PGCPB No. 08-09 File No. DSP-06072

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 hearings November 15, 2007 on January 17, 2008 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-06072 for Glenn Dale Commons, Phase I, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan proposes to demolish the existing vacant warehouse buildings located on the site and replace them with a residential development consisting of 142 single-family attached dwellings (townhouse) and 68 two-family dwellings (two-over-two) on the site. All the dwellings are proposed as condominium ownership.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Office/warehouse	Residential
Acreage	11.89	11.89
Area within 100 year floodplain	0	0
Net tract area	11.89	11.89
Dwelling Units	0	Townhouses—68 Two-family dwellings—142 Total = 210
Lots	2	0
Parcels	0	1
Square Footage/GFA	426,716	511,767
Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Based on 3,191,641 sq. ft. of NTA in the M-X-T Zone 139,557 sq.ft. to be demolished in DSP-06072)	0.13	0.25

3. **Location**: The site is located west and south of Northern Avenue, east of Glenn Dale Road and north of Greenbelt Road (MD 193). The property is located in Planning Area 70 within the 2006 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the East Glenn Dale Area*

4. **Surrounding Uses:** To the north of the subject property is a number of uses in the R-R and I-1 Zones, including a single-family detached dwelling, office and church. To the east is an existing

stormwater management pond. To the south of the property is a mini-warehouse facility in the I-1 Zone. To the west of the property is multifamily development in the R-18 Zone.

5. **Previous approvals:** On May 23, 2002, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved the Preliminary Plan for the 30.77 acre parcel and I-1 zoned property of land known as Glenn Dale Business Campus, Lot 10 and 11, Block A and Parcel 10. Pursuant to PGCPB No. 02-109 (No. 4-02002), the preliminary plan was approved with 11 conditions.

The 2006 *Approved Sector Plan and Proposed Sectional Map Amendment for the East Glenn Dale Area* retained this property in the I-1 (Light Industrial) and I-3 (Planned Industrial) Zones. However, Resolution CR-23-2006 rezoned all parcels within this conceptual plan area to the M-X-T (Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented) Zone on March 28, 2006.

A Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06001 was approved with conditions by the Planning Board on February 1, 2007, pursuant to PGCPB No. 06-282.

6. **Design Features:** This first phase of the Glenn Dale Commons M-X-T-zoned properties proposes to demolish two existing office/warehouse buildings in order to create the first phase of a residential community. The application proposes to develop townhouses and two-family dwellings, commonly known as two-over-two units. The two-over-two units are an attached product that looks like a four-story townhouse. The internal arrangement is such that one family resides in the lower two levels of the building, and another family resides in the upper two floors of the building. These buildings are arranged in an attached manner with strings of units of five to seven in a row. All of the townhouses and two-over-two units are proposed as condominium units. Some of the units are served by a two-car garage in the front of the unit as is the most typical design of townhouses, and other townhouses are served with a two-car rear load garage. All of the two-over-two units are served with single-car rear load garages.

The layout of the site as proposed places the front elevations of units facing Aerospace Road, fronts along the main street within the development, and front elevations on interior green areas that are designed as mews, which is a courtyard-type of design. In the mews design, the fronts of units are facing each other, with a green space the width of the approximate height of the buildings flanking the courtyard and a common sidewalk provides access to the front units. Parking is proposed entirely as surface parking and garage parking. A centrally located open space area has been provided as a passive recreational area with benches. Single-car garages are located at the rear of all of the two-family dwellings. Front-loaded garages are proposed for some of the townhouses. Other townhouses will have rear-loaded garages.

The community is proposed as a gated community. There is a sliding gate detail included on the plans, but the site plan does not, in plan view, indicate the features that would support a sliding gate. The site plan only shows the location of piers; a close analysis indicates that the piers are located within a storm drain easement. The Planning Board adopted a condition that the plans be revised prior to signature approval to clearly indicate a functional gate system and that the gates and pier systems are not within any proposed easements.

The central green area will provide a readily available space within the community for passive activities such as sitting and socializing.

The architectural elevations are proposed by NVR Homes, and include the following unit types:

Townhouse	Minimum Finished Living Area
Norwood	2,925 square feet
Matisse	1,642 square feet
Picasso	2,641 square feet

The products appear to be quality unit types with adequate attention paid to the window and door fenestration and detailing. All of the townhouses and two-over-two units are proposed at 24 feet in width. A four-foot-deep cantilevered deck is proposed as a standard feature for all of the two-over-two unites proposed. Side entries with porches are proposed for most of the highly visible end units.

M-X-T Zone Required Findings

7. **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division.**

Comment: This detailed site plan for Glenn Dale Commons, Phase One is in conformance with the requirements of Part 10, Division 2, of the Zoning Ordinance.

8. **The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation.**

Comment: The two-family dwellings front on Aerospace Drive. This provides for "eyes on the street," which is necessary for this development that is largely surrounded by multifamily development, warehousing and vacant existing development. Units are also proposed to front on Hubble Drive, which is appropriate for the development of the site, in order to meet the above requirement concerning outward orientation of the development.

9. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.**

Comment: The proposed Phase One of the development, which constitutes the most westerly side of the M-X-T Zone, consisting of townhouses and two-over-two units, will provide a transitional area from the apartments located further west. As a transitional land use, the project is compatible with the existing development to the west, and with the future single-family detached development to the east.

