

C O R R E C T E D 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 December 7, 2017, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063-04 for Signature Club at Manning Village, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Approval:** To develop 95 single-family detached and 218 single-family attached residential units. Future Phase 2 will add commercial development to the property.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use	Residential and Vacant	Residential
Acreage	*[70.49] <u>70.29</u>	*[70.49] <u>70.29</u>
100-year Floodplain	5.40	5.40
Net Tract Area	65.09	65.09
Dwelling Units	0	313 proposed
Total Square Footage	0	626,000

Overall Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the M-X-T Zone

Base Density Allowed	0.40 FAR
Residential Bonus Incentive	1.00 FAR
Total FAR Permitted:	1.40 FAR*
Total FAR Proposed:	0.25 FAR**

*Without the use of the optional method of development per Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance.

**Calculated using an average 2,000-square-foot building footprint for 313 units, divided by the net lot area, resulting in a floor area ratio (FAR) of 0.25.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

Parking Requirements*

Type of Unit	Number of Units/ Square Feet	Parking Rate	Spaces Required	Spaces Approved
Single-family Detached	95	2 per unit	190	380
Single-family Attached	218	2.04 per unit	449	598
Community Building	2,289	Per Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance	14	16 (including 2 handicapped)
Visitor Parking	N/A	N/A	N/A	6 (including 2 handicapped)
Total			653	1,000

The number of parking spaces for developments in the M-X-T Zone is to be calculated by the applicant, and submitted for approval by the Prince George's County Planning Board at the time of DSP, as stated in Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance. In this case, the applicant has provided 16 additional spaces for the community building, the multi-sport court, and the recreational amenities at the end of Tortola Drive, as well as providing 149 more parking spaces than required for the single-family detached units and 49 more than required for the single-family attached units. The Planning Board hereby finds that adequate parking has been provided for the development. However, all of the additional spaces are located on individual lots and will not be usable as visitor parking spaces. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, additional parking be added to the site plan to accommodate visitors to the townhouse portion of the development. The community building is parked for the specific uses, which includes a club room, kitchen, bathrooms, and office.

Section 27-583 of the Zoning Ordinance provides the requirements for the number of loading spaces required in the M-X-T Zone. Basically, it requires that the applicant determine the number of loading spaces normally required under Section 27-582 of the Zoning Ordinance, and determine if the loading spaces can be shared by two or more of the uses, taking into consideration the specifics of the case. In this case, Phase 1 of the development, which is only single-family residential uses, does not require loading.

- Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of the intersection of MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) and MD 228 (Berry Road), in Planning Area 84 and Council District 9.
- Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is bounded to the east by forested land, with single-family residential development beyond; to the south by single-family residential development; to the west by a combination of forested land and single-family detached residential development; and to the north by residential development.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The site is the subject of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050, approved by the Planning Board on July 20, 2000 and formalized by the Planning Board's adoption of PGCPB Resolution No. 00-142 on July 27, 2000. The Planning Board approved CSP-99050-01 on November 3, 2005 and formalized that approval by the adoption of PGCPB Resolution No. 05-228 on December 1, 2005. The site is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-01063 approved on January 10, 2002 and formalized by the adoption of PGCPB Resolution No. 02-07 on February 7, 2002. The PPS was granted a one-year extension on April 24, 2004 and, on February 2, 2017, the applicant requested that the Planning Board waive their rules and reconsider the case. The Planning Board agreed and on July 20, 2017 reapproved the PPS. An amended resolution was adopted on July 20, 2017. The project is also subject to Stormwater Management Concept Plan 32197-2004-03, approved on April 19, 2017 and valid until April 19, 2020.

6. **Design Features:**

Site Design—The project is nestled on the eastern side of the intersection of MD 210 and MD 228, with its sole vehicular access from Manning Road in the southernmost corner of the development. Private roads, Caribbean Way, Tortola Drive, Southwind Drive, and Anageda Drive, provide frontage for the 218 townhouses included in the development before terminating in a culs-de-sac in the most western point of the development. The single-family detached section of the development is generally located in its northern portion, fronting on Tortola Drive, which runs from the extreme southern portion to its most northern corner. Guest parking is provided both at the community building and the end of Tortola Drive, where the balance of the recreational facilities are located. There is currently an occupied two-family attached dwelling existing on the property, known as "Building Phase 10" recorded on *~~[Condominium Plat]~~ Phasing Plan PM 232-67, dated June 10, 2010, constructed pursuant to previous approvals. The existing two-family dwelling is to remain based on the plans submitted for both the PPS and DSP. This area was included in the PPS, reconsidered and approved, reflecting the existing dwellings to be located on proposed Lots 24 and 25. However, by letter dated November 27, 2017, in reference to the subject approval, Macarthur Development LLS and Premier Bank Inc (Owner) state that "[I]t is uncertain what interest was conveyed by the various deeds in Phase 10," and they request that "Building Phase 10" be removed from the DSP due to uncertainty in the deeds.

The record plat (PM 232-67) provides bearings and distances including the square footage of Building Phase 10 (8,708 square feet). Both the PPS and the current DSP reflect that Lots 24 and 25 are 5,434 square feet. The Planning Board requested an exhibit from the applicant showing the impact of the removal of the Building Phase 10 from the site plan including necessary adjustments to other plan elements including landscaping and the lotting pattern. As that exhibit has not been

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

provided, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certification of the site plan, the applicant shall adjust the site plan as they have requested; Building Phase 10 (PM 232-67) will be removed from the plans for the project and made other adjustments as deemed necessary.

Architecture—The single-family detached units are exclusively offered by Caruso Homes, Inc., and range in size from 1,801 square feet to 3,102 square feet in minimum base finished square footage. Architectural styles vary, but visual interest is created throughout by variety in the form and massing of the units, the use of architectural detail, and quality architectural materials including various forms of masonry. Porches, porticos, and double-story features provide artistic accents on some of the models.

Visual interest is created in the townhouse units by the fenestration on the façades, together with the use of architectural detail, such as rowlocks above the window openings, pilasters on either side of the entrance doors, or the use of paneled doors both on the pedestrian entrances and on the garage doors.

