

## 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 1, 2005 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 for Signature Club at Manning Village, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests the construction of 315 residential, age-restricted (age 55 and older) dwelling units in the M-X-T Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	315 residential dwelling units
Acreage	70.74	70.74
Outlots	2	2

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 84, Council District 9. More specifically, it is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and Berry Road (MD 228).
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The 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 and single-family residential land; and to the north by residential development.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The relevant site was the subject of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050/01 and Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-01063 and 4-01064, formalized in resolutions PGCPB Nos. 02-07 and 02-08, and adopted February 7, 2002. A stormwater management concept approval was issued on October 19, 2004, and is valid until October 19, 2007. Final Plats of Subdivision 5-05029 and 5-05030 were approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 2005, and were recorded as Manokeek, Plat 13 and 14 in Plat Book 205, Pages 45 and 46, on March 8, 2005. Plat 13 shows a single lot (Lot 11); the development proposed for the site is to be under a condominium regime. Plat 14 shows a single lot (Lot 12) and a large outparcel (Outparcel B), with neither plat containing a lotting pattern or road configuration.
6. **Design Features:** The larger Manokeek project, covered by Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050/01, is divided into three pods. The subject detailed site plan is known as "Pod 2" in that conceptual site plan. Pod 2, 57.47 acres, has been designed as an age-restricted community of 315 single-

family dwelling units, and ancillary land containing stormwater management ponds and parking and recreational areas. Its 315 residential units are divided as follows:

<b>Type of Development</b>	<b># of Units/Square Footage</b>
Townhouse	62
Villas (semidetached)	82
Single-family Dwellings	111
Condominium Dwelling	60
Community Building	2,496

The two stormwater management ponds are positioned along MD 210 (Indianhead Highway) in the northern end of the development. All roads in the development are proposed to be private except Manning Road, which is proposed as a public street and provides access to the development from MD 228.

This residential component of the Manokeek development will be gated and will have a manned gatehouse at its entrance. The entrance will be embellished by an entrance sign flanked by a decorative fence, wall and extensive landscaping.

Architecture for the project includes four different residential types: single-family detached, semi-detached units (“villas”), townhomes, and condominiums.

The models to be offered for the single-family homes include the Brighton, the Piedmont, and the Cardiff. These are relatively modest architectural models but meet minimum requirements for acceptability. All models indicate an option for a partial brick or stone front facade. The base square footage for the Brighton is 1,716. The base square footage for the Piedmont is 1,288 and the base square footage of the Cardiff is 1,927.

The semi-detached units (the “villas”) utilize the same floor plan as the townhomes. The units are well articulated and the fenestration varied. Options include one- or two-car garage and front or side entry. Materials for the units include a partial brick veneer on the front elevation. The “villa” units all follow the Stonehurst plan with a base square footage of 2,183.

The townhouse units are known as the “Melrose,” with a base square footage of 2,742. They are well articulated with varied fenestration. The options and materials for the townhouse units are the same as on the semi-detached units. The side elevations indicate an optional two-car, side-entry garage for end units.

The 60 condominium units are to be located in five buildings containing 12 units each. The Hampton Court model is proposed for the condominium buildings with a range of variation on the facades—from windowless sides to the use of partial brick or stone on well articulated and architecturally embellished front and rear facades. Staff has recommended a condition below to require that the partial brick option be used on both the front and rear facade; that brick on the first story be continued on the side elevations and that the side facade with two windows at “loft”

level with four-inch trim and keystone and that the six “optional” windows become standard.

Architecture of the Community Building front façade is well articulated. The front entrance is well designed and a cupola, dormers, and pediment over the entrance create visual interest in the roofline. Shutters help define the window openings and brick brought up to the water table give weight to the base of the façade. The sides, however, offer little fenestration and no brick. A condition below ensures that equal architectural attention will be given to the sides and rear of the subject building. In addition, staff is recommending Condition 1w to ensure that the architecture of units on highly visible lots (please see staff exhibit #1) is appropriately designed.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547, which governs permitted uses in the M-X-T Zone.

b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-548, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in the M-X-T Zone.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050/01:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050/01 was approved by the Planning Board on November 3, 2005. Staff offers the following evaluation of the proposed detailed site plan against the conditions approved in CSP-99050/01. Relevant recommended conditions are listed below, followed by staff 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.**

Comment: TCPII/39/-01-01 has been submitted together with the subject detailed site plan. The Environmental Planning Section has evaluated it against all relevant requirements and has recommended approval subject to conditions that have been included below in the Recommendation section of this report.

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.**

Comment: The location and appearance of the proposed noise attenuation wall has been reviewed and found acceptable by the Urban Design Section with respect to the detailed site plan application and the Environmental Planning section with respect to TCPII/39/01-01.

