

## 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-00048 for Cross Creek, Phase V, the Planning Board finds:

1.     LocationCThe subject property is located approximately 1,600 feet northwest of the intersection of Briggs Chaney Road and Old Gunpowder Road. The proposed subdivision is immediately north, south, east and west of Phase IA of the proposed development which is the golf course; and south of a small portion of an adjoining residential phase, Phase IV, which has yet to be developed, all of which are zoned R-R.
2.     The Proposed DevelopmentCThe purpose of this Detailed Site Plan is for the approval of ninety-eight (98) single-family detached dwellings on the subject property. The plan includes site, landscape and tree conservation plans. The proposed subdivision will have a single vehicular access point from the future realigned Old Gunpowder Road, via the proposed Bay Hill Drive.  
  
Architecture for all phases of the subject development has previously been approved by the Planning Board under a separate Detailed Site Plan, SP-97042. This umbrella approval of the proposed architecture alleviated the necessity of having separate architectural approvals for each phase of development. Thus, the architecture approved in SP-97042 will serve as the architecture for the subject application.
3.     BackgroundCThe approved Master Plan for Subregion I (1990) recommends park development for the entire property. The Subregion I Sectional Map Amendment (1990) retained the R-R Zone. There are no master plan issues pertaining to the subject application and the proposed development.
4.     The Approved Conceptual Site PlanCThe Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with Conceptual Site Plan SP-96021 approved by the District Council on November 18, 1996, with the exceptions noted in Findings 5 and 7 below in regard to environmental issues.
5.     The Approved Preliminary PlatCPreliminary Plat 4-96048 for the subject property was approved by the Planning Board on July 25, 1996 (PGCPB No. 96-254). The overall lotting pattern, circulation pattern and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plat 4-96048. Given the size of the proposed development, the subject plat has a six-year validity period and will expire on July 25,

2002. The approved Preliminary Plat included 44 conditions of approval. Five of these conditions required specific action be taken or additional information be supplied at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Below are the specific conditions warranting discussion pertaining to conformance to the approved Preliminary Plat:

6. **At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the Natural Resources Division shall evaluate the proposed noise mitigation measures to ensure that noise impacts associated with I-95 shall attenuate so as not to exceed the most practical extent possible 65 dBA exterior and 45 dBA interior for all residences within this subdivision.**

Comment: The portion of the subject phase nearest to I-95, the eastern edge, is approximately 2,100 linear feet, or almost 2 mile, away from the roadway. There are no noise implications pertaining to the subject development phase.

13. **Prior to the submittal of any other Detailed Site Plans for Cross Creek, except for Phase I, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns ("the applicant") shall provide documentation satisfactory to the Natural Resources Division that demonstrates the exact location and acreage of all off-site woodland conservation. All off-site woodland conservation shall be located in the Anacostia watershed, to the fullest extent possible.**

Comment: The subject condition requires that prior to the submittal of Detailed Site Plans for Cross Creek, except for Phase I, the applicant shall submit locations for off-site woodland conservation area. Looked at in isolation, Phase V does not meet the woodland conservation threshold. Instead the applicant is currently Abanking trees@ on-site, that is, taking credit for trees that have not yet been proposed to be cleared under a TCP II. In this situation, the applicant must take the responsibility for providing the promised woodland conservation incrementally on the site. The final site plan and approved TCP II must result in the balance of on-site and off-site woodland conservation promised at TCP I.

15. **Prior to the certificate approval of the Preliminary Plan, the applicant shall:**

- a. **Submit a conceptual stream restoration plan for the approval of the Natural Resources Division. The conceptual plan shall address drainage problems caused by previous mining, stabilizing stream banks, reconnecting stream linkages, and enhancing or re-establishing stream buffers where they have been lost.**

**At Detailed Site Plan, a Detailed Stream Restoration Plan shall be prepared which includes detailed stream restoration methods and the necessary documentation for implementation as part of site development. The stream restoration plan should be coordinated with the tree conservation plan, and wetlands mitigation or**

**enhancement proposed. The variation request listing shall indicate whether the disturbance proposed is proposed for restoration/enhancement as part of this plan.**

Comment: The stream restoration plan does not affect Phase V.