The architecture of the community building is designed to fit in with the residential architecture on the site. It also utilizes form and massing, fenestration patterns, and the use of architectural detail to create visual interest. Also, quality masonry materials are utilized, which ground the architecture and lend a feeling of permanence. Glazing is somewhat more pervasive on the architecture of the community building, which gives it a welcoming air, and a roofed drop-off area will provide a practical amenity.

Architecture for the project includes the following architectural models:

Single-family Detached

Model	Minimum Base Finished Square Footage
Michigan	2,129
Monterey	2,658
Stanford	1,801
Dartmouth	2,477
Oxford	2,597
Emory II	2,868
Princeton	3,002
Rembrandt	3,102

Townhouse

Model	Minimum Base Finished Square Footage
Adams	1,623
Chesapeake	2,159
Magothy	2,019
Mozart	1,588
Strauss	1,852
Struss 2/attic	1,832
Leighton	1,869
Potomac	2,199
Schubert	1,971
Syracuse	2,946
Kingsport	3,516
Lexington II	3,360

Recreational Facilities—Recreational facilities for the project include a community building; which includes a clubroom, kitchen, bathrooms, office, storage, porch, and an adjacent picnic area, and 48-foot-wide by 80-foot-long multipurpose sport court; and a series of play equipment in three separate areas. The provided play equipment meets the suggestions of the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

Signage—A single gateway entrance sign is provided for the development. It measures approximately 9 feet 4 inches long and seven feet high. It is constructed of brick veneer, with the sign face made of a herringbone insert. The sill below the sign face is specified as “rowlock,” with a header frame and mitre corners. Cast stone is used on the sign monument for pier caps and coping.

Site Details—Details for the sound attenuation wall, the handicapped parking post, sign and parking stall layout, the retaining wall, and the multipurpose sport court are provided for the project on Sheet 13 of the DSP. Details for the concrete walk, the asphalt trail, pavers, the playground surface, the bike rack, trash receptacles, and fencing, are included on Sheet LSP5.01 of the landscape plan. The Planning Board has reviewed the site details included on the project plans, and found them acceptable for inclusion in the project design.

Green Building and Sustainable Techniques—The applicant has not provided any information regarding the use of green building and sustainable techniques in the project.

Lighting—Lighting for the project is to be provided by two types of fixtures, one in the parking area and one along the roadways. The Planning Board has reviewed the provided detailed specifications and finds them acceptable, though a downward-facing fixture is preferred, as it is less likely to produce spill light beyond the property boundaries. Additionally, a photometric plan

was not provided for the project. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant revise the plans to solely utilize a downward-facing light fixture and provide a photometric plan for review and approval by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject DSP has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. The subject approval is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547, Uses Permitted, of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed single-family attached and detached residential uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone, subject to Footnote 7, which requires that the maximum number and type of dwelling units be determined at the time of CSP approval. Conceptual Site Plan CSP 99050-01 approved the maximum number and type of dwelling units including: 111 single-family detached dwelling units, 140 townhouses, 4 two-family units, and 60 multifamily dwelling units. The subject DSP is within these limits for dwelling units.

b. Section 27-548, M-X-T Zone regulations, establishes additional standards for the development in this zone. The DSP's conformance with the applicable provisions is discussed as follows:

(a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):

- (1) Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR**
- (2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR**

The maximum FAR with this DSP is 0.25, which meets this requirement.

(b) The uses allowed in the M-X-T Zone may be located in more than one (1) building, and on more than one (1) lot.

The approval locates the residential units in more than one building and on more than one lot, as allowed by the M-X-T regulations.

(c) Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.

The approval includes regulations for location and lot coverage for improvements on the subject site. However, a dimensional limit for height was not included. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that it be included prior to certificate approval. Note that structures included in the project include only single-family detached and single-family attached dwelling units and a community building, which is approximately one and one-half stories tall. The maximum height of any of the structures to be included in the DSP is not expected to be excessive.

- (d) Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.**

Conformance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) is analyzed in Finding 11 below.

- (g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.**

The overall development is accessed by private streets, including both the individual townhouse and single-family detached lots. The use of private streets and alleys has been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24, in the approval of PPS 4-01063.

- (h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least one thousand eight hundred (1,800) square feet in size, and shall have at least sixty percent (60%) of the full front facades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco. In addition, there shall be no more than six (6) townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than six (6) dwelling units (but not more than eight (8) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than six (6) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be twenty (20) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. The minimum lot size, maximum number of units per building group and percentages of such**

building groups, and building width requirements and restrictions shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000. In no event shall there be more than ten (10) dwelling units in a building group and no more than two (2) building groups containing ten (10) dwelling units. For purposes of this section, a building group shall be considered a separate building group (even though attached) when the angle formed by the front walls of two (2) adjoining rows of units is greater than forty-five degrees (45°). Except that, in the case of a Mixed-Use Planned Community, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except when the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be twenty-two (22) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. Garages may not dominate the streetscape. Garages that are attached or incorporated into the dwelling shall be set back a minimum of four (4) feet from the front façade and there shall not be more than a single garage, not to exceed ten (10) feet wide, along the front façade of any individual unit. Garages are preferred to may be incorporated into the rear of the building or freestanding in the rear yard and accessed by an alley. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all public and private streets and parking lots. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve a request to substitute townhouses, proposed for development as condominiums, in place of multifamily dwellings that were approved in a Conceptual Site Plan approved prior to April 1, 2004. Such substitution shall not require a revision to any previous plan approvals. Further, at the time of Detailed Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Planned Community, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve modifications to these regulations so long as the modifications conform to the applicable regulations for the particular development.

Each of the requirements of Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance for townhouses is discussed in turn below:

Each of the townhouse lots must measure at least 1,800 square feet.

Pursuant to a variance approved with the reconsideration of PPS 4-01063, the minimum lot size allowed is 1,639 square feet. The lot sizes proposed on the DSP are in conformance with the PPS approval.

Each townhouse shall have 60 percent of its front façade constructed of brick, stone or stucco.

The applicant has provided charts on Sheet SP-2 of the plan set demonstrating, among other things, that 60 percent, or 132 of the townhouses, will have a predominantly brick front, in accordance with this requirement.

No more than six townhouses per building group except where the applicant demonstrates that more than six, but not more than eight would create a more attractive living environment or be more environmentally sensitive.