**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.**

Comment: Staff has 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.**

Comment: Review of the plans show that the focal point areas have been well designed at human scale and include well designed focal point areas.

- c. The building materials and architecture.**

Comment: The applicant has submitted a range of architectural elevations for the varying architectural forms to be included in the project: single-family dwellings, semi-detached dwellings, townhomes, and multifamily. The submitted architectural elevations, in turn, offer a variety of options regarding design, architectural detail, and material choices. Staff has specified in the recommended conditions below the combinations of design choices that fulfill the special attention required to be given to building materials and architecture for the subject project and has required further review of the architecture for units on highly visible lots as identified on staff's Exhibit #1.

- 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.**

Comment: Since the CSP has been revised to omit the commercial component of the project, 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 adjacent to a public right-of-way in the proposed design.

- 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.**

Comment: The proposed landscape plan exceeds the requirements of Section 4.3c of the Landscape Manual by more than 25 percent. Whereas only 8 shade trees are required, 75 percent more, or 14, have been provided.

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

Comment: Although this condition is contained both in the resolution for CSP-99050 and in the approval for CSP-99050/01, neither a location for nor a specific description of said public amenity have been provided. Staff would suggest, and a recommended condition below provides, 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.

**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.**

Comment: Office development has been deleted from the design program for this project. Residential structures contemplated as part of this project fall well within the maximum stipulated height of five to six stories.

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

Comment: The commercial/retail component has been deleted from the design program for this project, rendering this condition inapplicable.

**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.**

Comment: Since all commercial development (which would include a gasoline station) has been deleted from this development, Condition 6 becomes irrelevant to the proposed project.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-01063 and 4-01064:** The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plans 4-01063 and 4-01064 on February 7, 2002. The resolutions, PGCPB 02-07 and 02-08, were adopted on February 7, 2002. The preliminary plans were valid for two years and were given a one-year extension on April 22, 2004. Final Plats of Subdivision 5-05029 and 5-05030 were approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 2005, and were recorded as Manokeek, Plat 13 and 14 in Plat Book 205, Pages 45 and 46, on March 8, 2005. Plat 13 shows a single lot (Lot 11), the development proposed for the site is to be developed under a condominium regime. Plat 14 shows a single lot (Lot 12) and a large outparcel (Outparcel B). Thus, neither contains a lotting pattern or road configuration.

The Preliminary Plan conditions applicable to the detailed site plan stage are listed below.

**4-04163:**

4. **A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas to be 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.**

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the Phase II noise study and found it acceptable. Noise attenuation measures mitigate exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less and interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA.

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.**

Comment: The applicant has placed parking and recreational areas under the power lines so that residential structures could be placed outside the direct impact area of the power lines.

- b. **Landscaping necessary to minimize the visual impact of the development on adjoining properties.**

Comment: Applicant has agreed to set the noise attenuation wall ten feet back from the property line in order to allow for landscaping necessary to minimize the visual impact of the development on adjoining properties. In addition, by utilizing low impact stormwater management techniques, the applicant has incorporated landscaped bioretention areas.

- c. **Building height and views.**

Comment: The tallest structures to be included in the subject residential development are the three-story condominium buildings. Strategically located toward the rear of the development, they will be obscured from view along the project's road frontage, partially due to location, but also due to design and placement of the noise attenuation wall and its complementary landscaping. In addition, staff is recommending in Condition 1f architectural enhancements of the condominium buildings that should improve views of the structures.

**4-01064:**

4. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for the construction through the SHA access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the SHA or the DPW&T:**

**MD 228 at Manning Road:**

- a. **Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan, the applicant shall submit the results of State Highway Administration (SHA) and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) of a traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of MD 228 and Manning Road. If deemed warranted by SHA and DPW&T, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal."**

Comment: The signal has already been deemed warranted by SHA and DPW&T and built by the developer.

10. ***Landscape Manual:*** The proposed development is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*.

The Urban Design staff reviewed the proposed landscape plan and found that the submittals are in general compliance with the applicable sections of the *Landscape Manual*.

11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. CSP-99050 and TCPI/52/97 were previously approved with conditions by PGCPB No. 00-142. Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and TCPI/52/97-01 were approved with conditions by PGCPB No. 02-07. TCPII/121/99 was approved for the 210.60 acres of the Manokeek project that are in the R-A Zone and 32.64 acres in the R-R Zone. TCPII/121/99 has been revised at staff level several times with the most recent, TCPII/121/99-06, being revised on November 22, 2003. TCPII/112/01 was approved in conjunction with DSP-01036 for 26.04 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone and the most recent revision, TCPII/112/01-01, was approved by staff on July 15, 2003. TCPII/39/01 was approved for 57.47 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone. TCPI/52/97-02 is currently under review with CSP-99050/01. The Environmental Planning Section is recommending approval, with conditions for both TCPI/52/97-02 and TCPII3901-01. Therefore, staff finds that the plan is in general compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:  
**Historic Preservation**—In an e-mail received May 25, 2005, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no impacts on historic resources.