**20. At time of Detailed Site Plan:**

- a. All stream crossings shall be designed in a bio-sensitive manner, to minimize and mitigate impacts. The design of stream crossings shall be approved by the Natural Resources Division.**

Comment: No stream crossing exists in the subject development phase.

- b. Sediment and Erosion Control Plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Natural Resources Division. Minimization of sediment and erosion potential during and after construction is of special concern on this site, which may require the use of best management practices of a higher level than normally required, especially within regard to disturbance in the floodplain and wetland areas.**

Comment: This condition is addressed in the Environmental Planning referral. See Finding 7 below.

- c. Water quality ponds shall not be located in the stream course, the 50 feet minimum stream buffer area, or the 100-year floodplain unless appropriate measures have been employed to pretreat the run-off and reduce pollutant loads before the water enters the stream course.**

Comment : No part or section of minimum stream buffer area, 100-year floodplain, or the Little Paint Branch exist within proximity to the proposed subdivision.

- 40. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns shall provide stub streets to Montgomery County in accordance with the Preliminary Plan. At the time of Detailed Site Plan for the portion of the plan which includes the stub streets into Montgomery County, the applicant will be required to show an appropriate transition between the proposed cross-section in Prince George's County and the planned cross-section in Montgomery County at both locations.**

Comment: No portion of the proposed subdivision abuts, or is in proximity to, Montgomery County.

6. The site development data is as follows:

Zone	R-R
(Developed pursuant to Sec. 27-444 for Recreational Community Developments.)	
Gross Tract Area	26.46 acres
100-year Floodplain	none
Number of Lots Proposed	98 lots
Setbacks	
Front	25 ft.
Sides	5 ft.
Rear	20 ft.
Maximum lot coverage (lots smaller than 10,000 sq. ft.)	75 percent

7. Conformance with Woodland Conservation Ordinance C This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, because the total site is more than 40,000 square feet and has more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required. The Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/11/95, was approved as part of Preliminary Plat 4-96048. Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/21/01 has been reviewed.

The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the plan for conformance with environmental conditions of previous approvals and for conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The findings of the Environmental Planning Section were reported in a memorandum dated February 21, 2001 (Finch to Jordan), and the following comments were provided:

A Phase V is part of a six-phase golf course community being developed under R-P-C requirements in the R-R Zone. This phase contains 98 single-family lots on 24.50 acres. This site was previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section as part of a Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-96021), a Preliminary Plan (4-96048), and a Tree Conservation Plan, Type I (TCPI/11/95).

ADuring each of these approvals specific conditions were imposed, which are addressed below.

ACompliance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-96021

AA detailed review of environmental concerns was carried out at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval. The following conditions are applicable to Phase V:

ACondition 6.b. states:

A>Sediment and Erosion Control Plans shall be submitted for review and approval by the Natural Resources Division. Minimization of sediment and erosion potential during and after construction is of special concern on this site, which may require the use of best management practices of a higher level than normally required, especially with regard to disturbance in the floodplain and wetland areas.=

*ADiscussion: Sediment and Erosions Control Plans were submitted as part of the application. The limits of disturbance proposed extend beyond the revised limits of Phase V, and also extend onto adjacent phases, and affect areas proposed for woodland preservation on the TCP I.*

ACompliance with Preliminary Plan 4-96048 and Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/11/95

AA detailed review of environmental concerns was carried out at the time of Preliminary Plan. The only environmental condition to be addressed at time of Detailed Site Plan which is applicable to Phase V reiterated Conditions 6.b. of the Conceptual Site Plan approval, which was addressed above.