Of the 218 townhouse units included in the development, there are only five sticks of townhouses which include more than six units, but not more than eight.

Permitting these few townhouse sticks to exceed six units in length will help create a more attractive living environment, or be more environmentally-sensitive, in accordance with the required finding. Avoidance of the wetlands and floodplain on-site, as well as the power line easement traversing the site, create design constraints that are addressed by consolidating units into longer groups in some areas.

The building groups containing more than six units shall not exceed 20 percent of those in the development.

Of the 43 sticks of townhouses included in the development, only five exceed six units in length. Therefore, approximately 12 percent of the sticks in the development exceed six townhouses in length, which is well within the limit set by this requirement.

Such groups shall have end units that measure a minimum of 24 feet wide.

In a reconsideration of the PPS 4-01063, for the subject project, PGCPB Resolution No. 02-07(A)), the Planning Board considered and approved a variance from Section 27-548(h), which included among other things, that the end units of townhouse building groups exceeding six units in length be a minimum of 22 feet wide. Therefore, it is acceptable that the subject project does not, in all instances, meet this requirement.

The minimum width in any continuous, attached group shall be 20 feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be 1,250 square feet (excepting garage, unfinished basement or attic areas).

All units measure a minimum of 20 feet wide and have a minimum gross living space of 1,250 square feet, excepting garages, unfinished basements, or attic areas, in accordance with this requirement.

- (j) **As noted in Section 27-544(b), which references property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, regulations for Conceptual or Detailed Site Plans (such as, but not limited to density, setbacks, buffers, screening, landscaping, height, recreational requirements, ingress/egress, and internal circulation) should be based on the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or the Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change and any referenced exhibit of record for the property. This regulation also applies to property readopted in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006 and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation of a concurrent Master Plan or Sector Plan (see Section 27-226(f)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance).**

This section is not applicable, as the property was placed in the M-X-T Zone through a sectional map amendment approved before October 1, 2006.

- c. The DSP is in conformance with the applicable site plan site design guidelines contained in Section 27-283, as cross-referenced in Section 27-274.
- d. The subject approval has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires additional findings for the Planning Board to approve a DSP in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

- (1) **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division:**

The development conforms to the purposes as stated in Section 27-542(a) of the Zoning Ordinance and other provisions of the Division of the Zoning Ordinance that pertain to mixed-use zones. The purposes of the M-X-T Zone, as stated in Section 27-542(a), include the following:

- (1) To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, and major transit stops, so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;**

This project promotes the orderly redevelopment of the subject property by redeveloping it with single-family detached and attached units in an organized pattern, in accordance with this requirement. The subject project will enhance the economic status of Prince George's County by providing and expanding the source of desirable living opportunities for its citizens. Employment opportunities for its citizens will be provided by other phases of the Signature Club at Manning Village development.

- (2) To implement recommendations in the approved General Plan, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, by creating compact, mixed-use, walkable communities enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses;**

The project implements the vision of the 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA) by providing a portion of the residential component that has been envisioned. Other portions of the larger Signature Club at Manning Village development will provide commercial land uses to create the desired compact and walkable community, in accordance with this requirement.

- (3) To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;**

The subject project comprises part of the residential portion of the larger mixed-use development, Signature Club at Manning Village. In its entirety, the project will conserve the value of land and buildings by creating a compact mixed-use development in which people can live, shop, and work; thereby, maximizing the public and private development potential in the subject location. Otherwise, the property might be developed with a single use, with the remaining uses located on separate sites, without the benefit of being proximate to complementary distinct land uses.

- (4) To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems;**

The DSP conforms to the underlying CSP and PPS, which evaluated and set limits regarding transportation systems. Therefore, the subject project promotes the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems in the vicinity, in accordance with this requirement.

- (5) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;**

The DSP proposes low- to medium-density housing. The larger CSP shows commercial land uses, which will complement the residential, to create a 24-hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours, through an increase in activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area.

- (6) To encourage diverse land uses which blend together harmoniously;**

The DSP is solely for a residential land use. However, the larger development will offer commercial land uses enabling the subject development to be one of several diverse uses that will blend together harmoniously in conformance to this requirement. Future phases of the Signature Club at Manning Village development will be encouraged to be harmonious in design, to the extent practical, and to be coordinated visually through the site design processes.

- (7) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;**

The subject DSP will provide a low- to medium-density residential development component of a larger development that will create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive character and identity. More particularly, the larger Signature Club at Manning Village development, as approved in CSP-99050-01, is an organized phased development. Future phases will include commercial land use that will create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses. Distinctive visual character and identity will be ensured, as demonstrated in the subject DSP, through the development review process and the Planning Board's approval.

- (8) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale and savings in energy beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;**

The subject property is development of mostly vacant land. Developing this site promotes optimum land planning, as it adds a low- to medium-density residential use, which will be adjacent to the future commercial uses.

(9) To permit a flexible response to the market; and

The M-X-T Zone is one of the mixed-use zones that was created to allow developers maximum flexibility to respond to the changing market. The DSP proposes 218 attached and 95 detached single-family units. The original DSP approval was for an age-restricted condominium development, which has changed in response to the market, in accordance with this purpose.

(10) To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.

The architectural models herein approved exhibit aesthetically-pleasing architectural design utilizing brick, stone, and vinyl siding. Enhanced treatment of the units to be placed on highly-visible lots will ensure excellence in planning.

(2) For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;

This regulation is not applicable to this DSP, as the property was placed in the M-X-T Zone through the 1993 Subregion V Sectional Map Amendment approved before October 1, 2006.

(3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

The subject project has an outward orientation. The project road frontages along MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) and MD 228 (Berry Road) are generously landscaped and will provide an aesthetic aspect to passersby, in addition to the attractive monument sign provided for the project. This, together with generous buffering along the common property lines, will assist in physically and visually enhancing the existing community and catalyzing rejuvenation.

(4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

The residential development approved herein will be compatible with the future phases of the larger Signature Club at Manning Village development by a proposed condition of this approval. In this way, the Planning Board will ensure that the residential development will be buffered from the future commercial development through the use of landscaping.