**Archeology**—In a memorandum dated April 12, 2005, the staff archeologist stated that archeological investigations are recommended for the subject property. More particularly, she stated that one prehistoric site, 18PR287, identified on the property in a 1986 survey, should be relocated if possible. Additionally, she noted that the residence of John Manning was shown on

the 1861 Martenet map as being located just north of the intersection of Manning and Berry Roads. However, in a letter dated September 21, 2004, the Historic Planning Section stated that they had reviewed the archeological survey of the Manning Signature Club property and Phase II archeological NRHP evaluation of the Manning Signature Club #1 site and that they concurred with the consultant's conclusion that, based on the paucity of artifacts and lack of features, no additional work would be required. They requested, however, that four revised final copies of the consultant's report should be submitted to them. A condition to that effect is included in the recommendation section of this report.

**Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated September 16, 2005, the Community Planning Section stated:

- These applications are not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier.
- The conceptual site plan revision proposal is generally consistent with the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan policies for mixed-use development in this area, as implemented by the Planning Board's approval of CSP-99050, Manokeek, on July 27, 2000. The site data table on this revised site plan does not accurately reflect the proposed development revisions. (See the background section/proposal below..
- The detailed site plan proposal for a mix of age-restricted housing on development Pod 2 is generally consistent with the land use concept for higher density residential land use on this site as proposed in CSP-99050/01 and as originally approved in CSP-99050, albeit at a much lower density and without the commercial elements previously proposed for this part of the site.
- There are a number of site plan issues to address regarding the design or location of sound barrier walls, fencing, interior sidewalks and paths, and pedestrian access to other parts of the overall site.

In addition, the Community Planning Division raised the following planning and site plan issues:

- **Mix of Uses**—The 1993 master plan states, "A major mixed-use development area is recommended for the intersection of MD 228 and Indian Head Highway. Retail, office and other types of employment development, as well as community facilities and some higher density residential land uses, are envisioned." (See page 90) The master plan envisaged mixed-use development being a mixture of retail, office, high-density residential uses, community, recreational and leisure facilities within close proximity to each other, all co-mingled in a shared environment.

The proposed development conforms to the requirements of Sec. 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides that "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." Taking into account the total mix of development for Pods 1-3, the land use proposal for Pod 2 substantially conforms



to the development concepts approved in CSP-99050, albeit at a much lower density and without the commercial elements previously approved.

- **Fences and Walls (Along MD 228)**—A proposed sound barrier wall is shown along MD 228 on CSP-99050/01; there is a dashed line along the public utilities easement (PUE) adjacent to MD 228 on DSP-04063, but it is not identified on the legend. Moreover, there is no design detail on either the CSP or DSP documents submitted to this division for review. The design of this fence/wall is important from two aspects: (1) the view of the site from highway frontage, which is extensive, and (2) the effectiveness of the design as a sound buffer for the proposed residential dwellings from traffic noise on MD 228, which is substantial. (Per Condition 5, PGCPB 00-142, CSP-99050 and Condition 4, PGCPB No. 02-07, Preliminary Subdivision 4-01063..

Along site periphery elsewhere—A symbol that appears to be a fence is shown along the rest of the site but is not indicated in the DSP legend. Again, there is no detail for fence design. Although not as visible as the fencing along MD 228, as development occurs on adjoining sites, the fence design will be important.

- **Noise**—Concerns have been raised in the community about noise from traffic on MD 228 and the measures proposed to mitigate the effect on future residents. In addition to the sound barrier wall indicated on CSP-99050/01, consideration should be given to acoustical interior buffering for the housing proposed in noise impact areas along MD 228..
- **Bocce Ball and Horseshoe Pits**—There is a detail of these recreation facilities on page 11/11 of DSP-04063 (landscape plan), however, the location of these proposed facilities is not evident on the site plan. Are they proposed, or is the detail in error?
- **Interior Sidewalks and Trails**—CSP-99050/01 indicates paths and trails, primarily along streets, but also in open space areas on the western portion of the site. Again, the legend for DSP-04063 does not contain a symbol for sidewalks, but their proposed location can be interpolated from parallel lines along the street. Sidewalks are generally proposed only on one side of the street, leaving residents on the opposite side to cross the street to reach a sidewalk, or to walk in the street or across private yards. Consideration should be given to requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street.
- **Exterior Pedestrian Access/Intersection Design**—Both MD 228 intersections with MD 210 and with Manning Road East are proposed to be grade separated. As the conceptual site plan is currently designed, there is a sidewalk indicated off-site along the entrance road connecting to Manning Road and to the future commercial development on Pod 3. However, there is no pedestrian access between Pod 1 (retail, commercial office) and Pod 2 (age-restricted residential community). Ideally, there would be a pedestrian friendly means to connect the residential and primary commercial components of this mixed-use development proposal, but none are shown on CSP-99050 as approved, or on the proposed amendment CSP-99050/01. The high-volume, high-speed character of MD 228, designated as an expressway, makes the design of a safe pedestrian crossing problematic,

but it should not be impossible.