10. **The mix of uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.**

Comment: Neo-traditional design usually features unit fronts on the existing roadways and provides a pedestrian-friendly environment that will contribute to the sustainability of the neighborhood as it transitions from industrial and commercial uses to residential uses. The future landscaping improvements to the existing stormwater management pond, if the conditions of approval are adopted, will contribute to improving the natural environment.

The addition of parking spaces within the project is necessary to ensure a quality development. The original plan provided for only 11 additional guest spaces above the number of spaces required. This would have only served five percent of the units within the development. Each of the unit types requires approximately two parking spaces per unit. Some of the units have two-car garages, with a parking pad that is not long enough to support tandem spaces behind the garage. In practice, it is well known that future residents will park behind the garage, which will cause a conflict within the pedestrian zone because the vehicle will overhang the sidewalk. In order to address the possible conflict of overhanging vehicles that park tandem to the garage spaces for all of the front-load products, staff recommended that these units be adjusted on the site to provide for a 20-foot-long parking space behind the garage. This will relieve parking issues relating to 37 of the townhouse units. With regard to the two-over-two units, inadequate parking becomes even more critical as an issue. These units are served with single-car garages and tandem spaces behind the garages. If the garage is used for storage purposes, which is often the case for a large percentage of these smaller units, then there is only one space available for the future residents. Staff originally recommended that at least 21 additional spaces be provided for the project, which would have meant a loss of units in order to provide for a total of 32 spaces for the project, providing 15 percent of the overall units with one additional space. Staff recommended the following condition of approval:

> **Additional guest and overflow parking shall be provided on the site to equal a minimum of one space for each unit for 15 percent of the total number of units on the site.**

The applicant provided the following written justification in opposition to the condition in letter dated December 21, 2007, Bramble to Adams:

"We discussed **Condition 8j** at length in our meeting. While you acknowledge that you are requesting parking spaces above what is required by the Prince George's County Code, Subtitle 27 (the "Zoning Ordinance"), staff's position is that requesting additional spaces is merited based on existing conditions in other developments. Staff requests additional spaces in the amount of 15% above Zoning Ordinance requirements (i.e. 32 spaces). Based on the location of the on-street public parking on Aerospace Drive and its accessibility to the project, it was determined that we could make up the 15% through those spaces and additional spaces added in front of the open space play area and units 64-70. See **Exhibit B** (attached). The on-street public parking on Aerospace Drive amounts to 48 spaces, while the additional spaces in front of the open-space and units 64-70 amount to 14 additional on-street private spaces. Additionally, guests parking in the on-street public spaces will have access to the project through four (4) sidewalk entrances into the community. While these entrances are gated for security, guests will be able to call residents to let them in. We hope this explanation satisfies this condition."

Revised plans, submitted after the public hearing on November 15, 2007 provided a parking exhibit which provided additional surface parking. The plans were revised to incorporate a total of 24 off-street parking spaces (those spaces within the limits of the development). The use of on-street parking spaces to fulfill the needs of a private development has not been counted in the past and is not in accordance with the Parking and Loading Standards of Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance. However, the spaces shown on the applicant's exhibit to be allowed by DPW&T along Aerospace Road were also recognized as possible convenient to guests of the future residents.

Staff recommended the following condition of approval:

> **The plans shall be revised to require a minimum 20-foot-deep parking pad in front of the garages for all of the front-load townhouses.**

The plans have not been revised to fully conform to this condition. There are still some units that are placed as little as 14 feet from the back of the sidewalk. Staff continued to recommend that the plans be revised to provide a minimum of 19 feet from the face of the garage to the back of the sidewalk. This issue affects one stick of townhouses located at the entrance to the development off Aerospace Road. The Planning Board agreed with the staff and adopted Condition No. 7(d), which requires the shifting of Dorsey Lane east at the intersection of Aerospace Road, in order to provide sufficient space to provide a 19-foot deep parking pad in front of the townhouses located at the entrance to the development.

> **Parking shall be provided in a parking pad, tandem to the garage to a minimum depth of 20 feet, for all rear load garages.**

Staff recommended the following condition of approval:

The plans have been revised to provide 19 feet on most units; however, a dimension on the plans should verify this issue. Units still not meeting the requirement above are located on the west side of Dorsey Lane. The Planning Board adopted conditions 9(d) and (g) in order to assure proper dimensioning of a minimum of 19 feet in depth.

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

Comment: This first phase of the development of the Glenn Dale Commons project can only be considered self-sufficient if recreational facilities that serve the youngest population of the project are provided within the development. The central open space area could be designed as an activity area for young and old alike, for active and passive play and socializing. "Eyes on the recreational area" will occur due to the highly visible location of the play area. It was staff's opinion the plans should be revised to provide for one or more active play areas near the center of the project for the use of the residents only. Staff recommended the following condition of approval:

> **The plans shall be revised to redesign the central recreational area such that activities for the youngest population can be accommodated. Facilities such as three spring animals, climbing rocks or the like shall be incorporated into the design. The oval trail shall be reduced in size to setback from the public sidewalk and from the retaining wall at the south side of the space. Steps should be incorporated into the midpoint of the retaining wall and provide an axis for the design of the space. Additional landscaping should also be incorporated to buffer the space from the fronts of the townhouses, allowing views into the green space.**

The central recreational area has been redesigned to create an open space area of approximately 70 by 160 feet. This is smaller than the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines* for an open play area, but it will still provide some benefit. The cross slope of

the open area is approximately four percent, which should be reduced to no more than two percent so that it appears relatively flat to the eye. It is important that these spaces are flat so they will function properly as a play area. Staff recommended that the area conform to the details and specifications for an open play area as stated in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guideline*, except for the size requirement in accordance with Condition 7(p).

