

A M E N D 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 *was held before the Planning Board on July 14, 2005 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for Brighton Place, *[the Planning Board finds:] *and the Planning Board approved DSP-04082 and TCPII/75/05; and

*WHEREAS, District Council reviewed the Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 on February 27, 2006; and

*WHEREAS, the District Council remanded the case to the Planning Board to address issues relating to the design of the stormwater management pond, brick front façade requirements, utilities relocation, townhouse groups, the Watts-Branch watershed of the Anacostia River, and the tot-lot requirements; and

*WHEREAS, the Planning Board having considered the evidence presented at a second hearing on the case held on November 30, 2006 and evaluated the issues contained in the Order of Remand, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** This detailed site plan is for the purpose of reviewing a plan of development for 68 single-family detached dwellings, *[60]58 single-family attached (townhouse) dwellings, and *[three]two parcels to be conveyed to the homeowners association. In conjunction with the detailed site plan, the applicant is requesting two variances and a number of alternatives to the Development District Standards. The detailed site plan includes the site plan, the landscape plan, and the proposed architectural elevations for the single-family detached and the townhouse units.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

2. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-55 & R-T (DDOZ)	R-55 & R-T (DDOZ)
Use(s)	Single family detached dwelling(s)	Single family detached and townhouses
Acreage	RR-55 (19.00) R-T (10.00)	RR-55 (19.00) R-T (10.00)
Parcels	3	3
Lots	RR-55 (0) R-T (0)	RR-55 (68) R-T (60)
Dwelling Units:		
Detached	2 (to be razed)	68
Attached	0	*[60]58
Parking Required for townhouses (2.04 per unit)		*[123]119 spaces
Parking Provided for townhouses		*[146]134 spaces

3. **Location:** The property is located on the west side of Rollins Avenue approximately 1,500 feet south of its intersection with MD 332 (Old Central Avenue). The project is located within the Addison Road Metro (ARM) Town Center Development District Overlay Zone, which consists of a number of properties to the north, east, south and west of the Addison Road Metro Station. The town center is planned to serve as the focal point of the surrounding community. A compact, pedestrian-oriented street environment is envisioned for the town center through the ARM sector plan, which recommends specific land uses for the town center to take advantage of the Metro station. It promotes a mixed-use neighborhood with retail, office, residential, public and recreational spaces within convenient walking distance to Metro. The plan recommends an urban boulevard treatment along MD 214 (an arterial) and Addison Road (a collector) incorporating new trees, plantings, sidewalks, crosswalks, coordinated sign system, street furniture and lighting.

The subject property is located in the subarea known as Addison South. Addison South is envisioned in the plan to be a single-family neighborhood close to the Metro station with pedestrian access that is convenient and safe.

4. **Surroundings and Uses:** To the north of the subject property are a church and single-family detached units. To the east is vacant property zoned R-T. To the south is another church. To the west, across Rollins Avenue, are residential properties and an undeveloped park site owned by M-NCPPC.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject site was approved by the Planning Board on July 29, 2004, as Preliminary Plan 4-04011. The resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution No. 04-185, was adopted on September 23, 2004. The preliminary plan remains valid until September 23, 2006, or until a final plat is approved and recorded.
6. **Design Features:** The site is zoned both R-T and R-55 with a DDOZ overlay. The northern most area of the property is zoned R-T and is designed as a townhouse community. The townhouses are proposed to front on public roads and be accessed by private alleys with two-car garages at the rear of the unit. A central green space provides both preservation of existing woodland, recreational opportunities, and provision for stormwater management. The architectural elevations indicate the Brenton model, which is proposed at 1,640 square feet of finished living area, includes three bedrooms, 2.5 baths, and a two-car garage.

The R-55-zoned property is a single-family detached development with lots fronting on Rollins Avenue and lots configured around an internal grid street pattern. It is designed such that the locations of intersections with Rollins Avenue are based on good visibility for vehicular traffic, and culs-de-sac are utilized where intersections with Rollins Avenue did not meet the standards for good visibility.

The architectural elevations propose five different models for the single-family detached development to be built by Beazer Homes as follows:

Model	Minimum Finished Living Area
Kendall	2,702 square feet
Devon	2,252 square feet
Bancroft	2,693 square feet
Farrington	2,700 square feet
Ashland	2,590 square feet

The plan layout as a whole conforms to the vision set out by the ARM plan for the development of this site. This is the *[first]third residential development within the overlay zone to be reviewed by the Planning Board/District Council and will contribute toward revitalization of the area.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. The staff finds that the proposed development conforms to the purposes and recommendations for the Development District as stated in the Addison Road Metro Town Center sector plan. The ARM Town Center Development District sector plan sets out four primary goals or purposes. These four goals emphasize the need for revitalization of the area and the need to accommodate the users of the Metro station and pedestrians. The Development District Standards were written as design criteria to implement these goals. The sector plan summary states the following purposes:

The chief single purpose of the sector plan is to maximize the public benefits from the Addison Road Metro Station. Built on a widened and improved Central Avenue, the Addison Road station represents years of transportation planning and construction and millions of dollars of public investment. The station connects the ARM Town Center to the many employment, shopping, recreation, and business opportunities available to users of the Washington Metro system.

The sector plan sets out four primary goals:

First, revitalizing the town center with new, upscale residential and commercial development. The entire town center area is in need of revitalization to attract new business and residents.

Comment: The proposed infill project is the *[first] third residential use proposed as a detailed site plan and has been reviewed under the Development District Standards and should be considered *[the] a critical *[first] step in the revitalization of the Addison Road Metro Town Center.

Second, promoting transit-oriented development near the Metro station. Transit-oriented development serves Metro users, not the automobile.

Comment: The layout of this development is a grid pattern that will provide direct pedestrian access to the Metro as other properties develop and provide the critical connections to Addison Road.

Third, promoting pedestrian-oriented development. Pedestrian-oriented development aids Metro users and will encourage pedestrians to use residential and commercial properties near the Metro station; and

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

Comment: The site plan has provided for the use of rear-loaded townhouses, which will enhance the public streetscape for use by the pedestrian. The layout places the building toward the front

of the site and the vehicle driveway and parking facilities are removed from the pedestrian zone by the use of alleys. Although the automobile will be provided for on the site, pedestrian and vehicular conflicts have been minimized.

Fourth, compact development in the form of a town center, with a town commons area at Addison Road and MD 214, next to the Metro station. Compact development, with higher development densities favoring Metro users and pedestrians, offers the benefits of the Metro station to the greatest number of residents and businesses.

Comment: The proposed site plan contributes to the compact form of development envisioned in the Development District Standards. *[The density is the maximum allowed within the R-T Zone. The applicant has requested a variance to allow for more units in a row than would normally be allowed in the zone. Although the staff would not support such a request in a more suburban location, near the Metro it makes good planning sense to increase densities where possible. The use of block-length connected sticks of buildings is common in urban areas, which is the vision of this sector plan, to create an urban environment around the Metro]. This is one of the most important contributing factors to building the appearance of a Town Center.