**Transportation**—In a memorandum dated September 26, 2005, the Transportation Planning Section stated the following:

The site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of circulation. Appropriate dedication along MD 228 and Manning Road, as determined as a part of Preliminary Plan 4-01012 and further clarified as a part of 4-01063, is reflected on the current site plan.

Access is gained by easement over an adjacent unsubdivided parcel, and this easement connects to a dedicated right-of-way. This arrangement was deemed to be acceptable to serve an age-restricted residential community during review of 4-01063. As the resulting community is now intended to encompass fewer residential units, it is deemed to be acceptable now.

At the time of Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and Conceptual Site Plan SP-99050, a number of transportation-related conditions were placed on the property pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities (aside from a trip cap condition that has no bearing since Pod 3 is not proposed to be developed at this time, 4-01064 contains no original conditions that require a status update, and also 4-97091 and 4-01065 do not appear to have relevance to the current plan). The status of these conditions would be summarized as follows:

**SP-99050:**

Condition 7 indicates a trip cap for the overall Manokeek site. The preliminary plan trip cap was determined to conform to this cap and the cap supersedes it.

Condition 8 provides a list of off-site transportation improvements. Condition 8A(1) has been met; the required traffic signal warrant study has been submitted and it has been installed. All other parts of this condition are enforceable at the time of building permit.

Condition 9 is only applicable to Pod 1; this plan includes Pods 2 and 3.

Condition 10 was enforced at the time of preliminary plan.

**4-01063:**

Condition 6 indicates a trip cap for the subject site. The trip cap is based upon 800 units of senior housing; this plan proposes 315 units. The community recreational building, from the standpoint of trip generation, is considered part of the elderly housing complex and is not assumed to contribute additional trips under the cap. The cap also includes a sizable retail component; the subject plan proposes no retail space. Therefore, the subject plan complies with this condition.

Condition 7 provides a list of off-site transportation improvements. The conditions at MD 228 and Manning Road have been completed or, in the case of those improvements needed to serve the development on the north side of MD 228, bonded. With regard to the Manning Road/senior living entrance, the traffic circle has been designed and the final design has been approved by the county's Department of Public Works and Transportation. Therefore, this condition has been met.

Condition 8 is met, as the record plat shows the needed right-of-way along Manning Road.

In conclusion, the transportation planning staff has no objection to the detailed site plan.

### **Summary**

Insofar as the uses proposed on this site plan are generally consistent with the uses proposed at the time of preliminary plan, making the basis for the preliminary plan findings still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities that are existing, programmed, or will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. Given that the conditions on the original CSP-99050 have been superseded by conditions placed upon the three preliminary plans approved within the site, it does not appear necessary to carry the transportation-related conditions forward on the revised conceptual plan. No conditions are required for the detailed site plan.

**Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated May 9, 2005, the Subdivision Section offered the following:

The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plans 4-01063 and 4-01064 on February 7, 2002. The resolutions, PGCPB 02-07 and 02-08, were adopted on February 7, 2002. The preliminary plans were valid for two years and were given a one-year extension on April 22, 2004. Final Plats of Subdivision 5-05029 and 5-05030 were approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 2005, and were recorded as Manokeek, Plat 13 and 14 in Plat Book 205, Pages 45 and 46, on March 8, 2005. Plat 13 shows a single lot (Lot 11), the development proposed for the site is to be developed under a condominium regime. Plat 14 shows a single lot (Lot 12) and a large outparcel (Outparcel B). Thus, neither contains a lotting pattern or road configuration.

The Preliminary Plan conditions applicable to the detailed site plan stage are listed below.

### **4-04163:**

- 5. A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas to be 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.**

- 10. 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.**

**4-01064:**

- 5. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for the construction through the SHA access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the SHA or the DPW&T:**

**MD 228 at Manning Road:**

- a. Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan, the applicant shall submit the results of State Highway Administration (SHA) and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) of a traffic signal warrant study for the intersection of MD 228 and Manning Road. If deemed warranted by SHA and DPW&T, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal."**

For further discussion of the applicable requirements of the relevant subdivision plans, please see Finding 8 above.