12. **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development.**

Comment: The revised plans included an interconnective pedestrian system within the development.

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

Comment: The original plan did not adequately accommodate the needs of pedestrians, particularly in the streetscape of the main street within the development, and it lacks trail connections to the central open space area. The plan was improved by using a five-foot-wide sidewalk within the community on both sides of the main street within the development. The streetscape should be treated as if it were a space of its own: however, the streetscape design does not achieve its full potential because some of the units are too close to the street and the height of the buildings imposes upon the street. Setting back the buildings from the street would improve that situation. The conceptual site plan established the setback of units from the right-of-way as 15 feet from the front of the unit and 10 feet from corner to side rights-of-way. On a private street, the right-of-way is not clearly established; however, applying the principles of the development standards of the CSP, it is reasonable to establish the setback from the back of sidewalk. The Planning Board agreed with the staff recommendation and adopted Condition No. 7(c) to address this issue.

14. **Conformance to the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06001**—The following conditions of approval of the Conceptual Site Plan warrant discussion:

17. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan and the recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

Comment: The plan proposes four benches around an open space element centrally located within the development. An improvement to the plan would be the incorporation of additional sitting areas in both sunny and shaded areas that would allow people to congregate and socialize. A circular sidewalk is proposed within the open space. The construction of a circular concrete sidewalk is somewhat challenging. Furthermore, the juxtaposition of the circular sidewalk with the streetscape sidewalk and of the circular sidewalk with a three-foot high retaining wall, cry out for a redesign of the area to set these site elements back in such a way as to provide planting and ground level paving patterns that will distinguish the private areas from the public areas of this portion of the site. It was staff's opinion that a set of steps joining the front of the townhouses to the south of the open space would also be appropriate. These are rather minor changes to the site and landscape plan, but require additional efforts to create a usable and inviting open space area. The material, details, and

specifications of the retaining wall are important to integrate with the paving design within the open space. Lighting and trash facilities should be incorporated into the area as well. Staff recommends that prior to signature approval of the plans, the open-space area be redesigned to incorporate the items stated above, in order to improve the quality of the space and create a more park-like setting.

18. At the time of detailed site plan for the single family detached units, provide for a central recreational area near the stormwater management pond to include a one story community building, including, but not limited to, an indoor fitness room and an outdoor open play area, pedestrian plaza and seating area.

Comment: The requirement of the central recreational area near the stormwater management area was established in the approval of the conceptual site plan to be done at the same time as the detailed site plan for the single-family detached development. Unfortunately, this leaves the subject site void of an active recreational area until such time as the single-family development is constructed.

19. At the time of detailed site plan for the townhouses and the two-family dwellings, the applicant and staff shall work together to find space for a private recreational area, centrally located within the condominium area of sufficient size to serve the immediate community. Conversion of townhouse units to two family dwellings will be allowed.

Comment: The condition above was proposed to be met by the applicant with the circular pedestrian walk and passive seating area located in the open space and one-fourth picnic area shown on the plans located between two townhouse units. At the public hearing on January 17, 2008, the applicant proffered the following condition in response to negotiations with the Glenn Dale Citizen Civic Association:

> "Prior to the complete construction of 50% of the total units in the DSP, an alternative recreation facility/community space will be available in Unit 1, which is a townhouse, that shall be ADA accessible and will include community meeting space and exercise equipment. However, if the central recreation area approved in the CSP is constructed prior to that event, Unit 1 can be constructed as a residential unit. If Unit 1 is converted to a recreation facility/community space, it shall remain available until the recreation facility is completed."

20. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the Applicant shall report on negotiations with the Board of Education with regard to providing temporary classroom space in an existing building known as "Greentech III" by lease or otherwise to the school system with subsidies/incentives as agreed upon between the owner and the Board of Education for up to five (5) years from the March 28, 2006 adoption date of the Sector Plan. If the Applicant and Board of Education cannot come to an agreement, the Applicant shall provide written evidence that the Board of Education does not wish to use the Greentech III building as temporary classroom space.

Comment: In a letter dated February 21, 2007 (R. Owen Johnson to the Honorable Camille Exum), the following update on this subject was provided:

> "On behalf of the CIP Co-chairs, Dr. Ron Watson & Mrs. Donna Hathaway Beck, we appreciate the efforts of the Council in working collaboratively with the Board of Education in securing facilities for the temporary use of the students of Greenbelt Middle School during the proposed AIMCO/Springhill Lake redevelopment.
>
> "However, because of the current state of uncertainty surrounding the AIMCO/Springhill Lake redevelopment, and our current CIP Budget constraints, we believe it to be in the best interest of the County to utilize the GreenTech 3 Property for other purposes that best benefits the County."

22. At the time of the first detailed site plan, the plan shall include a plan for the enhancement of the existing stormwater management pond parcel located at the intersection of Hubbell Drive and Aerospace Avenue.