8. The detailed site plan is in conformance with the Development District Standards of the development district overlay plan. Where a development district standard cannot be complied with, Section 27-548.25(c), allows the applicant to ask the Planning Board to apply different development standards, unless the plan provides otherwise. The Board must find that the alternate standard will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the master plan, master plan amendment, or sector plan. The applicant has requested the approval of alternative Development District Standards in order to implement the proposed plan of development. In general, the staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to modify the Development District Standards because the goals of the Addison Road Metro Town Center sector plan continue to be met with the proposed alternative standards. The following standards are requested to be modified:

- **S3. D.—A front build-to line between 10 and 15 feet from the right-of-way line shall be established for single-family attached residential dwellings within the town center.**

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

Alternate:

A front build-to line between 10 and 15 feet from the right-of-way line shall not be required for single-family attached residential dwellings within the town center.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"The current design will provide additional green space and less pavement in the area which will prove to enhance the quality of the development. Although moving the single family attached dwellings to a build-to-line of 10-15 feet may create the more urban setting of a downtown, it removes the feel of old-style community, in middle America, where life took place along the street frontage; creating a "front porch" community. Vehicular access to each home is from the alleys in the rear and provides not only the garage, but also space for visitors. The front building line was held at 25 feet to avoid excessive rear driveway length for the rear load garage."

Comment: The plan shows the units located between 25-30 feet from the front right-of-way line.

- **S3. E.—A front build-to line between 15 and 25 feet from the right-of-way line shall be established for the single-family detached residential dwellings within the town center.**

Alternate:

A front build-to line between 15 and 25 feet from the right-of-way line shall not be required for the single-family detached residential dwellings along Rollins Avenue and within the culs-de-sac within the town center.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"The current design provides additional green space in the area. Additionally, the requirement by DPW&T that the houses be setback from Rollins Avenue further than 25', places the applicant between conflicting requirements. Front building line on single family detach held at 25 feet for adequate driveway length. Unique driveway conditions on Rollins Avenue required to minimize driveway aprons along collector road per DPW&T request."

Comment: The staff agrees with the applicant's request to allow the units to be more than 25 feet from the right-of-way line along Rollins Avenue and on culs-de-sac lots located on the bulb of the street. A condition of approval is included in the recommendation section of this report that addresses this issue.

- **S3. F.—Residential garages shall be sited to reduce their visual impact on the street. Alternatives should be pursued which locate the garage towards the side or rear of a lot, or at a minimum recess the garage at least six feet from the front building façade.**

Alternate:

The applicant is offering five house types, three of which have garages that are recessed at least six feet from the front building façade. All units along Rollins Avenue will have garages recessed at least six feet. The applicant will not be required to recess garages six feet for two of the housing types.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"During our Applicant's Meeting on March 9th, we agreed with Park & Planning that all units along Rollins Avenue will have the recessed garages. In order to provide a variety of options for homebuyers, we determined the overall development would benefit from two additional single family house types. Although the garage for each of these two units is not recessed six feet back from the front building façade, the garage is not the dominant feature and each unit incorporates a street-facing porch."

Comment: The staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to build units along Rollins Avenue with the garages recessed at least six feet and to allow flexibility to construct two additional units where the garage is not recessed.

- **P1. C.—Cul-de-sacs as the terminus to streets shall be avoided. Cul-de-sacs may be used when developable land is surrounded by environmentally sensitive features.**

Alternate:

Cul-de-sacs as the terminus to streets shall be allowed.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"The applicant has worked with the Park & Planning staff to establish the most effective layout for the proposed development which includes two culs-de-sac. Environmentally sensitive features are being maintained through the use of culs-de-sac in the developable area.

"The Plan proposes two culs-de-sac extending from Street "D" toward Rollins Avenue. The culs-de-sac are provided in conjunction with two other, parallel streets that will connect with Rollins Avenue. This pattern allows for compliance with Paragraph "A" above and Paragraph "I" below while minimizing the need for redundant pavement in the subdivision. Due to sight distance constraints, it will not be possible to extract the cul-de-sac streets to Rollins Avenue."

Comment: The Transportation Section has reviewed the site visibility issue along Rollins Avenue and has determined that the proposed road configuration, including the use of culs-de-sac, is optimum as shown.

- **P2. E.—Sidewalks within the residential areas of the town center shall be constructed of concrete or brick paving, be a minimum of five feet in width, and should provide a six-foot-grass strip for the planting of shade trees.**

Alternate:

While all sidewalks are at least five feet in width, grass strips in the development are between four and seven feet depending on the appropriate right-of-way detail as required by the DPW&T standard.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"This as the previous standard places the applicant between conflicting requirements; those listed in the Addison Road Development Standards and those required by the Department of Public Work and Transportation."

Comment: The staff agrees with granting relief from this provision because of the standards set forth by the DPW&T.

- **B3. I.— Exterior façade materials shall be extended down to 12 inches from the finished grade, avoiding exposed unfinished concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) basement walls.**

Alternate:

Units with in-ground basements will meet this standard, however, in cases where the units have walk-out basements, the concrete should not be required to meet this standard.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"Foundation walls which are proposed are a cast in place formed concrete product that has a finished ribbed masonry appearance. It is a standard in the industry at this time."

Comment: The staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to use cast in place formed concrete product with a masonry appearance. The staff recommends that the formed concrete be painted in a color to match the exterior siding of the structure.

- **P5.D.—Ornamental poles and luminaires should be used instead of standard cobra head highway fixtures along all major roadways.**

Alternate:

Ornamental poles and luminaries shall be incorporated along the roadways of the development, however, the existing street light fixtures will remain along Rollins Avenue.

Rifkin, Livingston, Levitan & Silver, LLC's letter dated July 13, 2005:

"Specifically we are requesting relief from Standard-P5.D which states: "(o)rnamental poles and luminaries should be used instead of the standard cobra head highway fixtures along major roadways." (Emphasis added) The requested relief would only apply to the east side of Rollins Avenue. On page 13 of the Approved Sector Plan & Sectional Map Amendment (Plan and SMA) for the Addison Road Metro Center and Vicinity the text distinguishes between the words shall and should. As to those proposals which use the word "should" the authors of the Plan concede that they recommendations only and are therefore not legally binding.

The first argument is that the standard does not apply to Rollins Avenue. The Sector Plan does not designate Rollins Avenue as "major roadway". In the Chapter entitled, Access and Circulation, on page 58 the text recommends that Rollins Avenue be improved to collector status and include curb, gutter, sidewalks and turn lanes. Map 17 on page entitled "Town Center-Proposed Vehicular Circulation System" designates Rollins Avenue as an "existing road with sidewalk improvements."

Rollins Avenue forms the western boundary of the Addison Road Metro Center and as such functions as a transition area between the proposed core area and the Town of Capitol Heights. The entire Rollins corridor lies outside the 2000' radius which is designated as being accessible by a ten minute walk from the Metro station. In keeping with the character of the homes and public uses on the west side of Rollins Avenue the streetscape, including the existing street lights should remain. As illustrated on Map 13 with the exception of the proposed mixed use retail/office development in the southeastern quadrant of the intersection of Rollins Avenue and MD 214 all of the uses fronting onto Rollins Avenue are either existing residences or public uses recommended for retention or new residential construction.

Pursuant to Sec. 27-548.25 (c) if an applicant requests and the Planning Board so desires it may apply standards which differ from the approved Development District standards. The Board must find that the alternate standards will benefit the development and not substantially impair implementation of the Master Plan. We are here by formally requesting that the Board allow the existing street light fixtures to remain along Rollins Avenue.

The installation of ornamental poles and luminaries would in turn require that the utility lines be buried underground. The cost of this type utility relocation is prohibitive. The grant of the request will not substantially impair implementation of the existing General Plan, Master Plan or the Sector Plan. In fact, no specific recommendations for the lighting along Rollins Avenue are set forth in the very detailed Approved Sector Plan & SMA."

- **P6. B. —Redevelopment of parcels within the town center should incorporate the relocation of utilities underground.**

Alternate:

All utilities within the development will be underground in the 10 foot public utility easement.