**Trails**—In a memorandum dated May 5, 2005, the senior trails planner stated that although no master plan trails issues in the adopted and approved Subregion V Master Plan impact the subject site, a comprehensive network of internal homeowner association trails has been provided. Additionally, with respect to sidewalk connectivity, the senior trails planner recommended, due to the density of the proposed development and the nature of the projected population, that sidewalks be provided on both sides of the street. He also noted that safe and convenient pedestrian accommodation be provided from the subject site to the commercial component of nearby Pod 3 including sidewalk and/or trail connections, and appropriate pavement markings and other safety features at the crossing of Manning Road should be provided in the future detailed site plan that includes Pod 3.

**Parks**—At the time of this writing, the Department of Parks and Recreation has not submitted comment on the subject project

**Permits**—In a memorandum dated May 12, 2005, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments on the proposed project that have either been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

**Public Facilities**—In a memorandum dated April 29, 2005, the Public Facilities Section stated that whereas fire and ambulance services were within the relevant response times, paramedic and ladder truck service were beyond the response time guidelines. This is provided for information only, as there is no requirement for a finding of adequate public facilities at the time of detailed site plan.

**Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated November 1, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

Review of Previously Approved Conditions

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject applications. The text in **bold** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans.

**PGCPB. No. 00-142, CSP-99050, July 27, 2000.**

4. **The Type I Tree Conservation Plan shall be further refined during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision to address reforestation in the Stormwater Management facilities, additional on-site preservation and/or reforestation and to address intrusions into the wetlands and wetland buffers.**

Comment: This condition was met during the approvals of the preliminary plans. Woodland conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

5. **The applicant shall submit a detailed Noise Study for review and approval in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for development Pod 2**

**which clearly reflects the limits of the 65 dBA noise contours for MD. Routes 210 and 228 at the residential areas of Pod 2. The study shall propose noise attenuation measures for all residential areas which are located within the 65 dBA noise contours.**

Comment: This condition has been superseded by Condition 4 of PGCPB. No. 02-07, 4-01063, February 7, 2002. Traffic-generated noise impacts are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

- 6. 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.**

Comment: Traffic-generated noise impacts are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**PGCPB. No. 98-22(A)/1, 4-97091, July 27, 2000.**

- 1. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/52/97. The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

**“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy and Subtitle 25.”**

Comment: Woodland conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

- 2. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits which impact wetland the applicant shall provide the Natural Resources Division with copies of the appropriate Federal, State and local wetland permits which may be required.**

Comment: This condition should be carried forward with rewording to note the change of “Natural Resources Division” to “Environmental Planning Section.”

- 3. Prior to signature approval of TCPI/52/97 the applicant shall revise the**

**worksheet for the M-X-T portion of the property to reflect a WCT of 15 percent and calculate the acreage for the WCT as 15 percent of 95.87 acres or 14.38 acres.**

Comment: The revision was made and TCPI/52/97 was signed.

- 11. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Concept Plan #988001460, when approved. Prior to signature approval, the stormwater concept plan approval shall be noted on the Preliminary Plat.**

Comment: The stormwater concept plan approval number was noted on Preliminary Plan 4-97091 prior to signature. Stormwater management is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**PGCPB. No. 02-07, 4-01063, February 7, 2002.**

- 1. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

**“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP I/52/97-01), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”**

Comment: Woodland Conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

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

Comment: Woodland Conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

- 3. Prior to signature approval of the Preliminary Plan, the Type I Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to remove all wetland buffer impacts not approved with the variation request and the Woodland Conservation Worksheet shall be revised to reflect the reduced acreage of woodland clearing.**

Comment: This condition was fulfilled and the preliminary plan was signed.

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.**

Comment: Traffic-generated noise impacts are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**PGCPB. No. 02-08, 4-01064, February 7, 2002.**

1. **Development of Lot 12 shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

**“Development of Lot 12 is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97-01), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”**

Comment: Woodland conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

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

Comment: Woodland conservation is discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

### **Environmental Review**

As revisions are made to the plans submitted the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

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

**“The Natural Reserve Area is composed of areas having physical features which exhibit severe constraints to development or which are important**



to sensitive ecological systems. Natural Reserve Areas must be preserved in their natural state.”

The Subregion V Master Plan elaborates on page 139:

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

For the purposes of this review, the natural reserve includes all expanded stream buffers and isolated wetlands and their buffers. All streams shown as perennial or intermittent on the plans will require minimum 50-foot stream buffers that shall be expanded in accordance with Section 24-130(b)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A wetlands study was submitted with this application. The 100-year floodplain has been approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources. The expanded stream buffer required by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations is shown on the plans.