ACompliance with Composite Overall Plan

AAAs Detailed Site Plans and Final Plats have been approved, it has become difficult to maintain a correct overview of the project due to many small changes and revisions that have occurred. In order to avoid processing Plats of Correction prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan for Phase V, the applicant has reduced the limits of the phase and removed previously platted areas, such as part of Parcel 7, from the Detailed Site Plan.

*ADiscussion: To facilitate the efficient review of this project, as independent phases are submitted, staff needs an up-to-date >Composite Overall Plan.=*

AEnvironmental Review

AThe Approved Conceptual Site plan identified a >stream buffer environmental review area= and delineated three management zones within the environmental review area: An environmental preservation zone, a conservation zone, and a restoration/enhancement zone. Delineation of these zones has not been provided on the current plans, so that the minimization of impacts can be demonstrated.

AThe plan set does not consistently identify the limits of phases throughout the entire set.

AParcel 7 is part of Phase IA and was platted as part of the golf course. No numbering of lot lines should be shown on the plans which would imply that a lot will occur in this location. The Phase V line should clearly show that Parcel 7 is not included in Phase V, and that any grading into Parcel 7 proposed as part of this plan would require a revision

to the Detailed Site Plan and TCP II for Phase IA.

ALot 1, Block A, is impacted by a sewer easement along its southern boundary, which is not in accordance with the recorded plat for this easement. Other boundaries have also been identified which do not conform with the final plat.

AThe plans shows the limit of disturbance extending into Parcels 2 and 3 of Phase IA. The plan proposes intrusions into conservation easements recorded in Phase IA.

AThe plan proposes intrusions into Phase IV, which does not have an approved Detailed Site Plan.

#### AWoodland Conservation

AIn the review of Phase V, the applicant has submitted information indicating the distribution of woodland areas on-site is not in accordance with what previously incorporated in the Woodland Conservation Summary Sheet. The applicant previously identified that there were 195.41 acres of woodlands on the entire site. The applicant has proposed a change in distribution of the woodlands between phases, which results in a net gain of woodlands to 197.02 acres for the entire site. The Environmental Planning Section is in agreement with the proposed revision to the existing woodlands on Phases IV, V and VI and will revise the summary worksheet to be in conformance with these changes.

AThe net tract area for Phase V is 24.50 acres and there are 12.80 acres of existing woodlands. The applicant proposes to clear 11.68 acres of woodlands. Although this leaves 1.10 acres of woodland which has not been cleared, not all of this is suitable for woodland preservation due to size, location or configuration.

APreservation Areas 1 and 3, totaling .49 acre, are unsuitable for these reasons: The size of the area, the encumbrance of a small lot, and the quality of the woodlands do not warrant preservation, so this quantity should be not counted as woodland conservation. Although not counted as woodland conservation, there is no reason to retain a small area of woodland on Lot 17, Block B.

AThe applicant has proposed a narrow strip of existing woodland to remain adjacent to Parcel 2 and Parcel 3, which combines woodland preservation on the golf course to provide a substantial area of woodland conservation. But the perpetual retention of these woodlands on private lots is a concern. The preservation of existing woodlands on these lots is acceptable if a permanent fence to mark the edge of the woodland conservation area is placed to protect the woodland from homeowner intrusion.

AThe woodland conservation requirement for Cross Creek has been handled on a site-wide basis, rather than on a phase-by-phase approach. Existing trees on-site have been counted against the total requirement, until they are cleared under an approved

development plan. The clearing proposed for Phase V brings the total clearing for the project close to a point where off-site woodland mitigation may be necessary.

AThe clearing proposed on Phase V is quantifiable. The unauthorized clearing that went forward on the golf course without permits last fall is an unknown quantity. The Detailed Site Plan for Phase IA authorized 42.84 acres of clearing on the golf course, but there is strong evidence that the approved limits of disturbance were exceeded. On January 10, 2001, the golf course applicant was notified that they need to submit a plan showing the existing tree line so the extent of unauthorized clearing can be determined.