- (5) The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;**

The subject project involves only a residential use. However, the rest of the phases of the Signature Club at Manning Village development will provide commercial land use, which will be designed, by condition of this approval, to be well-coordinated with this residential land use in both its architectural design and landscaping approach to create a development capable of sustaining an independent environment of high quality and stability, in accordance with this requirement.

- (6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

The residential dwelling units herein approved are to be completed in a single stage. Therefore, this requirement is not relevant to the subject project. However, this DSP is the first phase of a larger development and will complement the other phases in this project.

- (7) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

The DSP shows sidewalks along all private roads. Some additional connections have been provided in this DSP to link this site to the other phases of the larger development, forming a comprehensive pedestrian network to encourage pedestrian activity throughout the development.

- (8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

Hardscape elements will be of quality design, in accordance with this requirement. The noise wall fencing will include panels with an aesthetic brick design, and the keystone retaining wall presents an attractive design. The benches and paving proximate to the community building and the other recreational areas, specifically used for pedestrian activities and gathering places, are designed in accordance with these requirements, with attention to human scale, high-quality urban design. Landscaping is generous, especially

on the peripheries of the development and proximate to the community building and other provided recreational amenities. It is complemented by choice of quality hardscape details such as benches and trash receptacles.

- (9) **On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

The subject approval is not a CSP, so this finding is not applicable.

- (10) **On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club).**

All transportation facilities needed to serve the current approval will be available within a reasonable time period, as required by this section of the Zoning Ordinance.

- (11) **On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.**

The subject property it is not being developed as a Mixed-Use Planned Community. Therefore, this requirement is not relevant to the subject approval.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 and its revision:** The Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 on July 20, 2000, adopting PGCPB Resolution No. 00-142, formalizing that approval. The Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050-01 on November 3, 2005, adopting PGCPB Resolution No. 05-228 on December 1, 2005, formalizing

the approval. The District Council affirmed the Planning Board's decision in an Order dated April 10, 2006. The relevant conditions of that approval are included in **boldface** type below, followed by Planning Board comment.

2. **A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan. As part of this approval, the review shall reevaluate the small tree save areas adjacent to the SMECO easement, reevaluate clearing in the wetland buffer on the north side of the main wetland system just west of the internal street crossing, and evaluate a woodland planting or landscaped connection between the isolated wetlands in the northern open space.**

Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-039-01-03 is recommended to be approved, together with the subject DSP, in conformance with this requirement.

4. **The location and appearance of the required noise attenuation structures shall be reviewed and approved with the detailed site plan and Type II tree conservation plan.**

The location and appearance of the required noise attenuation structures have been reviewed and are recommended for approval, together with the subject DSP and TCPH, in accordance with this requirement.

6. **At the time of detailed site plan, special attention shall be given, but shall not be limited to, the following:**

- a. **The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.**

The Planning Board reviewed streetscape design including sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings and sitting areas, and finds it acceptable.

- b. **The designated focal point areas of the subject property to include human scale, urban design, materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.**

Review of the plans show that the focal point areas have been well designed at human scale and include quality urban design landscape and hardscape in accordance with this requirement.

c. The building materials and architecture.

The Planning Board herein approves eight single-family detached and 12 single-family attached architectural models for the subject project, which have been found to be acceptable and utilizes quality masonry materials which ground the architecture and lend a feeling of permanence. Special attention has been given to building materials and architecture in accordance with this requirement.

d. Perimeter landscaping/screening of all development pods shall exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a, of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.

As the commercial component of the project is not a part of the subject DSP, Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements, becomes irrelevant. Section 4.3, likewise, has become irrelevant to the subject project as there are no parking lots which measure greater than 7,000 square feet.

e. Parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of plant quantities by no less than 25 percent.

The project herein approved is located in Pod 2. Therefore, this requirement is not relevant to the subject approval.

f. Provision of a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2.

Although this condition is contained both in the approval for CSP-99050 and CSP-99050/01, neither a location nor a specific description of said public amenity have been provided. A condition of this approval requires that the applicant work with the Accokeek Development Review District Commission to determine the appropriateness of a public amenity for the site and, if it is determined appropriate, a precise location and specific description of the proposed public amenity or provide another public amenity within the development subject to approval by the Planning Board and its designee.

g. The maximum height of office structures shall be limited to a maximum of 3-4 stories. The maximum height of residential structures shall be limited to 5-6 stories.

As office development is not included in the subject project, the first part of this requirement is not applicable. The tallest residential structure is proposed to be 47 feet, well in accordance with the 5–6 story requirement.

- h. The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. A comprehensive design approach is recommended.**

The commercial/retail component are not part of this project. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable to the subject approval.

- i. The provision of a gasoline station use on any pad site within the development. The proposed architecture shall be of a high quality and shall be compatible with the surrounding commercial/retail components with respect to materials and articulation.**

The commercial/retail component are not part of this project. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable to the subject approval.

- 7. Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures which will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section which reflect those components.**

The noise attenuation measures are clearly shown on the plans, in accordance with this requirement.

- 9. Appropriate signage and pavement markings should be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and Manning Road intersection.**

A condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the plans be revised to include appropriate signage and pavement markings at the MD 228 and Manning Road intersection, in order to accommodate safe pedestrian crossings, in accordance with this requirement.

- 10. A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour and shall be submitted as part of the detailed site plan submission. The study shall include noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA.**

A Phase II noise study was prepared and submitted for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour, as required. The study included noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA, also in accordance with this requirement.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063 for Manokeek was approved by the Planning Board on January 10, 2002. The Planning Board adopted PGCPB Resolution No. 02-07 formalizing that approval on February 7, 2002. The case was granted a one-year extension by the Planning Board on April 22, 2004. On February 2, 2017, the applicant requested the case be reheard, and that the rules be waived. On June 16, 2017, the Planning Board granted the applicant's reconsideration request. On July 20, 2017, the Planning Board reconsidered the request and approved the case. On the same day, the Planning Board adopted amended PGCPB Resolution No. 02-07(A), subject to conditions, formalizing that approval. As the case has not received signature approval, a condition of this approval requires that the applicant provide evidence that the case received signature approval prior to the subject DSP receiving certificate approval.