The plans show impacts that were not requested, evaluated or approved during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan 4-01063. Specifically, the grading into the expanded stream buffer shown on Sheet 7 of 10 of the TCPII on the north side of the wetlands and behind the four residential units west of the main north/south street can be avoided by the use of a retaining wall.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the detailed site plan and the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised to use a

retaining wall to eliminate the grading into the expanded stream buffer shown on Sheet 7 of 10 of the TCPII on the north side of the wetlands and behind the four residential units west of the main north-south street.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the issuance of any grading permits that impact wetlands, the applicant shall provide the Environmental Planning Section with copies of the appropriate federal, state and local wetland permits that may be required.

2. The property is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. CSP-99050 and TCPI/52/97 were approved with conditions by PGCPB. No. 00-142. Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and TCPI/52/97-01 were approved with conditions by PGCPB. No. 02-07. TCPII/121/99 was approved for the 210.60 acres of the Manokeek project that are in the R-A

Zone and 32.64 acres in the R-R Zone. TCPII/121/99 has been revised at staff levels several times, with the most recent, TCPII/121/99-06, being on November 22, 2003. TCPII/112/01 was approved in conjunction with DSP-01036 for 26.04 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone and the most recent revision, TCPII/112/01-01, was approved by staff on July 15, 2003. TCPII/39/01 was approved for 57.47 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone. TCPI/52/97-02 is currently under review as a companion to CSP-99050/01 and includes 70.74 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone.

The revised Type II tree conservation plan, TCPII/39/01-01, has been reviewed. The plan proposes clearing 58.32 of the existing 62.34 acres of upland woodland, clearing 0.17 acre of the existing 5.40 acres of woodland within the 100-year floodplain and off-site clearing of 0.20 acre. The woodland conservation requirement has been correctly calculated as 29.02 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 2.40 acres of on-site preservation and 27.06 acres of off-site conservation. As required by the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, all off-site woodland conservation must be provided prior to the issuance of any grading permit for this property.

The general design of the proposed woodland conservation is consistent with TCPI/52/97-02 and the Green Infrastructure Plan. The plan fulfills the goals of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

As noted previously, some minor changes to grading to avoid disturbance to the expanded stream buffer are required. This will slightly reduce the area of upland woodland cleared, slightly reduce the woodland conservation requirement, and slightly increase the woodland preservation on-site.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to:

- a. Use a retaining wall to eliminate the grading into the expanded stream buffer shown on Sheet 7 of 10 of the TCPII on the north side of the wetlands and behind the four residential units west of the main north/south street.
- b. Revise the worksheet as needed.
- c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the issuance of any new permits for Lot 11, TCPII/116/01 shall be revised to reflect clearing required for the development of Lot 11.

3. MD 228, which is located along the southern property line, and MD 210, which is located along the western property line, have been identified as noise generators that would have adverse noise impacts on any residential development. For residential uses, outdoor activity areas must have noise levels of 65 dBA Ldn or less to be in conformance with Maryland standards. The outdoor activity areas on the impacted lots are the areas with 40 feet of the rears of the affected houses. The interiors of all structures must have noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or less to be in conformance with state standards. Condition 5 of PGCP# 00-142 states::

“The applicant shall submit a detailed noise study for review and approval in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for development of Pod 2 which clearly reflects the limits of the 65 dBA noise contours for MD Routes 210 and 228 at the residential areas of Pod 2. The study shall propose noise attenuation measures for all residential areas which are located with the 65 dBA noise contours.”

A noise study was not submitted with Preliminary Plan 4-01063 as requested. Condition 4 of PGCPB. No. 02-07, 4-01063 was created to replace Condition 5 of PGCPB. No. 00-142.

A Phase II noise study was submitted with the conceptual site plan. Staff were initially concerned that on-site measurements were taken only after or before rush-hour traffic. After discussions about this procedure with the acoustical engineer who prepared the report, staff are satisfied that this methodology for calibration of noise measuring devices is consistent with standard approved practices. The study clearly demonstrates the need for a noise attenuation structures. The revised detailed site plan and revised Type II tree conservation plan show the proposed noise barriers and the mitigated 65 dBA Ldn ground level noise contour.

The mitigation provided by the proposed noise barrier will be sufficient to reduce the noise levels impinging on all residential structures to levels below Maryland standards. No additional noise mitigation measures are required because standard construction materials will ensure that interior noise levels do not exceed 45 dBA (Ldn).

Comment: No further action regarding traffic-generated noise is required with respect to the review of this detailed site plan.

4. Stormwater Management Concept Plan, CSD 32197-2004, has been approved by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources. The plans show extensive use of bioretention areas.

Comment: No further action regarding stormwater managements is required for the review of this conceptual site plan.