Comment: The revised statement of justification from the applicant, received on September 25, 2007, includes the following comment to address this condition:

> "As regards to stormwater design, our design analysis determined that it is most appropriate to manage the quality of stormwater runoff in the existing stormwater management pond. As mentioned above, the impervious area proposed is less than the current impervious area and additional green area is being provided; thus, the proposed development will limit disruption of natural water hydrology. The pond will be landscaped as part of the stormwater management requirements with native plant material appropriate for the location."

The timing mechanism in Condition 22 stipulates the first DSP submittal shall address enhancement of the existing stormwater management pond. The revised plan does not include the existing stormwater management pond in the scope of review because the revised landscape plan indicates on Sheet 7 of 8 that the existing stormwater management pond is "not a part of the review of DSP-06072 and will be developed under DSP-07004."

At the September 11, 2007, meeting with the applicant, this condition was discussed. Staff recommended that the stormwater management pond must be enhanced prior to the issuance of building permits for the units in DSP-06072 to address this condition.

In accordance with Condition 6 of the CSP (see Environmental referral discussion below), a primary objective in conservation landscaping is the exclusive use of native plants and noninvasive species. To ensure conservation landscaping objectives are met at the overall site, a note should be shown on the landscape plan as it relates to the stormwater management pond, and all proposed landscaping on the overall site, to stipulate the use of native plants and noninvasive species are to be used.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, a note shall be provided on the Landscape Plan in relation to the stormwater management pond to read as follows: "The landscaping plant material for the stormwater management pond shall be native plants consistent with conservation landscaping objectives."

On December 19, 2007 the applicant submitted revised plans that indicated a note was added to the plans (on Sheet 5 of 8 of the landscape plan), so there is no need for the condition.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, the plant list(s) shown on the plans shall be adjusted to remove any invasive plant species, as stated in Condition No. 1.

15. **Conformance to the *Landscape Manual*—**The plan is not in conformance to the *Landscape Manual* in regard to Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses.

The applicant requested Alternative Compliance to Section 4.7, Incompatible uses. The Alternative Compliance was requested by the applicant for Bufferyards identified as B and C as stated below. In addition, the staff is also requesting approval of alternative compliance behind units 1-11 in order to support proposed staff condition number 7(a) which recommended the incorporation of an alley at the rear of the units in order to reduce the presence of garages along the main street within the development. The following decision of the Alternative Compliance Committee and the Planning Director, dated January 15, 2008 was entered into the record of the Planning Board hearing.

Bufferyard A - No buffer is required along the western property line. A 25-foot wide vacant I-1 strip of land consisting of existing woodlands separates the subject property from a multifamily development.

Bufferyard B

REQUIRED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses: North Property line abutting I-1 Office

Length of buffer yard		340-feet
Building setback		40-feet
Landscape yard	30-feet	
Fence		Yes
Existing Woodlands		Yes
Plant units (120 per 100 l.f.)		114 plant units (50% reduction)

PROVIDED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses

Length of buffer yard	340-feet
Building setback	25-feet
Landscape yard	25-feet
Fence or wall	yes
Existing Woodlands	44%
Plant unit's provided	15-plant units

Bufferyard C

REQUIRED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses: Northern property line abutting Warehouse/church

Length of buffer yard	300-feet
Building setback	50-feet
Landscape yard	40-feet
Fence	yes

Existing Woodlands	no
Plant units (160 per 100 l.f.)	240-plant units

PROVIDED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses

Length of buffer yard	300-feet
Building setback	30-feet
Landscape yard	19-feet
Fence or wall	yes
Existing Woodlands	0%
Plant unit's provided	40-plant units

Bufferyard D - No alternative compliance is requested or required along this northern property line abutting an existing single-family detached dwelling.

Bufferyard E – relates to Condition No. 7 of DSP-06072

REQUIRED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses: Northern property line abutting an office use

Length of buffer yard	273-feet
Building setback	40-feet
Landscape yard	30-feet
Fence	yes
Existing Woodlands	no
Plant units (120 per 100 l.f.)	164-plant units

PROVIDED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses

Length of buffer yard	273-feet
Building setback	40-feet
Landscape yard	20-feet
Fence or wall	yes
Existing Woodlands	0%
Plant unit's provided	150 plant units

JUSTIFICATION OF RECOMMENDATION:

The applicant has not provided the minimum number of plant units to justify the proposed alternative compliance. In some cases, the applicant is claiming that existing woodlands will remain, but the limit of disturbance and the indication of new utilities on the plans indicate that the area will be cleared. Therefore, in order to justify the granting of Alternative Compliance, the committee recommends the following:

Bufferyard B – the request for the building setback is 62.5 percent of the normal requirement under the Landscape Manual. In order to provide a quantifiable relationship of the number of plant units to offset the reduced building setback, the committee suggests that the number of plant units proposed within the bufferyard should be increased by an additional 37.5 percent of the normal requirement. Therefore the staff recommends that the number of plant units provided within Bufferyard B increase

from the 15 plant units shown on the plan to 157 plant units. In this case, staff recommends that the plant material within the buffer be comprised of the following:

8 shade trees at 2 ½ - 3 inch caliper
77 shrubs planted 2.5 feet on center

There is soil sufficient area within the 25-foot-wide landscape buffer to support the 157 plant units.