The following conditions are relevant to the review of the subject DSP, in **boldface** text followed by Planning Board comment:

2. **A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved in conjunction with the Detailed Site Plan.**

Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-039-01-03 is herein approved, together with the subject DSP, in conformance with this requirement.

4. **A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour and shall be submitted as part of the Detailed Site Plan submission. The study shall include noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA.**

This condition was met with the previous DSP approval. A Phase II noise study was prepared and submitted for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour, as required. The study included noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA, also in accordance with this requirement.

5. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide an internal trail system, subject to the following:**

- a. **All internal *homeowners' association paths/trails shall be a minimum of six feet wide and asphalt.**
- b. **Appropriate signage and pavement markings shall be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and Manning Road intersection.**

Conditions of this approval ensure that these requirements regarding trails and pedestrian safety are met.

- 6. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 800 units of senior housing and 70,000 square feet of mixed retail and office space; or different uses allowed under the governing Conceptual Site Plan which generate no more than the number of peak hour trips (244 AM peak hour trips and 366 PM peak hour trips) generated by the above development. Community facilities, skilled care facilities, and incidental office and retail space which are not public but are developed within the senior housing community shall be considered a part of the 800-unit community. Any development which generates a greater impact than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plat of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

This requirement places a trip cap on the subject site, based on 800 units of senior housing. The subject plan only proposes 315 units. The community recreational building, from the standpoint of trip generation, is considered part of the residential complex and is not assumed to contribute additional trips under the cap. The cap also includes a sizeable retail component; the subject plan proposes no retail space. Therefore, the subject plan complies with this condition.

- 9. In addition to normal review, the Detailed Site Plan review shall consider:**
 - a. The proximity of the residential structures to the power lines, with a goal of maximizing that distance.**
 - b. Landscaping necessary to minimize the visual impact of the development on adjoining properties.**
 - c. Building height and views.**

The DSP review has considered the proximity of the dwelling units to the power lines, the visual impact of the development on adjoining properties, and building height and views, in conformance with this requirement. Note that a 40-foot-wide landscape buffer is maintained on either side of the high-voltage power lines, that the project is well landscaped in accordance with the Landscape Manual, and that building heights are limited by virtue of the single-family detached and attached housing product to be utilized on the site. All of this is in conformance with the above requirement.

- 10. Development of the site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Concept Plan 8004410-2000-01, or any revisions thereto.**

In a memorandum dated October 25, 2017 (Giles to Grover), the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) stated that the subject Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063-04 is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 32197-2004-03 dated April 19, 2017, in conformance with this requirement.

- 11. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.**

The private recreational facilities have been reviewed, in accordance with this requirement, for adequacy and proper siting and are designed in accordance with the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

- 14. The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.**

A homeowners association will be formed to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities, in accordance with this requirement.

- 16. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.**

The private recreational facilities have been reviewed, in accordance with this requirement, for adequacy and proper siting and are designed in accordance with the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

- *25. At the time of detailed site plan, provide a color-coded utility plan locating all existing and proposed public and private utilities. The location of public utility easements shall be shown on the detailed site plan.**

A color-coded utility plan locating all existing and proposed public and private utilities was submitted to the Planning Board, and the location of public utility easements was shown on the DSP, in accordance with this requirement.

- *26. The final location of the portion of the wall abutting stormwater pond basin #2 shall be further evaluated prior to approval of the detailed site plan.**

The final location of the portion of the wall abutting Stormwater Pond Basin #2 was evaluated as required by this condition during the DSP process.

10. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 and its revisions:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 was approved by the Planning Board on December 1, 2005. The Planning Board adopted PGCPB Resolution No. 05-250 on December 22, 2005, formalizing this approval. The District Council then called up the case and affirmed the Planning Board's action on April 10, 2006. Subsequently, three Planning Director level revisions were approved, two for the addition of architectural model types and one to replace the sound wall along MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) and MD 228 (Berry Road) for part of the frontage of Lot 11. The approval of the subject DSP is intended to supersede the original approval of DSP-04063. Therefore, none of the requirements of the original case are relevant to the subject DSP revision. However, the Planning Board finds that the architectural treatment of the highly-visible lots in the original approval be considered for the subject DSP to create a superior visual aspect for the development, as a whole. More particularly, the Planning Board finds that brick should be utilized on the entire front elevations or on the watertable of the units on these lots and wrapped to the side. Additionally, the Planning Board finds that the units be required to have an attractive pattern of fenestration and a minimum of three architectural features on all side elevations/endwalls. The Planning Board has reviewed the project plans and suggests that the following four lots also be deemed highly visible and be added to the Highly-Visible Lots exhibit on the cover sheet of the DSP: Lots 61, 252, 301 and 327.

A condition of this approval requires such enhanced architecture on the lots herein deemed "highly visible," with final approval of the design by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

11. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance, landscaping, screening, and buffering within the M-X-T Zone should be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. The following discussion is offered regarding the applicable provisions of the Landscape Manual:
- a. **Section 4.1, Residential Requirements**—Section 4.1 requires that a minimum number of trees be provided per single-family detached and townhouse lots, which for the townhouses may be provided on lots or in common open space. The correct schedule is provided on the landscape plan. However, the requirements are not being met for the proposed 95 detached and 218 townhouses lots. Therefore, the applicant applied for alternative compliance, pursuant to Section 1.3 of the Landscape Manual. See discussion below.
 - b. **Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets**—Section 4.6 requires that, when rear yards of single-family attached and detached dwellings are oriented toward a street, a buffer area should be provided between the development and the street. On the subject application, the DSP shows multiple residential lots that this section is applicable to, and the required schedules. However, the requirements are not being met fully. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant procure alternative compliance approval from the requirements of Section 4.6 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*

- c. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—Section 4.7 requires a bufferyard between adjacent incompatible land uses, which includes the vacant R-R-zoned land to the east and a high-voltage power line, which traverses the site. The applicant has not provided the appropriate schedules demonstrating conformance with the requirements of Section 4.7. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate of approval, the applicant revise the landscape plan to provide the appropriate schedules demonstrating conformance with Section 4.7 of the Landscape Manual.
- d. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—Section 4.9 requires that a certain percentage of plants within each plant type (including shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees, and shrubs) should be native species (or the cultivars of native species). The minimum percentage of plants of each plant type required to be native species and/or cultivars is specified below:

Shade trees	50 percent
Ornamental trees	50 percent
Evergreen trees	30 percent
Shrubs	30 percent

The landscape plan provides 100 percent native shade trees, 100 percent native ornamental trees, 58 percent native evergreen trees, and 100 percent native shrubs and, therefore, meets the above requirements.