Applicant's justification statement per letter dated June 14, 2005:

"Existing utility poles along Rollins Avenue will require relocation and it will be up to PEPCO to determine the feasibility of relocating the utilities underground along Rollins. Based on this, the applicant should not be required to relocate the existing utilities underground."

Comment: The feasibility of a small development conforming to the requirement to underground the utilities as stated above is questionable due to cost. This standard is more appropriate for a large redevelopment within the town center.

9. The alternative development district standards will benefit the proposed development and the district and will not substantially impair implementation of the DDOZ. The site plan will meet all other mandatory requirements; however the following requirements warrant discussion:

- **S3. M.—The rear of single-family detached/attached homes in Addison South shall not be oriented (facing) toward the master planned streets.**

Comment: The plan conforms to this important design concept by placing the front of the units toward the street line in both the single family detached section and the single family attached section.

- **S3. N.—The maximum lot coverage for single-family detached dwelling units shall be 60 percent.**
- **S3. O.—The maximum building coverage for single-family attached dwelling units shall be 50 percent of the overall net tract area.**

Comment: The plans should be revised to indicate conformance to this requirement prior to signature approval. A note added to the plans should be sufficient for both items above; however, at the time of building permit issuance, the lot coverage for the single-family detached development should be provided for each individual lot.

- **S4. E.—The bufferyard requirements within the town center shall be reduced to facilitate a compact form of development compatible with the urban character of the area surrounding the Metro station. The minimum bufferyard requirements for incompatible uses in the *Landscape Manual* shall be reduced by 50 percent within the town center. Alternative Compliance shall not be required for this reduction. A six-foot-high opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment shall be provided in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard between**

residential and commercial uses. The plant units required per 100 linear feet of property line or right-of-way shall also be reduced by 50 percent.

Comment: The plan reflects compliance with the criteria above.

- **P1. I.**—Vehicular linkages in Addison South shall be provided by a grid network of interconnecting streets. Linkages include connections to Rollins Avenue, Addison Road, Brooks Drive extension and Metro West to the north via Zelma and Yolanda Avenues.

Comment: The plan provides for a grid network of interconnecting streets.

- **P2. F.**—Crosswalks shall be provided at all intersections. Crosswalks at primary intersections shall be constructed of interlocking concrete pavers. Crosswalks at secondary intersections shall have striped markings in the pavement. Crosswalk materials for primary intersections shall be consistent throughout the town center.

Comment: The plans indicate crosswalks at the primary intersections, but details of the crosswalk should be added to the plans, prior to signature approval.

- **P4. B.**—Medium to large deciduous shade trees shall be utilized for street trees, and shall be planted between 30 and 40 feet on center. Street trees shall be installed at a minimum height of 12 feet and 2½ inch caliper.
- **P4. D.**—A limited tree and plant palette shall be selected to provide consistency, uniformity and a distinct identity to the roads within the town center. One tree species shall be selected for use as the street tree for each roadway within the town center.
- **P4. F.**—Plant selections for trees shall consider the following characteristics: shape of canopy, depth of root zone, overhead utility lines, drought tolerance, maintenance requirements and tolerance of adverse urban conditions. Native plant species are strongly recommended.

Comment: The three requirements above are best enforced through the submission of the street tree and paving plan for review prior to the issuance of building permits. Staff recommends that the applicant submit the plans to the Development Review Division at the time of the first building permit.

- **P5. C.**—At the time of the first site plan in Metro West or Addison South, a consistent type of ornamental pole and luminaire shall be selected in consultation with DPW&T.

Comment: This plan constitutes the *[first] third detailed site plan within the Addison South subarea. The plans reflect an attractive ornamental light fixture that is standard equipment to be installed under the PEPCO utility company.

- **B1. G.—At least 60 percent of the single family detached residential dwellings in a development project should incorporate street-facing porches to promote social interaction among neighbors and create a more active street environment.**

Comment: This requirement makes sense for this development with the exception of those units along Rollins Avenue. Those units are on the exterior of the community and will face a collector status roadway. Staff recommends that the units along Rollins Avenue not be required to meet the front porch requirement, because there are no units across the street.

- **B1. K.—The minimum size for single-family detached dwelling units shall be 2,200 square feet, not to include garages and unfinished basements. The minimum size for attached dwelling units shall be 1,600 square feet, not to include garage and unfinished basements.**

Comment: The size of the single-family detached units range from 2,252 to 2,702 square feet. The plans propose a minimum of 1,640 square feet of finished living area for the townhouse units.

- **B2. C.—Single-family attached residential units shall vary the roof line of each unit in a row to reduce the massing and bulk of the overall building and for architectural interest.**

Comment: The DDOZ requires variation in roofline within each stick of single-family attached units. The staff has asked the applicant to prepare an exhibit that depicts the typical *[ten-unit] building proposed for review and approval.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

- **B3. B.—Single-family residential building types shall have masonry front facades (brick, stone or approved equal) on at least 60 percent of the dwellings within a development project. Use of some masonry (such as brick) is encouraged on all sides of detached dwellings with brick fronts.**

Comment: In addition to the requirement that the front facades of the townhouses be at least 60 percent brick, the staff also recommends that all end walls have an exterior finish material of brick, at least for the first floor. In regard to the single family detached units, the staff recommends that the units along Rollins Avenue all have brick fronts to provide for a unified appearance along that street and to provide added noise reduction to the interior of the unit.

- **B3. L.—The selection of exterior colors should allow the building to blend in harmoniously with the overall fabric of adjacent buildings.**

- **B3. M.—The color palette for buildings should be kept simple and restrained. Wall color should be neutral with trim colors providing an appropriate accent.**
- **B3.N.—Brick or stone should be used in their natural or traditional colors and finish when selected as the predominant wall material of a building. Brick or stone generally should not be painted.**

Comment: The staff recommends that prior to signature approval the applicant provide the color samples for review by Urban Design to determine compliance to the three requirements above, and to provide a unified appearance to the development.

- **B4. J.—Single-family attached residential dwellings shall incorporate two or more windows or other architectural features on the ends of units. Blank walls are not permitted.**

Comment: A balanced end wall treatment of window placement must also be provided prior to signature approval of the plans.

10. The Transit District Site Plan is consistent with, and reflects the guidelines and criteria for development contained in, the Transit District Development Plan.

11. The Transit District site plan meets all of the requirements of the TDOZ and applicable regulations of the underlying zones*[,]. *[if the following requests for variances are approved by the Planning Board. By letter dated June 8, 2005, the applicant requests approval of a variance to allow for the construction of townhouses in groups of more than six units in a row. In addition, the applicant asked for approval of a reduction in the minimum width of private streets within the development from 26 feet to 18 feet in order to serve the townhouse units in an alley configuration. The following discussion addressed each of the issues above:]

*[Section 27-548.25(e) states the following:

If a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable Development District Standards.]

*[The applicant is requesting a variance from Section 27-433(d)(2), which states the following:

There shall be not more than six (6) dwelling units in any horizontal, continuous, attached group, except where the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, determines that more than six (6) dwelling units (but not more than eight (8) dwellings units) or that one-family semidetached dwellings would create a more attractive living environment, would be more environmentally sensitive, or would otherwise achieve the purposes of this Division. 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, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width.]