AUntil the extent of clearing which has occurred on the golf course is verified and the associated woodland conservation calculations are complete, a determination of whether off-site woodland mitigation is required as part of Phase V cannot be made.

AThe Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of TCPII/21/01 with the conditions stated in the Recommendation section of this report.@

8. TransportationCThe subject plan was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and was found to be acceptable.
9. Urban DesignCThe Urban Design staff has reviewed the subject plan and offers the following comments. For the most part the plan presents a well-defined lotting pattern and layout. A minimal number of rear elevations face or are visible from any public right-of-way.

- a. The subject phase is either adjacent to, or bounded by, three holesC1, 3 and 18. Staff is concerned about the proximity of some of the lots, specifically some of the proposed building footprint locations, with respect to the fairways and the likely flight travel paths of golf balls. Although submitted, the final Detailed Site Plan for the golf course design is pending and the final errant ball studies are not available at this time. Lots that fall within the Ahazard area@ were identified for special attention at the time of the Conceptual Site Plan approval. Condition 13 of the Conceptual Site Plan states the following:

**The design of the Golf Course shall be in accordance with the safety corridor guidelines of the Urban Land Institute publication Golf Course Development and Real Estate (1994), as follows:**

**\$ Centerline of golf hole to boundary of adjacent development (or lot lines): 175 feet; plus a 35-foot setback for a house on a lot.**

**The Planning Board may approve modifications of these guidelines upon submission at the time of Detailed Site Plan of written justification from a qualified professional golf course architect that the adjustment will not reduce the safety of the golf course operation.**

Since the applicant has not provided all necessary information required to evaluate the final golf course design, staff has applied this condition to the most up-to-date golf course plan which has been revised with respect to what was originally approved in CSP-96021. The subject Phase V lot arrangement and overall area have been modified from what was approved in the conceptual and preliminary plans. Furthermore, the proposed golf course layout and some of its tree save areas have also been modified. Specific information, with respect to the proposed golf course grades, topography, tree save areas, and layout, has not been identified with sufficient clarity to allow staff to fully review all components which will affect the well-being of prospective residents and their property. Given the said plan modifications, it is staff's contention that the previously identified potential hazard areas are no longer applicable. The lots identified below should be considered within potential hazard areas until the applicant provides definitive information in the context of the final golf course designed to demonstrate that the subject lots do not lie in hazardous flight paths, or that the incidence of errant balls striking homes will be mitigated by buffering/screening, topography, golf course hazards, etc. Therefore, it is recommended that all lots identified to be within golf ball flight path hazard areas, Lots 1-5, 12-23, Block A, and Lots 2-10, Block E, shall not be platted prior to final Detailed Site Plan approval for the golf course. If at such time it is determined that the proposed mitigation to relieve the hazard is insufficient, then the subject lots will be deleted.

- b. The vehicular entrance to the golf course clubhouse facility, parking compound, and the proposed swimming pool will be located directly south of the proposed subdivision, with access from the south side of Bay Hill Drive. The subject plans depict the adjacent clubhouse area as providing a maintenance building and a swimming pool in proximity to Lot 1, Block A, of the subject subdivision. The approved Conceptual Site Plan for the entire development provided two tennis courts in the approximate general location which is now proposed to be occupied by the maintenance building and swimming pool. The swimming pool was shown on the approved Conceptual Site Plan, but it was further south at the end of the clubhouse area entrance drive. The approved tennis courts have been tentatively relocated to the east side of the clubhouse parking compound, south of the proposed traffic circle at the entrance to the clubhouse area and within a platted conservation easement. Initially, per the approved Conceptual Site Plan, the maintenance building was sited on a parcel south of Briggs Chaney Road. Although staff concurs that there will be a logistical advantage to locating the maintenance building close to the clubhouse and on the golf course, the fact remains that the tennis courts, a major recreational amenity approved per the Conceptual Site Plan, are proposed to be sited in a conservation easement. Staff believes that this finding is pertinent to this review because Phase V is adjacent to the clubhouse area and would be the most likely area for the relocation of the tennis courts in proximity to their previously approved location if it is determined that disturbance of the conservation easement will not be allowed. A revision to



the site plan for Phase V may be required at the time of approval of the final golf course site plan, Phase IA. Furthermore, for the above-stated reasons, Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block A, should not be platted prior to the final Detailed Site Plan approval for the golf course, at which time the tennis courts= location will be resolved.