- e. **Section 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets**—Section 4.10 provides specifics for the planting of street trees along private streets, which applies to the subject development. Though the applicant provided the appropriate schedule, conformance with the requirements was not demonstrated and alternative compliance, pursuant to Section 1.3 of the Landscape Manual, was required. See discussion below.
- f. **Alternative Compliance AC-17020**—Alternative Compliance (AC) AC-17020 requested relief from the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* for Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements and 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets for Signature Club at Manning Village. The Planning Director's recommendation to the Planning Board for the request is as follows:

The application is currently subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets, Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements; and Section 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) because it involves construction of new buildings on the subject property. The applicant has filed this request for Alternative Compliance from Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements, to allow planting off the lots of the single family detached lots, and 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets, to:

- (1) Allow flexibility in the quantity of street trees along streets; and
- (2) Allow an alternative configuration from the requirement in Section 4.10(c)(1) that states that “Street Trees shall be located in a space not less than five (5) feet wide between the street curb or edge of planting and the sidewalk.” Instead, the applicant requests to use an alternate sidewalk and green space configuration along some of the proposed private streets that would place the sidewalk along the street curb and the green space behind the sidewalk.

Section 4.1, Residential Requirements

The applicant is asking for relief from the requirements of Section 4.1 to allow for a reduced quantity of the planting materials required on the lots for the single-family detached component of the development. The applicant justifies their request by stating that they have attempted to provide trees on the lots, but that there are space limitations due to narrow rear yards and due to the abundance of utilities along the frontage of the lots. The applicant also asks for relief from the requirements for the on-lot planting within the townhouse development; however, Alternative Compliance is not necessary for that component of the development because the required plantings are allowed to be placed either on the lot or in the common open space.

Section 4.1 of the Landscape Manual requires a minimum of two shade trees and two ornamental trees on single-family detached (SFD) lots less than 9,500 square feet. It should be noted that the proposed lot sizes for the single-family detached lots, as approved with the preliminary plan of subdivision, are much smaller than 9,500 square feet; generally, between 4,750 square feet to 6,500 square feet. The application has been analyzed and it is found that the proposed plant material is generally provided at a minimum rate of at least one shade tree and one ornamental or evergreen tree for each of the single-family lots. The schedules indicate 125 shade trees are provided and 174 ornamental evergreen trees are provided on the single-family detached lots. The application also provides an abundance of planting in and around the open-space areas at the perimeter of the lots, which will provide for adequate landscaping for the overall community. Combining the number of shade trees, ornamental, and evergreen trees required for the overall development based on the rates required per Section 4.1 for both the single-family detached lots and the townhouse lots, results in 515 shade trees required and 635 shade trees provided, or 23 percent more shade trees on the overall site. There are 406 ornamental and/or evergreen trees required on the site and 894 trees are provided, or 120 percent more ornamental and/or evergreens than the numbers required per Section 4.1 for the overall site.

The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends APPROVAL of Alternative Compliance for Section 4.1 for the single-family detached lots as shown on the plans, due to the plentiful planting in and around the lots and the open-space areas adjacent to the single-family detached neighborhood.

Section 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets

The applicant requests relief from Section 4.10, to allow flexibility in the quantity of street trees along specific streets, and to allow an alternative configuration from the requirement in 4.10(c)(1) that states that “Street Trees shall be located in a space not less than five (5) feet wide between the street curb or edge of planting and the sidewalk.” Instead, the applicant requests to use an alternate sidewalk and green space configuration along some of the private streets to place the sidewalk along the street curb and the green space behind the sidewalk. It should be noted that the entire street system within the development is proposed as a private street system, so all streets are subject to the requirements of Section 4.10.

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Caribbean Way

Length of street frontage	1,190 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	34

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Caribbean Way

Length of street frontage	1,190 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	53

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Tortola Drive

Length of street frontage	1,165 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	34

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Tortola Drive

Length of street frontage	1,165 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	77

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Anegada Drive

Length of street frontage	610 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	18

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Anegada Drive

Length of street frontage	610 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	17

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Southwind Drive

Length of street frontage	435 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	13

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Southwind Drive

Length of street frontage	435 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	19

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Wingfoot Court

Length of street frontage	550 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	16

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Wingfoot Court

Length of street frontage	550 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	9

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Buco Reef Loop

Length of street frontage	1,690 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	48

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Buco Reef Loop

Length of street frontage	1,690 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	48

REQUIRED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Tobago Way

Length of street frontage	195 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	6

PROVIDED: 4.10 Street Trees Along Private Streets, along Tobago Way

Length of street frontage	195 linear feet
Street trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	8

Justification of Recommendation

The applicant is requesting Alternative Compliance from Section 4.10, Street Trees Along Private Streets, along all private streets on the site for the location of the proposed street trees. The Landscape Manual requires that street trees be located between the street curb and the sidewalk. The applicant is proposing to exceed the total required number of street trees but is proposing to locate the street trees, in some places, behind the curb and sidewalk as approved in the previous DSP applications for the site. This design, which consolidates the green area to one side of the paving, may allow for a larger green area for planting the street trees. Two of the streets are short on the number of street trees required, specifically, Anegada Drive and Wingfoot Court. However, the overall street system requires 169 street trees, and the number of street trees provided for the overall site is 231 street trees, or 36 percent more street trees than required. The Alternative Compliance Committee finds the proposed alternative compliance measures to be equally effective as normal compliance with Section 4.10 of the Landscape Manual along Anegada Drive and Wingfoot Court, as the missing trees on these streets are provided along other streets within the community.

Recommendation

The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends APPROVAL of, and the Planning Board herein approves, Alternative Compliance for Sections 4.1 for the single-family detached lots and Section 4.10, along Anegada Drive and Wingfoot Court, of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, for Signature Club at Manning Village, Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063-04, with the following condition:

- (1) Prior to certificate approval of the DSP all schedules shall be adjusted to reflect the calculations as represented herein.