Bufferyard C – the request for the building setback is 60 percent of the normal requirement under the Landscape Manual. In order to provide a quantifiable relationship of the number of plant units to offset the reduced building setback, the committee suggests that the number of plant units proposed within the bufferyard should be increased by an additional 40 percent of the normal requirement. Therefore the staff would recommend that the number of plant units provided within Bufferyard C increase from the 40 plant units shown on the plan to 336 plant units, however, the 19-foot-wide landscaped buffer proposed is not wide enough to support the increase in plant material. Therefore, the staff suggests that the number of plant units be reduced to 240 units, as would normally be required, but that the size of the plant material within this buffer be planted as larger stock than the normal requirements. In this case, staff recommends that the plant material within the buffer be comprised of the following:

12 shade trees at 3 ½ - 4 inch caliper in size
120 shrubs at 24-30 inches in height or spread, planted 2.5 feet on center

The size and spacing of the plant material within the Bufferyard C will be supported by the available soil area

Bufferyard E – The staff is recommending the granting of the alternative compliance along this portion of the northern property line in order to implement rear- loaded garages and alleys for the townhouses identified on the plans as units 1-11 and as stated in Condition Number 7(a) of the staff report for DSP-06072. The "provided" building setback and landscaped yard of 40 and 20 feet respectively as shown in the chart above for Bufferyard E is an estimate and is subject to the final engineering of the plans. However, the numbers above are fairly accurate and a conclusion can be reached for the alternative compliance. In order to justify the reduced bufferyard which is a consequence of the recommendation to mitigate a garage dominated streetscape, the staff recommends that the relationship of the number of plant units offset the reduced landscaped yard, since it appears the building will meet the required setback. The request for the reduced width of the landscaped yard is 66 percent of the normal requirement under the Landscape Manual. In order to provide a quantifiable relationship of the number of plant units to offset the reduced landscaped yard, the committee suggests that the number of plant units proposed within the bufferyard should be increased by an additional 33 percent of the normal requirement. Therefore the staff recommends that the number of plant units provided within Bufferyard E increase from the 150 plant units shown on the plan to 219 plant units. In this case, staff recommends that the plant material within the buffer be comprised of the following:

11 shade trees at 2 ½ - 3 inch caliper in size
109 shrubs planted 2.5 feet on center

The size and spacing of the plant material within the Bufferyard E will be supported by the available

soil area.

In addition, a 6-foot high, sight-tight, non-wood product fence along the entire north property line will deem this request for Alternative Compliance equal or better than the requirements of the Landscape Manual.

RECOMMENDATION:

The Alternative Compliance Committee recommends of Approval of Alternative Compliance pursuant to Section 4.7 of the Prince George's County Landscape Manual for bufferyards B, C and E located along the north property line, as stated in the findings above, subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the following changes shall be made to the plans:

    a. The site plan shall be revised to demonstrate the 6-foot high, sight-tight fence along the entire north property line.

    b. Bufferyard B shall be revised to incorporate 157 plant units and the schedule shall be revised to indicate the correct amount of woodland to remain.

    c. Bufferyard C shall be revised to incorporate 240 plant units with shade trees sized at 3 ½-4 inch caliper and shrubs sized at 24-30 inches in height or spread, and the schedule shall be revised to indicate that no woodland will remain.

    d. Bufferyard E shall be revised to incorporate 219 plant units and the schedule shall be revised to indicate that no woodland will remain.

Comment: The Planning Board reviewed and approved the Alternative Compliance recommendation and approved the applicable conditions, omitting an approval relating to Bufferyard B, which the Planning Board recognized as impacted by Condition No. 7(a). The Alternative Compliance request for Bufferyard B was addressed by Condition No. 7(n).

Referrals

16. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the detailed site plan application referenced above and provides the following plan comments:

    On December 7, 2007, the Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06001 for Glenn Dale Commons. Based on information outlined in PGCPB 06-282, the plan was approved with the following transportation conditions:

    2. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within an M-X-T zone which generates no more than 458 AM or 424 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require an additional preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

3. **At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate a right-of-way along Northern Avenue of 30 feet from centerline as shown on the submitted plan.**

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 construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:**

   a. **Lengthen the existing substandard right-turn lane along northbound Good Luck Road approaching MD 193 to the County Department of Public Works standards within the existing right-of-way.**

   b. **Provide a double left-turn lane from eastbound MD 193 onto northbound Forbes Boulevard and re-stripe or provide extra pavement along Forbes Boulevard to accommodate two receiving lanes with two southbound lanes (one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane, as currently exist). This improvement shall include any needed modifications to the traffic signal, signage, and pavement markings.**

   c. **Install (or fund the installation of) a bus shelter at the existing bus stop at MD 193 and Aerospace Drive, or at a location, which serves the subject site to be determined by the Transit Division of the County Department of Public Works and Transportation, in order to serve patrons of the T15 and T17 bus routes.**

5. **Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of $210.00 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of a bikeway sign(s) along Northern Avenue, designated a Class III Bikeway. A note shall be placed on the final plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit**

Comment: Condition 2 of the above-referenced preliminary plan established a trip cap of 458 AM peak-hour trips, and 424 PM peak-hour trips. The subject application proposes the construction of 71 townhouses and 142 condominiums. Based on trip rates from the *Guidelines*, the proposed developments (combined) would generate 124 AM peak-hour trips, and 142 PM peak-hour trips. Staff therefore concludes that the proposed development will not exceed the trip cap as conditioned by the Planning Board. Because the subject application represents one phase of the overall approved development, the trip cap must remain intact until the entirety of the property has been developed. Consequently, Condition 2 is still valid and will be carried forward.

