors is not appropriate, even as accent trim or as decoration. Windows should have the appearance of multiple panes and be distributed across the elevation in a balanced arrangement. Optional features like chimneys and decks should be detailed in a manner consistent with the overall design. All chimneys should be masonry and match the brick used on the main block of the house. Projecting porches and decks should be simply detailed: if they are to be constructed of pressure-treated materials, the materials should be painted or opaque stained to match the house's window trim. Foundation elements visible from the Historic Site should also be brick and should include a water table to distinguish the foundation from the story(s) above. Roofing materials used should be traditional in design, color and texture. Light colors are discouraged: textured architectural shingles approximating wood shingles are acceptable. Garages should be positioned so that the garage doors are not visible from the Historic Site.

The Ashton is inappropriately massed to be visually compatible with the Historic Site. Staff recommends that the Ashton not be built on Lots 1, 3, and 11. Staff further recommends that the Fairview, the Villager - if it can be built with brick veneer-, or the Kentmoor be seriously considered for Lots 1 and 3 as the right side elevations if these models have balanced window arrangements and traditional architectural styling that would be compatible with the Historic Site. The house chosen for Lot 11 should follow the above guidelines for design, materials and organization for the rear elevation...

Comment: Lot 1 is not part of the condition relating to 1.b of Preliminary Plan, 4-96001 therefore, the Planning Board may not require mitigation for Lot 1. Conditions 1.a and 1.b in the Recommendation Section of this report address the above concerns for Lots 3 and 11.

10. Condition 1.c of the approved Preliminary Plan requires that the required building setback and landscape buffers be required on Lots 1, 3, 11, and 12 (Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*, Buffering Incompatible Uses, along the west property line). In addition, the application is also subject to Section 4.6 of the *Landscape Manual*, Buffering Residential Development from Streets, along the north property line. The applicant requests Alternative Compliance for the bufferyard along the north property line where the site adjoins US 50, as well as along the western property line where the site adjoins a historic site, Belvidere (*Historic Site #73-5 listed in the Historic Sites and*

Districts Plan). The Alternative Compliance Committee and the Planning Director recommend approval of AC-00058 based upon the following rationale:

The applicant proposes to employ the existing sound barrier and a 70-foot-wide reforestation strip in lieu of the required 75-foot-wide landscaped buffer along US 50. The purpose of Section 4.6 is to ensure that the rear yard and lowest story of the dwellings are screened from the view of the adjoining street. This is already accomplished by the wall along US 50. In addition, the 70-foot-wide reforestation strip, when mature, will provide a much more substantial buffer than would the normally-required 75-foot landscaped strip. This combination will be equal to or better than normal compliance in its ability to fulfill the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. Similarly, the applicant's request to place the 40-foot-wide landscaped strip on the adjoining historic property is justified. In fact, when the property was subdivided in 1996 (4-96001), the staff and Planning Board suggested doing so, acting on the recommendation of the Historic Preservation Committee. This will allow the new lots to have more yard area unencumbered by landscaped easements, while still providing 100 percent of the required buffering. This combination will also be equal to or better than normal compliance in its ability to fulfill the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

Alternative Compliance AC-00058 is recommended for approval subject to Conditions 1.c through 1.f below.

11. The Department of Environmental Resources, found the subject application acceptable as submitted.
12. The Health Department submitted a referral addressing concerns about utility poles on Lots 17 and 19. These lots are not included in this Limited Detailed Site Plan, however at the Planning Board hearing the applicant proffered to relocate the utility pole on Lot 17.
13. The Transportation Planning Section and the State Highway Administration find the plans acceptable as submitted.
14. The Department of Public Works and Transportation and the Bureau of Fire Prevention and Special Hazards provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way and access to fire hydrants, respectively. The plans should address these comments at the time of the review of permits.
15. In order to ensure that prospective purchasers in this subdivision are made aware of all exterior elevations of all models approved by the Planning Board, and of the existence of an approved Limited Detailed Site Plan and Landscape Plans, these plans must be displayed in the builder's sales office.
16. The proposed Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting

substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/106/00), APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan SP-00043 and further approved Alternative Compliance AC-00058 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the following revisions and/or notes shall be made to the Detailed Site Plan and Architectural elevations, or identifies issues shall be addressed:
 - a. Lots 1, 3, 7, 11, 12, and 20 are speciality lots, and shall be identified as such with an asterisk.
 - b. Any chimneys constructed on Lots 3 and 11 shall be constructed of masonry and come to grade. Roofing materials on Lots 3 and 11 shall be traditional in design, color and texture. Either the Fairview, Villager (with brick veneer), Olney or the Kentmorr shall be built on Lot 3. The Ashton shall not be built on Lot 11.
 - c. A corrected schedule for the 40-foot-wide landscaped strip on the adjoining historic site shall be provided.
 - d. The sound barrier along US 50 shall be clearly labeled.
 - e. The plant list shall be revised to show Eastern Red Cedars as 6-8 feet in height.
 - f. Provide evidence of a recorded easement along the western property line for the 40-foot-wide landscaped strip on the historic property. The Alternative Compliance request shall be modified to include a mutually acceptable mix of evergreens and deciduous trees in the required bufferyard. The evergreen trees that are to mitigate views of the historic house shall be 8-10 feet in height and shall be strategically sited to mitigate the viewshed of the historic home to Lot 3.
 - g. The Landscape Plans for Lots 7 and 20 shall be revised to include additional landscaping to ensure that the rear yards are screened from public view.
 - h. The site development data shall be added to the Detailed Site Plan.
2. A note shall be placed on the Detailed Site Plans that the houses on Lots 7 and 20 shall have brick front facades and the endwalls facing Belvidere Road shall have three endwall features.
3. The applicant his heirs, successors, and/or assigns, shall display in the sales office all of the plans approved by the Planning Board for this subdivision, including all exterior elevations of all approved models, the Limited Detailed Site Plan and Landscape Plan.

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 Lowe, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Lowe, Scott, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Eley absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 19, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 26th day of July 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LW:rmk