12. **Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The project is grandfathered with respect to the environmental regulations contained in Subtitles 24, 25, and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because this is a revision to a previous Detailed Site Plan approval (DSP-04063-03) that was approved prior to that date. The current approval request does not affect the grandfathering status of the project. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-039-01-03, was submitted for review.

The Woodland Conservation Worksheet shows a gross tract area of 70.49 acres and an on-site floodplain area of 5.96 acres. The net tract was originally forested with 62.34 acres and the floodplain was originally forested with 5.96 acres. The site has a woodland conservation threshold of 9.68 acres and a total woodland conservation requirement of 22.26 acres, based on clearing a cumulative total of 48.82 acres. The previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-039-01-02) provided 12.25 acres of on-site preservation. The current plan shows the requirement being met with 12.13 acres of on-site preservation and 10.09 acres of credits for off-site mitigation on another property. No on-site woodland reforestation is proposed with this submittal.

As conditions of this approval would bring the submitted TCPII into conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, it may be said that the subject project meets its requirements.

13. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, of the Prince George's County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading permit. Properties that are zoned M-X-T are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in TCC. The required coverage for the subject 70.49-acre property is 7 acres. The DSP has included the appropriate schedule, which indicates compliance with this requirement for the DSP.
14. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
 - a. **Historic Preservation and Archeological Review**—Phase I and II archeological investigations had been conducted on the subject property in 2005. Further, they stated that one Archeological Site, 18PR795—a Middle Archaic short-term prehistoric camp, was identified in the southern portion of the property near MD 228 (Berry Road). Phase II evaluation determined that additional archeological investigations were not necessary. The subject property has since been graded and extensively disturbed. There are no historic sites or historic resources on, or adjacent to, the subject property. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources, or known archeological site.
 - b. **Community Planning**—Master plan conformance is not required for the approval, and the project is located in an Established Community, according to the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035), which is appropriate for context-sensitive infill and low- to medium-density development. Additionally, noting that the project is in the land area covered by the 2013 Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA, its adoption retained the subject property in the M-X-T Zone. The project is located in Planning Area 84, the Piscataway and Vicinity community, and not within an Aviation Policy Area or the Military Installation Zone.

- c. **Transportation**—Based on the review of the DSP, the site is composed of Plat 45, Lot 11; Plat 46, Lot 12; and Parcel 25. Specifically, the residential portion of the project is Lot 11, with a portion of Parcel 25, as it will provide a private access road into the development. In reviewing Lot 11, the plat notes that access along both MD 228 (Berry Road) and MD 210 (Indian Head Highway) is denied. Not reviewed was Lot 12, as that will be developed as a commercial facility in the future.

As established with the Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA, roadway improvements are planned along MD 210, as it is a major commuter route linking Southern Maryland to Washington, D.C. The master plan recommends upgrading MD 210 to freeway status from the Subregion 7 boundary to MD 228. Also, from MD 228 to Charles County, MD 210 would be upgraded to an expressway (F-11). The proposed right-of-way varies, and six to eight lanes are proposed. No structures or other improvements within the site are proposed within the ultimate right-of-way.

Access to the Signature Club at Manning Village residential development will be through Manning Drive East, an existing roadway. There is no direct access onto MD 210 or MD 228.

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063 have several transportation-related conditions, which are discussed in Findings 8 and 9 above. All transportation facilities needed to serve the current approval will be available within a reasonable period of time, as required by Section 27-546(d)(10) of the Zoning Ordinance.

- d. **Subdivision**—The subject property is located on Tax Map 161 in Grids D-1, D-2, E-1, and E-2. The site is known as Lot 11, consists of 57.22 acres, and was recorded in Plat Book REP 205-45 on March 9, 2005. The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063.

The PPS was originally approved subject to 17 conditions. The reconsideration revised Condition 17 and added 9 additional conditions. See Finding 9 for a detailed discussion of the relevant conditions of that approval.

Other subdivision-related comments have either been addressed by revisions to the plan or by conditions of this approval.

- e. **Trails**—Both MD 210 and MD 228 are designated as master plan bikeways. However, although the site abuts both roads, it does not have direct access to either one, and frontage improvements or an access easement permit will likely not be required. These bikeways will be addressed separately by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) with pavement markings and signage as resurfacing or other road improvement projects occur.

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT reinforces the need for internal sidewalks and the accommodation of pedestrians as road improvements are made and new roads constructed.

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

Standard sidewalks are included along both sides of all internal roads, excluding the bridge over Parcel L. Several internal sidewalks or paths are also shown that provide access through open space parcels.

As part of a review of plans, the Planning Board also recommended the provision of a standard sidewalk along both sides of Tortola Drive, across the Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative right-of-way. This change has been made by the applicant and is reflected on the submitted DSP. The Planning Board also evaluated the possibility of providing a sidewalk along both sides of the bridge over Parcel L, but it appears that the approved impacts for the stream crossing only cover the width of the bridge, as currently shown. To avoid further impacts to the stream and comply with the already approved impacts, the Planning Board concurred with the sidewalk on one side of the bridge at this location. There is an existing commercial shopping center on the south side of MD 228, which is opposite of the subject site at the Manning Road intersection. Some pedestrian improvements have been made on the south side of the intersection, and the subject approval should complete the necessary pedestrian improvements to accommodate residents walking from the subject site to the shopping center.

- f. **Permits**—Permit review comments that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or by conditions of this approval.
- g. **Environmental Planning**—A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplain are found to occur on the property. No areas of steep slopes with highly-erodible soils have been found to occur on the property. The Sensitive Species Project Review Area map received from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, shows that there are potential rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur along the western corner of this property. Forest interior dwelling species (FIDS) habitat and a FIDS buffer are mapped on-site. The site is located within Environmental Plan Strategy Area 2 of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map, as designated by Plan Prince George's 2035. The 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan* shows that the site is entirely within the regulated and evaluation areas. There are no

designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the property. This property is located in the Gatewoman Creek watershed.

For a discussion of relevant environmental conditions of CSP-99050 (PGCPB Resolution No. 00-142) and CSP-99050-01 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-228), see Finding 8 of this approval. For a discussion of the relevant environmental conditions of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063 (PGCPB No. Resolution 02-07 (C)(A)), see Finding 9 of this approval.