*[The applicant provides the following justification for exceeding the maximum number of units in a row:

“The Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance recommends townhouse groups not exceed six units in one row. The applicant proposes a development with townhouses in groups of more than six units in a row. Six townhouse groups are shown on the proposed plan. All six of the townhouse groups are comprised of ten units in a row. The six townhouse groups will also exceed 20% of the proposed development. On page 30, the ARMS Plan recommends that ‘[m]oderate to high residential densities are typically appropriate near town centers.’ The proposed development is in conformance with this recommendation for residential areas within the town center of the Addison Road Metro area.]

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

*[**Comment:** The staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to construct ten units in a row for a number of reasons. The creation of long blocks of townhouses is typical of city streets. The relationship of the dwellings to the street line is an important aspect of creating the sense of enclosure for the street. This is an urban concept, which was envisioned by the ARM sector plan. Further, high density near the Metro station is a goal to support the ridership and encourage pedestrian access to Metro rather than vehicles.]

*[The applicant has shown the 24-foot-wide footprint on the site plan and is in the process of designing a unit 24 feet in width. The final version of these plans will be required to be submitted prior to signature approval of the plans.]

*[The applicant is also requesting a variance from Section 27-433(e)(1)(B) which states the following:

Private streets which are interior to the project (and are not dedicated to public use) shall be improved to not less than the current standards set forth in Subtitle 23 of this Code which apply to a public, twenty-six foot wide secondary street, except that roadside trees are not required (within the street right-of-way). Sidewalks may be omitted when it is determined that there is no need for them. Sidewalks cast monolithically with the curb and gutter shall be permitted.]

*[The applicant provides the following justification for reduction of the width of the private street:

“The Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance also states that private streets must be at least 26 feet wide. The applicant proposes a private street which services the townhouse units to be reduced to 18 feet wide. Reducing the street width allows the applicant to provide the residents of the community with a larger open space area for recreation purposes. ‘A town green and public amenities in a central location define space for social and community activities for town center residents and businesses.’ ARMS Plan page 166. Allowing a reduction to the private street will give the residents of the community a larger, centralized location in which to socialize.]

*[**Comment:** The staff agrees with the applicant's proposal to construct 18-foot wide alleys to serve the rear-loaded townhouses. This is the normal width of an alley and allows for the passage of two vehicles. However, this issue was resolved at the time of the Planning Board hearing because the County Council was approved CB-5-2005 which allows the use of alley within the Development District Overlay Zone.]

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

12. **Conformance to the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04011:** The plan layout is consistent with the layout approved at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision, with a few minor

changes due to stormwater management design and wetland impacts review by the Maryland Department of the Environment. The following conditions of approval of the plan warrant discussion:

3. **The applicant shall dedicate 60 feet along the north property line between Addison Road and Zelma Avenue as right-of-way for a planned east-west primary street as shown on the Addison Road Metro Town Center Sector Plan. Improvements within the dedicated right-of-way shall be determined by DPW&T.**

Comment: The site plan should be revised to label and delineate the dedication of 60 feet along the entire northern property line, from the eastern edge of the property to the western edge of the property.

- 8.f. **Storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to a homeowners association. The location and design of drainage outfalls that adversely impact property to be conveyed shall be reviewed and approved by DRD prior to the issuance of grading or building permits.**

The stormwater management pond and the wetland system to be preserved to the west will be the subject of a detailed grading plan, to be included with the first permit involving land disturbance in this area.

Recommended Condition: Prior to issuance of the first permit, a copy of the wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted, with all accompanying landscape plans. The mitigation plan shall show extensive plantings of wetland plants and water-tolerant trees and other plants throughout the disturbed area, in conformance with any and all comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Corps of Engineers. The areas where the wetlands previously existed shall be landscaped as a natural area and as much of the area as possible around the pond shall be naturalized.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams, or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.

Recommended Condition: The following notes shall be placed on the TCPII:

- After the site has been cleared, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the DER site inspector, M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section and their certified arborist to evaluate the vegetation on the edges of the preservation area.
- The certified arborist hired by the applicant shall prepare a written report regarding how invasive plants will be removed from the preservation area. The report shall be submitted to and reviewed by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section.

- 9. At the time of review of the DSP the plan shall be evaluated to ensure safe pedestrian and bicycle movements, that should include methods of reducing vehicular speeds within the neighborhoods and alerting motorists of pedestrian movements.**

Comment: Finding 7 of the Planning Board's approval for 4-04011 states the following: "The Adopted and Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan recognizes that bicycle and pedestrian facilities are important in promoting nonmotorized access to the Addison Road Metro. Standard sidewalks, wide sidewalks, or trails are recommended along all major roads due to their ability to facilitate continuous pedestrian movement to the town center and Metro. Sidewalks are recognized as an important component of transit-oriented development. The sector plan also recommends a grid street system in the town center area. This type of street grid is bicycle-friendly because it disperses traffic along numerous routes and tends to promote slower driving speeds. Part of this proposed grid is reflected on the submitted plan.

"Although no master plan trails impact the subject site, staff is recommending a comprehensive network of standard and wide sidewalks along the internal streets in order to accommodate pedestrian and encourage nonmotorized access to Metro. All sidewalk recommendations are per the concurrence of DPW&T. Further evaluation at the time of review of the DSP should occur to ensure safe pedestrian and bicycle movements. The DSP should also evaluate methods of promoting slower vehicular speeds within the neighborhoods and alerting motorists to pedestrian movements."

- 10. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:**
- a. Provide a wide sidewalk (six to eight-feet wide) along the subject site's entire frontage of Rollins Avenue.**
 - b. Provide wide sidewalks (six to eight-feet wide) along both sides of Street A and Street C. These roads, as envisioned in the Sector Plan, will provide pedestrian access from the town center and residential areas to the Addison Road Metro.**
 - c. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all other internal roads.**

All improvements within the public rights-of-way are subject to the approval of DPW&T.

Comment: The applicant should submit the street tree and paving plans to demonstrate conformance with the requirements above.

- 12. MD 332 and Rollins Avenue—Prior to the issuance of any building permits within**

the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital improvement program, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. Provision of a separate northbound left-turn and right-turn approach lanes along Rollins Avenue, to be constructed according to SHA standards.**
- b. Submission at the time of detailed site plan of an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA (and DPW&T, if necessary) for the intersection of MD 332 and Rollins Avenue. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of SHA. If a signal is deemed warranted by SHA, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by SHA.**

The improvements in a. above may be waived by SHA, in consultation with M-NCPPC transportation planning staff, only if (a) it is determined by SHA that adequate right-of-way to construct the needed improvements is not available, and (b) it is determined by SHA that the signalization identified in B above is warranted and will operate acceptably with the one-lane approach along Rollins Avenue. The status of these improvements shall be provided and reviewed during review of the detailed site plan.

Comment: This condition is a two-part condition requiring (a) construction of separate northbound left-turn and right-turn lanes and (b) study of signal warrants at the time of detailed site plan. The applicant did perform a signal warrant study, and it was submitted to the State Highway Administration (SHA).

The final section of Condition 12 allows the improvement under (a) above to be waived by SHA under the following circumstances: (1) It is determined by SHA that adequate right-of-way to construct the improvement is not available, **and** (2) the signal studied under (b) above is warranted and it is determined to operate acceptably with the one-lane approach. The applicant did determine that a signal would not be warranted and did also include a statement regarding the physical improvements that utilities would need to be relocated and that right-of-way was not available. Despite this determination, the entire condition cannot be waived. Either a signal is allowed by SHA or the physical improvements must be constructed as a means of meeting the adequacy finding made at the time of subdivision. NOTE: This is not really a detailed site plan issue, but must be addressed at the time of building permit application.