CSP-99050/01 and TCPI/52/97-02 for the same 70.75 acres are in concurrent review. Conditions of approval arising from that application may affect this detailed site plan and revised Type II tree conservation plan.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to signature approval of the DSP, the plan must be in full conformance with approved CSP-99050/01, and it must address all conditions of approval.

**Department of Environmental Resources (DER)**—In comments dated April 19, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for Manokeek–Signature Club at Manning Village, DSP-04063, is consistent with approved stormwater concept 32197-2004.

**Fire Department**—At the time of this writing, the Prince George’s County Fire Department has not submitted comment on the subject project.

**Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a revised memorandum dated September 29, 2005, DPW&T offered the following:

The property is located on the northwest corner of Berry Road (MD 228) and Manning Road East, and along the northeast side of Indian Head Highway (MD 210). MD 210 and MD 228 are state-maintained roadways; therefore, coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) is necessary.

Manning Road East is a proposed collector roadway (C-529) within the property as shown on the area master plan for the Subregion V comprehensive plan. The proposed collector roadway alignment, as shown on the master plan, shifts northwest of the existing Manning Road within Parcel 25. The proposed collector roadway alignment for Manning Road East, as shown on the ‘attached’ revised detailed site plan, is acceptable.

The proposed design for the roundabout located on Manning Road East, which provides access to the site, is acceptable.

Street construction and right-of-way dedication for the proposed collector roadway (C-529) in accordance with DPW&T’s standards are required.

All storm drainage systems and facilities within the proposed subdivision are private. All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with the Department of Environmental Resources’ requirements.

An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.

All proposed roadways with 24-foot-wide pavements are private roadways. All roadways will not be bonded and inspected by DPW&T.

All improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county are to be in accordance with the county road ordinances, DPW&T's specifications and standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

A soils investigation report, which includes subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for Manning Road East, is required.

Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments. Coordination with the various utility companies is required.

Please note that DPW& T's requirements are enforced through their separate permitting process.

**Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a letter dated April 7, 2005, SHA stated that they had no objection to Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 approval. They mentioned, however, that they had previously offered comments related to transportation needs to off-set traffic impacts created by the additional vehicle trips and that, in accordance with M-NCPPC Resolution PGCPB No. 98-22(A)/1, they expected compliance with transportation conditions prior to completion of the proposed project.

**Accokeek Development Review District Commission (ADRDC)**—In a letter dated June 2, 2005, the ADRDC stated that their major concern was noise abatement from MD 210 and MD 228. Particularly, they stated that the installation of a six-foot noise mitigation fence may not prevent the noise levels in the residential development from exceeding 65 dBA as required. Therefore, they recommended that:

- The developer be required to provide a noise abatement study to the Environmental Planning Section and ADRDC.

Urban Design Comment: Such noise abatement study has been provided to staff and the ADRDC.

- Maximum permitted noise levels not exceed 65dBA for exterior noise and 45 dBA for interior noise level.

Urban Design Comment: Condition 1.p. below ensures the interior and exterior noise levels will not exceed the specified levels.

- Buffers provided between the residential development and the noise generators be required to exceed six-feet in height.

Urban Design Comment: Subsequently, the ADRCD verbally informed staff that if a maximum interior noise level of 45 dBA was assured, the buffers need not exceed six feet in height.

- Structure design of living quarters above the six feet in height.

Urban Design Comment: Subsequently, the ADRDC verbally informed staff that if a maximum interior noise level of 45 dBA was assured, structural design of living quarters above six feet in height need not be addressed.

13. As required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

Furthermore, as required by Section 27-285(b)(2), the detailed site plan, if approved subject to recommended conditions, is in conformance with CSP-99050/01, if approved as presented.

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/39/01-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

- a. Applicant shall clarify what "setback from internal property lines" refers to as only one lot is proposed.
- b. Applicant shall clarify why the general notes refer to "lots" when there are no lots proposed.
- c. Signage plans shall be reviewed and approved by the urban design staff as designee of the Planning Board.
- d. Applicant shall correct the schedule for a 4.6 landscape buffer along MD 210 to include the correct number of required trees instead of "0."
- e. Standard sidewalks shall be indicated on both sides of all private internal roads.
- f. The Hampton Court model to be utilized for the five 12-unit condominium buildings shall uniformly utilize the partial brick option on the front, side and rear elevations. Both the left and right side elevations shall include two windows at "loft" level with four-inch trim and keystone and the additional six "optional" windows shall be made standard on all five 12-unit condominium buildings.
- g. The applicant shall include plans for the bocce ball court and horseshoe pits on the detailed site plan.
- h. All end walls or side elevations shall have a minimum of two architectural features.
- i. A note shall be added to the plans that identical units shall not be located side by side or directly across the street from one another.