10. Conformance with the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-R Zone, including the Requirements of the Prince George's County *Landscape Manual* The proposed plan is in general conformance with development regulations, Section 27-444, for Recreational Community Developments in the R-R Zone.

Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, applies to the subject site. The landscape plans appear to be in conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*, but the location of all required landscape yards and any proposed plant material is not clear. Therefore, it is recommended that the plans be revised to delineate the location of all landscape yards and plant materials to demonstrate compliance with Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*.

11. Trails The subject plan was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and in a memorandum dated December 13, 2000 (Shaffer to Jordan), it was noted that the Subregion I Master Plan, approved Preliminary Plat 4-96048, and approved Conceptual Site Plan SP-96021 all provide for a recreational trail system to be implemented as part of the entire Cross Creek development. The required trail system will ultimately run along the eastern edge of the subject development adjacent to the realigned Old Gunpowder Road, a portion of Briggs Chaney Road, residential Phases III and VI, and proposed open space to be dedicated to M-NCPPC.

The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) points out in its memorandum of January 5, 2001 (Asan to Jordan), that Condition 28 of Preliminary Plat 4-96048 requires construction of this trail prior to issuance of any building permits for Phase V or completion of relocated Gunpowder Road, whichever comes first. In order to be prepared for construction of the trail at the appropriate time, DPR is recommending conditions requiring approval by DPR of detailed construction drawings of the trail prior to signature approval of DSP-00048.

12. The subject property has approved Stormwater Management Concept Plans (CSD #978004163 and #978004165), which were approved on August 25, 2000.
13. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions, and significant issues were identified by the Environmental Planning Section (See Finding 7 above). The Permit Review Division provided several comments pertaining to additional information being provided on the plans. Although the plans have been revised subsequent to the receipt of the Permit Section memorandum, the applicant did not address all stated concerns. Conditions 1.a. and b. of the Recommendation section of this report address the Permit Review concerns. The Department of Public Works and

Transportation provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way. The plans should address these comments at the time of the review of permits.

14. In order to ensure that prospective purchasers in this subdivision are made aware of the existence of an approved Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations, and plans for recreational facilities, these plans must be displayed in the developer's office.
15. The 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/21//01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan SP-00048 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval, the Detailed Site Plan (and Tree Conservation Plan, where indicated) shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Provide minimum setbacks and percentage of lot coverage requirements for the R-R Zone in the general notes.
  - b. Provide percentage of lot coverage tables for each sheet.
  - c. Delineate the location of all required landscape yards and all proposed landscape material to demonstrate compliance to the requirements of Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*.
  - d. Provide an updated Overall Composite Plan for the Cross Creek Club Project which includes at a minimum accurate naming of parcels, phase lines, lot lines, plat numbers, areas, and a date.
  - e. Delineate the three management zones of the stream buffer environmental review area.
  - f. Approved grading on adjacent phases shall also be shown, and the Detailed Site Plan number shall be indicated.
  - g. All plans and area calculations shall clearly indicate that Parcel 7 is part of Phase IA.
  - h. Correct the location of the sewer easement along the southern boundary of Lot 1,

Block A. The easement shall be in conformance with the recorded plats for Phase IA.