- 13. At the time of review of the DSP, the applicant shall demonstrate conformance with Section 24-134 of the Subdivision Regulations and shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on homeowners association**

(HOA) open space land. Recreational facilities shall be provided in accordance with the Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines.

Comment: Finding 6 of the Planning Board approval for 4-04011 states the following:

“In accordance with Section 24-135(b) of the Subdivision Regulations, the Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation recommends that the applicant provide private on-site recreational facilities for the fulfillment of the requirement of mandatory dedication of parkland. The ARM plan identifies a centrally located park between Rollins Avenue and Addison Road South.

“M-NCPPC has an existing undeveloped park on the west side of Rollins Avenue known as the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park. Staff evaluated the possibility of the applicant paying a fee-in-lieu of the mandatory dedication of parkland for the purposes of developing facilities on the existing park. However, the cost of developing that site would exceed any fee-in-lieu that would be required. Staff recommends that on-site recreational facilities would better serve the residents, conform to the requirements of the ARM plan, and not require residents to cross Rollins Avenue to have access to any recreational facilities.”

Comment: The staff has reconsidered their previous recommendation that the Planning Board require recreational facilities on site. The sector plan had envisioned a central park area that would serve all the future residents within the ARM; however, the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation has made it clear that additional land in this area is not needed as a public park. The subject site is directly across Rollins Avenue from property known as the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park. This park consists of 17.5 acres of land and is currently undeveloped. No money is currently in the Capital Improvement Program for development of the park. With the development of the subject property and the development proposed on the adjacent property, known as Addison Road South (Preliminary Plan 4- 05016), staff believes that a central recreational area would be of greater value to the overall sector plan than scattered recreational facilities under the control of several different homeowners associations. The applicant has agreed to the concept of providing a donation to the Department of Parks and Recreation for development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park. *[In addition, the applicant has agreed to provide a tot-lot within the community that would serve the youngest future residents of the development.] Staff has included a condition that requires the applicant to donate *[a portion of] the money that would normally be bonded for the on-site recreational facilities. In addition, staff recommends that a crosswalk and appropriate signage be shown on the plans, as well as the street tree and paving plans.

*At the time of the review of the application by the District Council, it was made clear at the hearing, that the incorporation of the proposed tot-lot, as shown on the plan, was undesirable. Therefore, the staff recommends that the revised plans be approved eliminating the tot-lot, and that the Condition No. 1 be revised to increase the amount of the contribution from \$100,000 to \$145, 000 for the purpose of funding the Rollins Avenue Park.

- 18. Prior to submittal of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall coordinate and hold a meeting with staff from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), the Department of Environmental Resources, and the Urban Design and Environmental Planning Sections of the Planning Department, M-NCPPC. Prior to that meeting, the TCPI shall be reviewed to show all the regulated features correctly. Additional impacts to environmental features may be considered with input from MDE.**

Comment: Several meetings have been held with MDE. The wetland mitigation plan they approve will provide mitigation on the subject property. The TCPI has been revised and has signature approval has been obtained.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

- 23. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over to this plan.

- 24. Prior to the submittal of the detailed site plan the applicant shall coordinate a meeting with the Environmental Planning Section (M-NCPPC) and DPW&T to determine if impacts to the environmental feature on Parcel C are necessary for improvements along Rollins Avenue, if required, and shall determine if the impacts can be eliminated, reduced or altered.**

Comment: The revised plans show a design that maximizes the preservation area on the site. DPW&T requirements will need to be met along Rollins Avenue. The final drainage pattern will need to be designed to ensure the long-term survival of the plants in the preservation area. The condition above addresses the need for detailed plans for this area.

- 25. Prior to the submittal of the detailed site plan the applicant shall demonstrate an engineering reason, such as sight distances, grading or drainage, or other good cause why Street A can not be realigned to avoid impacts to the environmental feature on Parcel C along Rollins Avenue.**

Comment: The revised plans show the sight distance problem and site visits have confirmed this situation. The site as currently designed, with the large preservation area adjacent to Rollins Avenue, preserves the largest possible area of existing vegetation given the grading requirements and limitations of the site.

REFERRAL COMMENTS

13. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this detailed site plan (68 single-family dwelling units in R-55 Zone and 60 townhouse dwelling units in the R-T Zone) for adequacy of public facilities and concluded the following:

The existing fire engine service at Seat Pleasant Station, Company 8, located at 6305 Addison Road has a service travel time of 1.83 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at the Capitol Heights Station, Company 5, located at 6061 Central Avenue has a service travel time of 1.83 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at the Capitol Heights Station, Company 5, located at 6061 Central Avenue has a service travel time of 2.10 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at the Capitol Heights Fire Station, Company 8, located at 7701 Landover Road has a response time of 2.10 minutes, which is within the 4.25 minutes response time guideline.

The proposed complex will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance, paramedic and ladder truck service. The above findings are in conformance with the *Approved Public Safety Master Plan* (1990) and the “Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.”

Further, the proposed development is within the service area for Police District III—Landover. The Planning Board’s current test for police adequacy is based on a standard complement of officers. As of 1/2/05, the county had 1,302 sworn officers and 43 student officers in the academy for a total of 1,345 personnel, which is within the standard of 1,278 officers. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed residential development.

Comment: This analysis is provided for information purposes only, since adequate public facilities were tested, appropriately, at the time of the preliminary plat of subdivision

14. The Community Planning Division reviewed the plan and finds the following:
 - a. This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier.
 - b. This application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2000 Addison Road Town Center & Vicinity Sector Plan for Subarea 4—Addison South.
 - c. The application is located in the Developed Tier and in a Community Center. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use pedestrian-oriented, medium-to-high density neighborhoods.
15. **Conformance to the *Landscape Manual*** —The plan conforms to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* as modified by the Development District Standards.
16. The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the detailed site plan. The site is characterized by terrain sloping toward the northeast and draining into unnamed tributaries of the Anacostia River watershed in the Anacostia River basin. A review of the available information indicates that there are streams, Water of the U.S., wetlands, and areas of severe and steep slopes associated with the site. There are no 100-year floodplain, high erodible soils or Marlboro clays found to occur on the site. Rollins Avenue is a collector roadway not generally regulated for noise. The primary soil type found to occur on the subject property according to the Prince George’s County Soils Survey is the Collington series. This soil series generally exhibits slight to moderate limitations to development due to steep slopes. Based on the information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled, “Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George’s Counties,” December 1997, there are no

rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads adjacent to this property. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the adopted General Plan.

- a. The revised Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) as submitted, dated June 28, 2004, was found to generally address the requirements of a detailed forest stand delineation and to be in compliance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The plan, however, states that the amount of woodland on-site is 11.05 acres and the TCPI states that there are 11.14 acres. This discrepancy must be reconciled.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the amount of woodland existing on-site shall be verified and either the TCPI or the FSD shall be revised accordingly.

- b. The Subdivision Ordinance requires the preservation of stream and wetlands and their associated buffers in their entirety, unless the Planning Board approves a variation and can make the required findings of Section 24-113. Variations were approved for the site, with conditions. The DSP is in conformance with the approvals of the Planning Board with respect to the impacts to the on-site regulated features. A redesign of the stormwater management pond resulted in a different configuration of the pond and the preservation area than that shown on the TCPI. Staff recommends that the Planning Board find conformance with the previous approvals.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the proposed impacts to regulated features.

- c. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because a Type I Tree The Conservation Plan (TCPI/33/04) was approved by the Planning Board.