Regarding the status of Conditions 3, 4 & 5 however, no evidence was submitted indicating that those conditions were fulfilled, and consequently, all should be carried forward as conditions of approval for the subject application.

Site Circulation & Access

Two access points, one at Aerospace Road, and another along Hubble Drive will serve the proposed development. Both points are deemed to be acceptable to staff. With respect to on-site circulation however, staff did not support the proposed termini of Alleys "A, B and C", as shown on the originally submitted plans. These three termini were proposed as dead end streets without the ability of large vehicles such as trucks (perhaps some school buses) to make a safe turn-around. In the absence of such a utility, a truck that is servicing an end unit along one of those alleys would be forced to drive in reverse along the entire length of the alley. These types of maneuvers should be discouraged by providing hammerhead end treatment at the ends of these alleys, or, extend these dead end streets to "Street A." The applicant submitted revised plans that addressed the issue above.

TRANSPORTATION STAFF CONCLUSIONS

The Transportation Section concludes that the original site plan was deemed acceptable as required by Section 27-285 of the Prince George's County Code, if it is approved with the following conditions:

a. All of the transportation conditions outlined in PGCPB No. 06-282 are still valid and must be met prior to the issuance of any building permit.

b. Prior to signature approval of the subject application, the plan shall be revised to reflect the following changes:

   i) Provide a hammerhead turn around at the ends of Alleys A, B and C or connect Alleys A, B and C to Street A.

Comment: The applicable conditions of PGCPB No. 06-282 have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

17. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Section found that the Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the above-referenced 11.89-acre property located at the northwest intersection of Aerospace and Hubble Drives in Glenn Dale, Maryland. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Most of the subject property has previously been impacted by the construction of office buildings and grading. Two small parcels in the northeastern part of the property containing approximately six acres are still wooded, but a portion of the area has most likely been impacted by modern construction activities. The applicant should be aware that there are several prehistoric archeological and historic sites in the vicinity of the subject property. Brookland M.E. Church/Dorsey Chapel (PG 70-028), a chapel built in 1900 to serve the African-American farming community of Brookland, lies just the east of the subject property. The 1861 Martenet map also indicates a Mrs. Ward and S. Beall either on the subject property or adjacent to it.

Moreover, Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state or federal agencies. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, to include archeological sites. This review is required when state or federal monies or federal permits are required for a project.

18. The Subdivision Section found that the subject property is made up of two record lots, Lot 1, Block A of Glen Dale Business Campus (PB 119@72) and Lot 4, Block A of Glen Dale Business Campus (PB 134@48).

On December 7, 2006, the Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06001 as outlined in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-282. The plan was approved with the following subdivision related conditions:

1. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan for the single family detached dwelling units, a new preliminary plan of subdivision shall be approved. Upon issuance of the building permit for each residential unit, the applicant shall pay the applicable public safety surcharge and schools facilities surcharge.

2. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within an M-X-T zone which generates no more than 458 AM or 424 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require an additional preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

Comment: This proposal is for single-family attached units rather than detached, so the first sentence of Condition 1 does not apply, however, the second sentence applies to the subject application. Condition 2 will be applicable only if the cap set at the time of the CSP is exceeded, which seems unlikely at this time. The referral from the Transportation Planning Section will undoubtedly address this issue. Subdivision staff has no other comments at this time.

19. The Community Planning Division, in memorandum dated September 4, 2007, Mataya to Lareuse, found that this application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Regional Center in the Developed Tier, and that this application does not conform to the 2006 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the East Glenn Dale Area, including the site specific design recommendations for the townhouses in Glenn Dale Commons.

The Community Planning Division explained that the application proposes to demolish two existing office buildings to construct residential development located at the western portion of the Glenn Dale Common. The entire Glenn Dale Common project consists of single-family detached dwellings, a combination of two-family attached dwellings and townhouses, and multifamily dwellings for active adults. This application is for the first phase of the project consisting of 68 townhouses and 142 two-over-two townhouse as condominiums. The following discussion is taken from the analysis of the Community Planning Division:

"The approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-06001) proposed to develop the entire site in a neo-traditional style. Neo-traditional neighborhoods are compact communities designed to encourage bicycling and walking for short trips by providing destinations close to home and work, and by providing wide sidewalks and a pleasant environment for walking and biking. These neighborhoods

are reminiscent of 18th and 19th century American and European towns, along with modern considerations for the automobile.

"This application does not conform to the following sector plan strategies related to the design of the subject site.

"Strategies

(a) 'Ensure that parking lots and structures are sufficiently screened from the public view or designated to be visually unobtrusive and allocate parking lots or garages at the site's perimeter.' (Page 22).

(b) 'Create a consistent build-to line that frames the streets and provides a comfortable sense of enclosure for pedestrians.' (Page 21).

(c) 'Create a pedestrian accessible community and lining the community with continuous walking paths.' (Page 21).

"Staff Comment: The application fails to meet the strategy above to screen parking structures from public view and allocate parking garages at the site's perimeter. The townhouse garages shown in the application dominate portions of the north side of Street A. Sidewalks are interrupted by driveways allowing parked cars to fragment pedestrian access to the common space or green plaza south of Street A. Furthermore, placement of townhouse garages facing Street A is out of character for a neo-traditional neighborhood design. The applicant should incorporate an alley serving all the townhouse garages on the north side of Street A from the rear, rather than the front. Typical neo-traditional design neighborhoods have townhouse garages in alleys to screen them from pedestrians in accordance with strategy above. The applicant should redesign Street A to include a consistent treatment of street trees along the south and north side of Street A—place trees between the street and the sidewalk. The improvements to the streetscape on Street A will provide comfortable sense of enclosure for pedestrians."