Natural Resources Inventory

A natural resources inventory was not submitted for the subject property because the PPS and DSP are grandfathered from the requirement.

The site has a forest stand delineation that was reviewed with previous approvals. The site contains regulated environmental features, which include streams, wetlands, and floodplain. The woodland on the site is limited to the woodland conservation areas approved with previous development approvals.

Stormwater Management

Stormwater Management Concept Plan 32197-2004-03 has been approved by DPIE. The plans show extensive use of bioretention areas.

Soils

The predominant soils found to occur, according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, include Beltsville silt loam and Aura gravelly loam, which have limitations with respect to perched water tables, impeded drainage, and a hard stratum. Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property.

- h. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated October 1, 2017 (Oladeinde to Grover), the Fire/EMS Department offered comments regarding needed accessibility, private road design, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.
- i. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated October 25, 2017 (Giles to Grover), DPIE offered numerous comments that will be implemented through their separate permitting process. DPIE also stated that DSP-04063-04 is in conformance with approved Stormwater Concept Plan 32197-2004-03.
- j. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated October 6, 2017 (Johnson to Grover), the Health Department stated that, during the demolition/construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. A condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant add a note to the plans for the project stating the

applicant's intent in this regard. Additionally, the Health Department stated that miscellaneous solid waste materials must be collected and properly disposed of at the municipal waste landfill. This information has been provided to the applicant.

- k. **Verizon**—Verizon did not provide comment regarding the subject project.
 - l. **Southern Maryland Electric Cooperative (SMECO)**—In a memorandum dated November 6, 2017 (Ulrich to Grover), SMECO offered numerous comments about the electric distribution system for the project and impacts on the SMECO transmission right-of-way. SMECO's requirements will be met through their separate permitting process.
- 15. Based on the foregoing and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the DSP will, if approved with the proposed conditions below, represent a most 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.
 - 16. As required by Section 27-285(b)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, this DSP is also in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-99050-01.
 - 17. Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance requires the following for the approval of a detailed site plan:

The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible based on minimal changes to the limits of disturbance from the previously approved DSP and recommended that this finding could be made.

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 Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-039-01-03 and APPROVED Alternative Compliance AC-17020, and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063-04 for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certificate of approval of the detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant shall make revisions or provide information, as follows:
 - a. Provide easements for the stormdrains and retaining walls on private lots for needed access by the homeowners association for maintenance purposes.

- b. All internal homeowners association paths/trails shown on the plan shall be a minimum of six feet wide and be asphalt.
- c. Signage and pavement markings shall be provided at the intersection of MD 228 (Berry Road) and Manning Road, to ensure safe pedestrian crossing. Final design of the signage and pavement markings shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Prince George's County Planning Board, unless modified by the Maryland State Highway Administration.
- d. The dimensional requirement for height set by the DSP shall be listed in the general notes.
- e. The setbacks of the community building and the monument sign shall be dimensioned. The square footage of the monument sign shall be provided on Sheet LP5.03.
- f. Specify the height of the trees on the plant list.
- g. Add a general note to the plans stating that during the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity dust control requirements specified in the 2011 Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.
- h. The applicant shall provide proof to staff that signature approval of the reconsideration of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01063 is complete.
- i. The applicant shall include a note on the cover sheet of the landscape plans indicating that Lot 12 is Phase 2 of the subject project for future commercial development.
- j. The mitigated 65 dBA line shall be shown on the plans, and private recreational facilities shall be located outside of it.
- k. Revise the Type II tree conservation plan as follows:
 - (1) Revise the conservation worksheet to provide sufficient "Total Woodland Conservation Provided." The worksheet, as submitted, has a 0.09-acre shortfall.
 - (2) Provide the current tree conservation plan general notes per the Environmental Technical Manual. The corrected notes will include the current \$9.00 per square foot mitigation fee.
 - (3) Provide the current environmental approval block and include the purpose of this third revision.
 - (4) Show the noise/retaining wall with a sufficient setback from the limit of disturbance.

- (5) Revise the plan, as necessary, to remove all disturbance from outside of the limits of disturbance.
 - (6) Identify the floodplain on the plan using the symbol represented in the legend.
 - (7) Remove the WGL Easement from the preservation area, as declared in Liber 7779, page 305.
 - (8) Revise the “Woodland Conservation Provided” on the worksheet, as necessary, to reflect any changes required.
- l. The applicant shall provide a Section 4.7 schedule on the landscape plan, demonstrating conformance with the applicable requirements of Section 4.7 of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.
- m. Add six additional parking spaces to the site, in the vicinity of the townhouse lots.
- n. Typical parking space details shall be provided and shall be dimensioned in accordance with the requirements of Part 1 of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance.
- o. The applicant shall revise the plans to include only a downward-facing light fixture and to include a photometric plan, to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Prince George’s Planning Board.
- p. The townhouse and single-family detached units identified in the plan set as highly-visible shall to be treated as follows:
 - (1) Brick shall be used on the front elevation or the watertable and wrapped to the side.
 - (2) The units shall have an attractive pattern of fenestration and a minimum of three architectural features.
 - (3) Lots 61, 252, 301, and 327 shall be added to the “Highly-Visible Lots” graphic on Sheet 1 of the plan set.
 - (4) Final design of the units shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
- q. The *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* schedules for Section 4.1 and 4.10 shall be adjusted to reflect the calculations as represented in the Alternative Compliance AC-17020.

- r. The applicant shall pursue an Alternative Compliance application for Section 4.6 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
 - s. Removal of Building Phase 10 (PM 232-67), as requested by the applicant, including necessary additional revisions to accomplish said removal.
 - t. The applicant shall work with the Accokeek Development Review District Commission to determine the appropriateness of a public amenity for the site and, if it is determined appropriate, a precise location and specific description of the proposed public amenity or another public amenity shall be added to the DSP.
2. Prior to issuance of any grading permits, which impact wetlands or required buffers, the applicant shall provide copies of the appropriate federal, state and local wetland permits.

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 Geraldo, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Washington absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 7, 2017, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of December 2017, *and corrected administratively on January 12, 2018.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:RG:rpg

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language