According to the most recent TCPII on file for this case, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on February 28, 2005, the minimum woodland conservation requirement for the site is 5.80 acres of the net tract. An additional 7.14 acres are required due to the removal of all of the woodlands on-site, for a total woodland conservation requirement of 12.94 acres. However, because the FSD and the TCPI show different acreages of existing woodland and because the areas of disturbance will change to address other conditions, these calculations are not correct. The plan shows the requirement being met with 12.94 acres of off-site mitigation at a location to be determined later. In addition, there are several other minor revisions required.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the TCPII, it shall be revised as follows:

- (1) The plans shall be designed to meet all of the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance including the provision of tree protection and the

required notes.

- (2) Revise the worksheet as necessary to address all conditions of approval.
 - (3) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- d. A stormwater management concept approval letter and the associated plans are required to be submitted with the preliminary plan. The design of the pond has changed considerably; however, it is still in conformance with the concept approved. Technical stormwater management plans will be required prior to permit approval.

Recommended Condition: Prior to approval of the first permit, a copy of the approved technical stormwater management plans must be submitted to M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section. The limits of disturbance on the stormwater management plan and those on the TCPII must coincide.

17. The Transportation Planning Division has reviewed the detailed site plan application referenced above. The property is located on the east side of Rollins Avenue approximately 1,500 feet south of its intersection with Central Avenue. Vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable. The layout of this site was reviewed extensively at the time of the preliminary plan, and it was determined that the layout of the site, as reflected on the detailed site plan, is consistent with the underlying ARM plan. An issue that arose during review of the subject plan concerned the alignment of the major north/south street through the site. An adjacent site filed a subdivision plan that indicated that the southern end of this street, if extended along the alignment shown on the subject site's preliminary plan, would disturb environmental features on the adjacent property. A decision regarding the other pending subdivision was made to avoid the environmental features by extending this north/south street directly south instead of curving it southeastward, and the subject plan has been modified to take that change into account.

The subject plan includes three streets crossing the site on an east/west alignment and takes major steps toward the realization of the major transportation components of the ARM plan, including development of a grid street pattern.

The property was the subject of a 2004 traffic study and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2004 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04011. Insofar as the basis for those findings is 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.

18. The staff has reviewed the proposed architectural elevations. The townhouse architecture will need to be revised to include a second model type that is a minimum of 24 feet wide as an end-unit product. Additional townhouse architecture should be provided to add a second interior

model type as well. Any proposal for decks on the rear of the units will require details and specifications on the plans, prior to signature approval of the plans.

19. The project is located outside the City of Seat Pleasant and the Town of Capital Heights; however, the subject applicant is within one mile of each municipality. The plans were sent to each municipality; however, as of the writing of this report, this office has not received a response from either. The staff called each municipality on June 16 *2005 and left messages that the case would be going before the Planning Board for review.
20. The detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.
- *21. The Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for Brighton Place, on July 14, 2005 (PGCPB No. 05-162). The District Council reviewed the Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for Brighton Place on February 27, 2006, and remanded the case to the Planning Board. The Order of Remand dated February 27, 2006, is quoted below and responses are provided.

REMANDED to the Planning Board, for the following reasons:

- A. The Planning Board shall reevaluate, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), the advisability of the proposed above-ground stormwater management pond and the technical feasibility of underground facilities. If it is determined by DER that underground facilities are technically feasible and approvable in light of applicable county laws and policies, the plan shall be revised to eliminate the above-ground stormwater management pond and substitute underground facilities.**

The applicant provided the following discussion regarding this item in a letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

*Denotes Amendment
Underlining indicates new language
[Brackets] indicate deleted language

“In response to the March 28, 2006, remand by the District Council for the above-referenced case, the applicant, Beazer Homes, has responded as follows with its revised detailed site plan filed recently with The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC):

- “A. The Department of Environmental Resources (“DER”) has given conceptual stormwater approval to the proposed development. Previously, the detailed site plan was requesting an urban development—evidenced by the request to construct townhouses in groups of ten for which an underground pond was believed to be more appropriate. This has been deleted from the plan

resulting in a suburban development for which a pond is appropriate and will be used as a recreational feature.

“Additionally, an underground facility would be maintained by the homeowner’s association at the expense of the homeowners who will eventually reside at the property. Conversely, the proposed pond will be maintained by the county and will not be a maintenance and financial burden on the homeowners.

“Further, there are wetlands and ephemeral streams on this site that are to be impacted by this development. As part of the process to acquire permits for these impacts, it was demonstrated that some of the water quality benefits associated with these resources could be replaced by the proposed wet pond facility. An underground facility cannot provide the same benefits.

“The pond as designed for this site has undergone extensive review with the Maryland Department of the Environment, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Prince George’s County DER, and M-NCPPC. This pond is also designated as a publicly maintained facility due to the size of the drainage area and the fact that multiple individual residential property owners are dependent on its function. The design of the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed and is a component of the open space within the planned community. Finally, the pond has been redesigned to provide the homeowners with an aesthetically pleasing recreational area.”

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

Staff Comment: The stormwater management pond as now proposed is considerably smaller than the original submittal. This has increased the amount of woodland conservation area on-site. A letter dated July 27, 2006 from Rick Thompson of the Department of Environmental Resources to Redis Floyd, Clerk of the Council, indicates that DER has reviewed the advisability of above-ground stormwater management and technical feasibility of underground facilities, and determined that an above-ground facility is the best alternative in light of applicable county laws and policies. This issue has been addressed by the Department of Environmental Resources in a letter dated July 27, 2006, Thompson to Floyd:

“I am writing regarding the order of remand of the Brighton Place project issued by the District Council on March 28, 2006. As I understand it, the council is concerned about the use of the stormwater management (SWM) pond on the site. This letter should address this concern and clarify any issue with the SWM pond on the property.

“The issue was raised that this site is urban and should be treated as such with regard to SWM. The use of underground (UG) SWM facilities in urban areas is an acceptable practice when the density and use are such that there is no land available to provide for an acceptable above ground facility. UG facilities are most always privately owned and maintained due to the difficulties associated with access for maintenance and the fact that the contributing drainage areas are typically small and individually owned. UG facilities are common in redevelopment sites within ‘ultra urban’ areas that have previously been developed with near 100 percent impervious coverage and direct outfall to an extensive underground stormdrain system. UG facilities are also used beneath large, commercial parking areas in densely developed areas that, once again, do not have sufficient area for an above ground facility.

“This site, although considered urban, does not have any of the characteristics typically associated with the use of an UG SWM facility. It is not a redevelopment within an ‘ultra urban’ area, and its drainage area is large (33+ acres). In fact, the site has just recently been used for agriculture and has less than one percent of the entire site in impervious coverage. The site does not discharge to an extensive underground stormdrain system. The drainage outfall from this site discharges directly to an open channel stream system on the west side of Rollins Avenue. Further, there are wetlands and ephemeral streams on this site that will be impacted by this development. As part of the process to acquire permits for these impacts, it was demonstrated that some of the water quality benefits associated with these resources could be replaced by the proposed wet pond facility. A UG facility cannot provide the same benefits and could affect the issuance of these permits.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

“The pond designed for this site has undergone extensive review by the Maryland Department of the Environment, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources, and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. This pond is also designated as a publicly maintained facility due to the size of the drainage area and the fact that multiple residential property owners are dependent on its function. The design of the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed, and is a component of the open space within the planned community. Finally, this facility is being proposed as a site amenity that will provide the entire community with an aesthetically pleasing recreational area.”

B. Staff, applicant, and Planning Board must explain the basis for the brick front façade requirements in the Planning Board Resolution, PGCPB No. 05-162, approving this site plan.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion regarding this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“As required by the R-T Zone, a minimum of sixty percent of the single-family attached homes will have front facades that are one hundred percent brick.