- i. Correct all joint boundaries into conformance with the recorded plats for Phase IA.
  - j. Date all plan sheets.
  - k. The limits of disturbance shall be revised to minimize impacts to all adjacent parcels and to be in conformance with the approved TCP I. Grading impacts to Phase IA, or other adjacent phases, which were not previously approved, will require a revision to the Detailed Site Plan and Tree Conservation Plan for Phase IA prior to the issuance of grading permits for Phase V.
2. Prior to certificate approval, TCPII/21/01 shall be revised as follows:
- a. The woodland conservation summary worksheet shall be revised to indicate a net tract area for Phase V of 24.50 acres and 12.80 acres of existing woodlands.
  - b. Preservation Areas 1 and 3 shall be removed and the Woodland Conservation Worksheet adjusted to reflect this change.
  - c. The Woodland Conservation Summary Worksheet shall be revised and added to the TCP II.
  - d. The applicant shall graphically indicate a wooden fence on the plan sheets along the clearing edge on all private lots containing woodland preservation areas (Lots 7 through 18, Block A, and Lots 15 through 20, Block F). The fence shall be a minimum of 36 inches high and of the split rail style or an equivalent type proposed by the applicant, and approved by the Environmental Planning and Urban Design Review Sections. Appropriate details and notes shall be added to the plans. If the applicant chooses not to provide this fence, then proposed Preservation Area 2 shall be removed from the TCP II, and the woodland conservation worksheet shall be adjusted.
  - e. The applicant shall provide the revised TCP for Phase IA and associated information as stated in the January 10, 2001, letter from Faroll Hamer, Chief, Development Review, to Landscapes Unlimited. If a review of this information and the cumulative woodland conservation calculations for the site reveals that the overall site is in deficit for woodland conservation, the location of off-site woodland mitigation sites shall be provided by the applicant prior to certificate approval of the TCP II for Phase V. In proposing off-site woodland mitigation sites, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Environmental Planning Section that off-site woodland conservation sites are located in the Anacostia to the fullest extent possible.

3. Intrusions into conservation easements recorded in Phase IA which were not previously approved will require a revision to the Detailed Site Plan and Tree Conservation Plan, and a revision to the recorded easements prior to the issuance of grading permits for Phase V.
4. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-00048, the applicant shall have approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation detailed construction drawings for the entire length of the hiker/biker and equestrian trails (9,175 linear feet of 10-foot-wide equestrian, 12-foot-wide hiker/biker, and 10-foot-wide boardwalk) including layout, width, cross sections and landscaping along the trails. These plans shall also include the following:
  - a. Details approved by the Department of Public Works and Transportation for curb cuts and crosswalks at Bay Hill Drive Road, with traffic control signs for motor vehicles warning them of the trail crossing.
  - b. Hiker/biker and equestrian trail warning signs placed at a suitable distance in both directions from the Bay Hill Drive Road crossing; location and details of the signs to be approved by DPR.
5. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a revised Sediment and Erosion Control plan shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section which shows conformance with approved limits of disturbance and revised Phase V limits.
6. If off-site woodland mitigation is required, all affected Tree Conservation Plans shall be revised and submitted for approval, and the recorded easements shall be provided to the Environmental Planning Section.
7. Prior to the issuance of building permits the Detailed Site Plan shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Provide percentage of lot coverage for each lot, to be shown on the site plan as a table or on each lot.
8. Prior to final Detailed Site Plan approval for the golf course, SP-96056, all lots identified to be within golf ball flight path hazard areas, Lots 1-5, 12-23, Block A, and 2-10, Block E, shall not be platted, unless it is found that homes on the said lots are not in danger of damage by errant balls. If at such time it is determined that the proposed mitigation to relieve the hazard is insufficient, then the subject lots shall be deleted.
9. Prior to final Detailed Site Plan approval for the golf course, SP-96056, Lots 1, 2 and 3, Block A, shall not be platted unless it is determined that the said lots are not affected by the location of the tennis courts. Location of the approved tennis courts, per Conceptual Site Plan SP-96021, will be determined at the time of the golf course plan approval.
10. The developer, 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 Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan and plans for recreational facilities.

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 Brown, with Commissioners Lowe, Brown, Scott 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:JJ:rmk