Comment: The Planning Board agreed with the Community Planning Division regarding the desire to eliminate the townhouse garages along the north side of Street A. Therefore, the Planning Board adopted Condition No. 7(a) to incorporate townhouse units with rear-load garages and an alley for all units on the north side of Street A, also known as Dorsey Lane.

20. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed a revised Detailed Site Plan submitted for Glenn Dale Commons, DSP-06072, and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/156/03-02. A revised statement, the TCPII, and the landscape plan cover sheet were stamped as received on September 11, 2007. The revised DSP and landscape plan were stamped as received on September 21, 2007 by the Environmental Planning Section. A revised statement to address conditions from CSP-06001 was received by electronic mail on September 25, 2007. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-06072 and TCPII/156/03-02 subject to conditions.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed plans for the site when it was zoned I-1 and I-3 known as Glenn Dale Business Campus. The site was rezoned to M-X-T in the East Glenn Dale Sector Plan in Amendment 6 of the District Council's action of approval found in CR-23-2006.

A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/03/02, and two Type II Tree Conservation Plans, TCPII/09/90 and TCPII/156/03, are associated with the overall site. The more current TCPII of the two will be used for the entire site because the original TCPII/156/03 contained a larger portion of the overall site.

Portions of the overall 73.63-acre site are developed with office buildings and off-street parking. A Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-06001, was approved by the Planning Board on December 7, 2006, and the Board's conditions of approval are found in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-282. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/03/02, underwent an -01 revision in the review of CSP-06001.

The scope of review in DSP-06072 is for redevelopment of Phase 1. There are two existing office buildings in Phase 1 and these are to be demolished and off-street parking is to be removed. The overall site will be developed in three phases. Phase 1 contains 71 single-family attached townhouses and 142 multifamily condominiums. The subject DSP represents an -02 revision to TCPII/156/03.

This 11.89-acre Phase 1 area is located on the northwest portion of the overall 73.63-acre site and is on the north side of Aerospace Road and the west side of Hubble Drive. The property is zoned M-X-T. There are no regulated environmental features on-site. Three soils series, Iuka sandy loam, Rumford sandy loam, and Sunnyside Fine Sandy Loam soils (two types in this series) occur on-site. These soils are not problematic in relation to development. Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. MD 193 is an existing arterial road and is in the vicinity of the site. This road is a traffic-noise generator. However, traffic noise impacts are not anticipated because MD 193 is approximately 700 feet from Phase 1. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the site. According to available information from Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program staff, rare, threatened and endangered species are not found to occur in the vicinity of the site. The site is not within the designated network of the *Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. The site is in the Folly Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin, the East Glenn Dale Sector Plan, and the Developing Tier of the adopted General Plan.

Planning Board Resolution No. 06-282 for CSP-06001 included 22 conditions, five of which are environmental in nature that are to be addressed at the time of the subject detailed site plan review. The respective conditions are in bold typeface; the associated comments, additional information, plan revisions and recommended conditions are in standard typeface. Note that all five of these conditions are intended to implement the policies and strategies of the East Glenn Dale Sector Plan.

6. Prior to approval of the DSP, a statement shall be submitted that demonstrates how conservation landscaping techniques have been incorporated into the landscape plan.

A revised statement sent by electronic mail was received on September 25, 2007. The statement includes the following comments to address this condition:

> "The reduction of impervious surfaces in combination with the replacement of the flat roofs on the existing buildings with the pitch roofs of the residential units, and the proposed landscaping, will reduce the heat island effect to minimize impact on microclimate. The proposed design minimizes impacts to natural features by maintaining existing tree cover, as feasible, and by reducing the percentage of impervious area coverage by introducing green areas between building units as well as a large open space are to be used for recreation.

> Native plant material will be used, specifically varieties that are tolerant to different weather and soil conditions. Proposed impervious areas have been further reduced by the use of narrower streets and alleys, than would normally be used as standard public street rights-of-way.
>
> "The landscape plan indicates tree cover above and beyond the 10% minimum required by the conditions of the CSP. There are no large areas of parking, and the paving sections have been reduced from 26' to 22' for the primary private road and the 18' for alleys. A mix of small shade trees and ornamentals flank the road and drive aisles.
>
> "In addition to the plant material, the plan also includes pergolas as an integral feature of the design. Pergolas can provide a shaded communal area."

This statement provides conservation landscaping information and techniques which include: reduction of turf areas to reduce emissions related to maintenance; the use of native plants to reduce water demands; buffer plantings to reduce the negative effects of predominate wind patterns; and the careful placement of shade trees to reduce the heat island effect of buildings and parking areas. The revised landscape plan addresses these aspects of conservation landscaping. The revised plan has a plant legend with mostly native plant material with the exception of leyland cypress and burkii junipers. These plants are not native plants and should be replaced with comparable native plants from a list available from the Maryland Native Plant Society and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Chesapeake Bay Field Office) conservation landscaping publications.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, the landscape plan shall be revised to remove the two nonnative plants from the plant legend (leyland cypress and burkii junipers) and these shall be replaced with comparable native plants from a list available from the Maryland Native Plant Society and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Chesapeake Bay Field Office) conservation landscaping publications.