“Additionally, beyond these zone requirements, the applicant shall:

(A) Provide full brick side walls on the single-family, attached units on lots 1, 19, 20, 39, 40 and 58 as these lots are highly visible from the street.

(B) All the single-family attached end walls shall, at a minimum, have brick wrapping the first floor of the side elevations.

“Prior conditions (2) (j) (1) and (2) (l) need to be revised to reflect these changes.”

Staff comment: The basis for the brick front façade requirements are found in both the underlying R-T Zone and the DDOZ overlay zone. The Addison Road Metro Town Center requires at least 60 percent masonry front facades for all single family homes (see PGCPB No. 05-162, page 11, paragraph 8).

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

C. The Planning Board shall reconsider and review exterior facade materials, utilities relocation, townhouse groups, the Watts-Branch watershed of the Anacostia River, and the tot lot requirement, as follows:

(1) **In paragraph B.3. I. of the Board's initial decision (page 7): exterior facade materials should be extended down to 12 inches from the finished grade, avoiding exposed unfinished concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) basement walls. Alternatively, exposed side and rear basement walls may be clad with standard brick, or brick-formed and painted concrete below the level of the siding.**

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“B. As desired, exposed sides of rear basement walls will be clad with standard brick or brick-formed and painted concrete below the level of the siding.”

Staff comment: The majority of the units will not have exposed sides or rears of basement walls because most of the basements are below grade. Less than five percent of the units will have exposed sides and rear basement walls, none of which will be visible from a street.

(2) In paragraph P.6. B. of the Board's initial decision (page 8), redevelopment of parcels within the town center should require underground relocation of utilities (except along Rollins Avenue).

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“(2) As requested, all new utility connections to the houses will be underground.”

Staff comment: The staff continues to support the alternative language approved by the Planning Board:

All utilities within the development will be underground in the 10-foot public utility easement and in connections to individual houses.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

(3) The Board should explain why the plan as approved allows more than eight townhouse units in an attached group within the project.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“The project no longer proposes more than eight townhouse units in an attached group. In fact, the following groupings are proposed.

- “• Six sets of six units in a row.
- “• Four sets of four units in a row.
- “• Two sets of three units in a row.”

Staff comment: The plans have been revised to indicate no more than six units in a row. The original plan proposed ten units in a row.

(4) The Board, with staff assistance, should examine more closely and evaluate in its new decision the project's potential and likely impacts on the Watts-Branch watershed of the Anacostia River.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“Rick Thompson (Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources) in his letter on July 27, 2006 states: ‘The design on the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed, and is a component of the open space within the planned community.’ Clearly then, there is no potential and likely impact on the Watts-Branch Watershed on the Anacostia River as evidenced by the language and the positive findings of Mr. Thompson’s letter.”

Staff comment: All stormwater management facilities are designed to mimic pre-development conditions and are required to reduce post-construction volumes to that of pre-development conditions. The stormwater management facility shown is of sufficient size, according to review by the Department of Environmental Resources, to manage the volumes created by the new development. It should be noted that much of the development within the Anacostia watershed was completed prior to the establishment of stormwater management regulations. This project should result in improved water quality compared to the water quality that is running off sites developed without the benefit of stormwater management.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

(5) The Board should reevaluate the need for a tot lot in the project, and should replace the tot lot with other age groups or provide additional funds for development of Rollins Avenue Park.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“The District Council, at the February 27, 2006, hearing at which the detailed site plan was remanded to the Planning Board, was clear that it did not want on-site recreational amenities, including the one previously proposed tot lot. Instead, the District Council wants a fee in lieu paid in the amount of \$145,000 for regional facilities at the Rollins Avenue Park.

“In furtherance of the District Council’s clear and succinct instructions, the tot lot has been removed from the plan and the applicant shall pay \$145,000 to M-NCPPC as a fee-in-lieu.”

Staff comment: The plans have been revised to remove the tot-lot that was previously shown within the open space area of the townhouse section.

D. If additional persons wish to become parties of record, then they should be added, after the case is remanded.

Staff comment: The statement above reflects the current practice of the Planning Board. The property was posted 30 days prior to the scheduled hearing.

*22. The Environmental Planning Section provided the following analysis in conjunction with the revised plans as stated in their memo dated October 16, 2006.

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan and TCPII for Brighton Place, stamped as received by the Countywide Planning Division on September 26, 2006. This detailed site plan and TCPI were originally approved by the Planning Board subject to conditions contained in PGCPB No. 05-062 on July 14, 2005. The application was remanded to the Planning Board by order of the District Council on February 27, 2006, for reasons listed in the order of remand. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the reasons for remand, and recommends re-approval of DSP-04082 and TCPII/75/05 subject to the conditions of the original resolution, and as listed at the end of this memorandum.

-

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

Environmental Conditions of PGCPB No. 05-162

The Environmental Planning Section has re-reviewed the DSP and TCPII for conformance with environmental conditions of the original Planning Board resolution. These conditions are shown in bold typeface, and the associated comments are shown in standard typeface.

-
- 5. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

Comment: This condition will be addressed at time of issuance of any permits, and should be retained.

- 6. Prior to issuance of the first permit, a copy of the wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted, with all accompanying landscape plans. The mitigation plan shall show extensive plantings of wetland plants and water-tolerant trees and other plants throughout the disturbed area, in conformance with any and all comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Corps of Engineers. The areas where the wetlands previously existed shall be landscaped as a natural area and as much of the area around the pond shall be naturalized.**

Recommended Additional Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the DSP the TCPII/Landscape Plan shall be revised to show extensive landscaping around the proposed pond.

7. The following notes shall be placed on the TCPII:

“After the site has been cleared the applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the DER Site Inspector, M-NCPPC’s Environmental Planning Section and their certified arborist to evaluate the vegetation on the edges of the preservation area.” The certified arborist hired by the applicant shall prepare a written report regarding how invasive plants will be removed from the preservation area. The report shall be submitted to and reviewed by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section.”

Comment: This condition has been addressed, and does not need to be retained.

8. Prior to certification of the TCPII, it shall be revised as follows:

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

- a. The plans shall be designed to meet all of the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, including the provision of tree protection and the required notes.
- b. **Revise the worksheet as necessary to address all conditions of approval.**
- c. **Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.**

Comment: The TCPII and DSP must be revised to add the symbol for forest cleared areas in the legend. Furthermore, the symbol for area cleared on sheet 3 is missing on both the map and legend; existing tree lines must be shown on plan; stormwater management pond inlet and outfalls must be shown on the TCPII; wooded areas 1 and 2 retained as “non-woodlands retained FCA”, should be counted as area cleared because they are within limits of disturbance; and that portion of “woodland retained non FCA” area 3 within the right-of-way must be calculated as cleared.

Recommended Revised Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. Revise the legend and the plan to reflect and identify all graphic symbols used;
- b. Revise the plan to show the existing tree line;

- c. Revise the plan to reflect woodland areas 1 and 2 as being cleared;
- d. Revise the plan to reflect “woodland retained non-FCA” area 3 within the right-of-way must be counted as cleared;
- e. Remove labels “existing foundation landscaping (non forest); open crown scrub (non forest)” from sheet 5; and “existing tree row (not forest)” from sheet 3;
- f. Revise the plan to reflect the details of the final stormwater management pond design, including inlets and outfalls;
- g. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan; and
- h. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

9. Prior to approval of the first permit, a copy of the approved Technical Stormwater Management Plans must be submitted to M-NCPPC’s Environmental Planning Section. The limits of disturbance on the Stormwater Management Plan and those on the TCPII must coincide.