- j. The applicant shall submit four revised final copies of the archeological Phase I survey and Phase II NRHP evaluation report that addresses all comments to the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section. In order to determine compliance with this condition, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section, as designee of the Planning Board, shall determine that the reports are acceptable.
- k. Three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) or similar alternative shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) for their approval three weeks prior to a grading permit. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland. The RFA shall provide for the completion the clubhouse and clubhouse parking lot, one bocce ball court, one croquet court, 1,900 feet of trail system and the pool prior to the issuance of the 100<sup>th</sup> building permit; the completion of one trellis and one sitting area prior to the issuance of the 150<sup>th</sup> building permit; the completion of one gazebo and an additional 199 feet of trail by the issuance of the 200<sup>th</sup> building permit; the completion of the second trellis and an additional 660 feet of trail by the issuance of the 250<sup>th</sup> building permit; the completion of one picnic area, the second gazebo, one horseshoe pit and an additional 940 feet of trail and the completion of 275 feet of boardwalk and the second sitting area by the issuance of the 315<sup>th</sup> building permit. However, should inclement weather conditions prevent the completion of the pool prior to the issuance of the 100<sup>th</sup> building permit, in that case the pool shall be completed prior to the issuance of the 150<sup>th</sup> building permit.
- l. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
- m. Prior to signature approval, the applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that the recreational facilities are in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines and details and specifications of the facilities shall be provided. The recreational facilities shall be as follows:

**Indoor recreational facilities:**

Clubhouse including a meeting/gathering room and kitchen facilities

**Outdoor recreational facilities:**

Pool

Mini-park with croquet and sitting areas

Three gazebos

Two observation decks

A boardwalk adjacent to the southern observation deck

Bocce Courts and sitting areas

Horseshoe pits

Picnic area

One mile of hiker/biker trails located as proposed on the applicant's open space plan

- n. Seventy percent of single-family units and 60 percent of the townhouse units shall have a predominantly brick front. The proposed clubhouse shall utilize a minimum of 60 percent brick in the design of its elevations.
- o. A note shall be added to the plans stating that noise attenuation measures included in the project shall result in maximum exterior noise levels of 65 dBA and maximum interior noise levels of 45 dBA.
- p. Prior to issuance of the first building permit for the project, the applicant shall meet with the representatives of the Accokeek Development Review District Commission in order to determine the appropriateness of the inclusion of a public amenity in the proposed development. If deemed appropriate, the applicant and representatives of the Accokeek Development Review District Commission shall determine a precise location and specific description of the proposed public amenity.
- q. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the detailed site plan and the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised to use a retaining wall to eliminate the grading into the expanded stream buffer shown on Sheet 7 of 10 of the TCP II on the north side of the wetlands and behind the four residential units west of the main north-south street.
- r. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits that impact wetlands, the applicant shall provide the Environmental Planning Section with copies of the appropriate federal, state and local wetland permits which may be required.
- s. Prior to the certification of the detailed site plan, the TypeII tree conservation plan shall be revised to:
  - (i.) Use a retaining wall to eliminate the grading into the expanded stream buffer shown on Sheet 7 of 10 of the TCP II on the north side of the wetlands and behind the four residential units west of the main north/south street.
  - (ii.) Revise the worksheet as needed.
  - (iii.) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- t. Prior to the issuance of any new permits for Lot 11, TCP II/116/01 shall be revised to reflect clearing required for the development of Lot 11.
- u. The architectural design and materials for endwalls of units on highly visible lots, as identified on staff's Exhibit 1, shall be approved individually by Urban Design staff as



designee of the Planning Board. Design of such units shall involve the use of brick for entire front facades or as an accent water table and wrapped to visible side façades. The units shall have an attractive pattern of fenestration, which may involve an increased number of architectural features on a given façade.

- v. The architectural treatment (design and materials) of the sides and rear of the community building shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. Such design treatment shall include increased use of brick, continuation of at least a water table of brick to all four sides of the building, and increased balanced and well-articulated fenestration on the sides and rear.
  - w. Applicant shall add a note to the plans stating that all single-family detached dwellings and semidetached dwelling units shall have a minimum finished floor area of 2,200 square feet, exclusive of the garage.
- 2. Plans for all approved architecture for the project shall be maintained and made available to prospective purchasers in the sales office for the project.
  - 3. Prior to issuance of the first building permit for the project, the applicant shall meet with the representatives of the Accokeek Development Review District Commission in order to determine the appropriateness of the inclusion of a public amenity in the proposed development. If deemed appropriate, the applicant and representatives of the Accokeek Development Review District Commission shall determine a precise location and specific description of the proposed public amenity.

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 Vaughns, seconded by Commissioner Squire, with Commissioners Vaughns, Squire and Eley voting in favor of the motion, and with Chairman Hewlett absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 1, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 22nd day of December 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:rmk