Comment: This condition has not yet been addressed and should be retained.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

***23. Urban Design Review of Remand:** The plans have been revised to address the concerns expressed by the District Council in their review. The major changes to the plans are reflected in the reduction of the number of units in a row, being reduced from the original design of ten units in a row to no more than six in a row. The plans were also changed in regard to the design of the stormwater management plan. More attention has been given to detail on incorporation of trails and landscaping around the pond. The third major change to the plans is the elimination of the tot-lot from the plans.

The reduction of the number of units in a row results in an overall reduction in the number of townhouses from 60 to 58 units. This revision is still in keeping with the Addison Road Town center plan and does not create any other non-conformance issues with the underlying zone or the overlay zone. However, the change does impact the general notes of the plan and the number of required parking spaces, so the plan has addressed both issues appropriately.

The revisions to the stormwater management pond are an improvement over the original design. The applicant has provided an exhibit that reflects the proposal, but the actual detailed site plan does not reflect the same grading and details: therefore the plan must be changed prior to signature approval to reflect the proposal shown in the exhibit dated November 13, 2006.

The application has been revised to fulfill the District Council’s desire to eliminate the on-site recreational facilities and instead contribute funds toward the planned development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park across Rollins Avenue from the subject site. Therefore, the staff has revised the condition relating to the amount of the contribution to be increased proportionate to

the bonding amount of the tot-lot.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

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/75/05) and APPROVED the proposed Alternative Development District Standards S3.D, S3.E, S3.F, P1.C, P2.E, B3.I, P5.D and P6.B, *[APPROVED the requested variance from Section 27-433(d)(2),] and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide evidence of a contribution to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of *[\$100,000] \$145,000 for the development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.
2. Prior to signature approval, the following conditions shall be fulfilled:
 - a. The maximum lot coverage of 60 percent for the single-family detached dwellings shall be added to the plans.
 - b. The plans shall demonstrate that the maximum building coverage for single-family attached dwellings shall be no more than 50 percent of the overall tract area.
 - c. The details and specifications of the proposed crosswalks shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section and shall be shown on the plans.
 - d. The location of light fixtures, height of pole, details and specifications, and fixture type shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section and shall be shown on the plans.
 - e. The architectural elevations for the proposed building sticks shall be prepared for review and approval by the Urban Design Section.
 - f. The applicant shall submit the proposed exterior color palette for proposed siding, trim, roof shingles, brick foundation, and front doors for the units, and the colors shall be approved by the Urban Design Section.
 - g. A minimum of two end-wall features shall be provided on the single-family detached units and three or more features on the end walls of the townhouse units.
 - h. All roadways shall be extended to the property line and constructed so that they terminate

at the property line for future extension into the adjacent property.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

- i. A crosswalk shall be shown connecting Street A to the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.
 - j. The architectural elevations shall be revised as follows:
 - (1) *[The townhouse architecture shall include another interior model type and a 24-foot-wide unit to be added to the package to be constructed at the end of each townhouse stick. The elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section.] The *architecture of the townhouse end walls shall, at a minimum, depict brick wrapping the first floor of the front and side elevations.
 - (2) The Kendall and Ashland models shall be revised to show an attached garage.
 - (3) A side-entry garage shall be provided for the Devon model.
 - (4) The optional stone water table and partial stone front on Elevation 1 of the Ashland model shall be changed to brick.
 - (5) The Devon model shall delete Elevation 1 due to the lack of variation in the roof-line.
 - (6) All porch details shall be shown at least six feet in depth.
 - k. The location and the details and specifications of the signage shall be shown on the plans.
 - l. The architecture elevations for the single-family attached development shall indicate brick as the exterior finish material on the entire *highly visible side wall *for the lots 1, 19, 20, 39, 40, and 58.
 - m. The amenities to be included around the stormwater management pond shall include appropriate seating elements for the future residents.
3. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the street tree and paving plans shall be submitted to MNCPPC to determine conformance to the following:
- a. Street trees shall be planted approximately 35 feet on center.
 - b. Street trees shall be installed at a minimum size of 2½-inch caliper.
 - c. A variety of tree species shall be selected for use as the street trees for the roadways within the town center.

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

- d. Plant selections for trees shall consider the following characteristics: shape of canopy, depth of root zone, overhead utility lines, drought tolerance, maintenance requirements, and tolerance of adverse urban conditions. Native plant species are recommended if possible.
- e. Provide a six- to eight-foot-wide sidewalk along Rollins Avenue.
- f. Provide six-foot-wide sidewalks along street A and street C.
- g. Provide standard sidewalks on both sides of all other streets.
- h. Provide a crosswalk connecting Street A to the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.

All of the conditions above are subject to the approval of the DPW&T.

- 4. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the plans shall be revised to demonstrate the following:
 - a. Sixty percent of the single-family detached units within the development shall have front porches, except for units along Rollins Avenue, for a minimum of 33 of the units required to have front porches.
 - b. All of the units fronting on Rollins Avenue shall have brick fronts and the overall development shall have 60 percent of the units with brick fronts.
 - c. The Devon and Farrington units shall not be sited along Rollins Avenue.
- 5. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
- 6. Prior to issuance of the first permit, a copy of the wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted with all accompanying landscape plans. The mitigation plan shall show extensive plantings of wetland plants and water-tolerant trees and other plants throughout the disturbed area, in conformance with any and all comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Corps of Engineers. The areas where the wetlands previously existed shall be landscaped as a natural area and as much of the area around the pond as possible shall be naturalized.
- 7. The following notes shall be placed on the TCPII:

After the site has been cleared and prior to issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the DER site inspector, M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section, and their certified arborist to evaluate the vegetation on the edges of the preservation area. The certified arborist hired by the applicant shall prepare a written report regarding how invasive plants will be removed from the preservation area. The report shall be submitted to and reviewed by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section.

*[8. Prior to certification of the TCPII, it shall be revised as follows:

- a. The plans shall be designed to meet all of the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance including the provision of tree protection and the required notes.
- b. Revise the worksheet as necessary to address all conditions of approval.
- c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.] *

*8. Prior to certificate approval of the DSP the TCPII/Landscape Plan shall be revised to show extensive landscaping and trails—as shown on the applicant's exhibit dated November 13, 2006—around the proposed pond. *

*9. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:

- i. Revise the legend and the plan to reflect and identify all graphic symbols used;
- ii. Revise the plan to show the existing tree line;
- iii. Revise the plan to reflect woodland areas 1 and 2 as being cleared;
- iv. Revise the plan to reflect “woodland retained non-FCA” area 3 within the right-of-way must be counted as cleared;
- v. Remove labels “existing foundation landscaping (non forest); open crown scrub (non forest)” from sheet 5; and “existing tree row (not forest)” from sheet 3;
- vi. Revise the plan to reflect the details of the final stormwater management pond design, including inlets and outfalls; *
- vii. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan; and

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language

viii. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan. *

*[9]10. Prior to approval of the first permit, a copy of the approved technical stormwater management plans must be submitted to M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section. The limits of disturbance on the stormwater management plan and those on the TCPII must coincide.

*[10. Final Plats shall not be accepted until CB-6-2005 is enacted.]

*[11. Prior to signature approval, the architectural elevations for the single-family attached units shall be revised to indicate conformance to Applicant's Exhibit No. 1.]

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Squire, with Commissioners Eley, Squire, Vaughns, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 30, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 21st day of December 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:bjs

*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] indicate deleted language