8. At least 30 days prior to any Planning Board hearing on the DSP, the landscape plan shall provide a table stating how much tree cover exists on the site, how much tree cover is proposed to be removed and how much tree cover will remain on the site. The quantitative analysis shall demonstrate that at a minimum, ten percent tree cover shall be provided.

The cover sheet of the revised landscape plan has a tree cover calculations table with the following information:

		Acreage (approximate)
Existing Tree Cover:	77,527 square feet	1.78
Tree Cover to be Removed:	17,675 square feet	0.41
Tree Cover Remaining:	59,852 square feet	1.37
Proposed Tree Cover:	110,685 square feet	2.54

This condition has been addressed because the table includes the required information and the revised plan demonstrates the ten percent tree cover minimum has been met. Ten percent of the existing tree cover equals 7,752.7 square feet.

9. As part of the DSP submission package, a statement shall be included that demonstrates how the project will use green building techniques that reduce energy consumption and utilize alternative energy sources.

The revised statement received on September 25, 2007, contains the following information:

> "Glenn Dale Commons is an urban development and provides the kind of density envisioned in the Prince George's County General Plan and the Glenn Dale Sector Plan. The proposed development is located in an infill site, not fitting the definition of a greyfield as an abandoned, blighted area, since the site is currently improved with two R&D buildings unoccupied, but in good repair. The site does meet the greyfield definition of the National Association of Home Builders. "Model Green Home Building Guidelines"…and, any site previously developed with at least 50% of the surface area covered with impervious material.
>
> It is the intent of the developer that the builders meet at least the industry's minimum energy efficiency standards."

No supplemental information regarding the details of the building materials or the energy efficiency ratings of these materials in the industry has been submitted. In a meeting with the applicant on September 11, 2007, staff suggested that portfolio information from the builder (a list of energy efficiency rated materials used in the construction of the units) be submitted. The applicant identified the builder as nationally known with construction methods that include pre-fabricated units that are brought to the site and assembled. This method reduces the amount of on-site construction debris as the units are assembled. Additional information must be submitted to document the energy efficiency rating of building materials to be used by the builder to address this condition.

It should be noted, sheet 8 of 8 of the revised landscape plan shows a proposed 14,496 square foot courtyard. The courtyard will have shade and ornamental native trees along the outer edges of an oblong-shaped trail. This type of conversion of impervious surface at the existing development to a predominantly pervious landscaped surface (i.e., a courtyard) is consistent with green building techniques.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, submit a revised statement with an inventory of the proposed building materials to document the type of energy efficiency rated materials proposed in the construction of the units.

10. At the time of DSP review, the DSP shall show the use and location of full cut-off optic lighting features.

Sheet 6 and 8 of the revised landscape plan contains lighting information. Sheet 6 shows the luminaire schedule and statistics for the proposed lighting fixtures. This information addresses this condition.

22. At the time of the first detailed site plan, the plan shall include a plan for the enhancement of the existing stormwater management pond parcel located at the intersection of Hubbell Drive and Aerospace Avenue.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

a. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it has previously approved Type I and Type II tree conservation plans associated with it, TCPI/03/02-01 and TCPII/156/03-01, respectively.

This 11.89-acre phase has 0.25 acre of existing woodland and a Woodland Conservation Threshold (WCT) of 15 percent or 10.77 acres because the TCPII is for the entire site. Therefore, the WCT is based on the overall 73.63 acres. Because the overall site will be redeveloped/ developed in phases, a phased worksheet is shown on the TCPII. The worksheet shows the overall site's cumulative woodland conservation requirement of 19.77 acres is proposed to be met in Phase 1 with 0.25 acres of afforestation and the remainder of the cumulative requirement to be met in Phases 2 and 3 with a combination of on-site preservation and reforestation in Phase 3 and off-site mitigation in both Phases 2 and 3.

The revised plan has been reviewed and revisions are necessary. This review included a comparison of the approved limits of disturbance (LOD) on TCPI/03/02-01 and the proposed LOD on the revised plans (both the TCPII and DSP). The LOD as shown appears to be in general conformance with TCPI/03/02-01; however, there are two separate LOD symbols on the plan and only one is necessary. The revised DSP also shows the LOD correctly with only one symbol. Revise the plan to show the LOD as it is shown on TCPI/03/02-01.

There is a heavy dashed line on the outer boundaries of the site and this symbol is not identified in the legend with a corresponding symbol. One woodland conservation area shown on the plan is not identified for the intended purpose. On Sheet 2 of 4, on the southwest portion of the site, a woodland conservation area outside the limits of disturbance shows existing trees to remain. The area is not labeled for the intended treatment; however there is a symbol in the legend for "Woodland Saved, Not Counted." Show this proposed treatment to the closest $1/100^{th}$ of an acre with the corresponding symbol in the legend.

Add standard TCPII Note 5 regarding all required off-site mitigation because this note is not on the plan. The phased worksheet shows off-site mitigation shall be implemented to meet the site's cumulative woodland conservation requirement in Phases 2 and 3.

Add the standard detail for the permanent two-rail split rail fence symbol to Sheet 4 of 4 of the plan. On Sheet 2 of 4, the permanent two-rail split rail fence symbol as shown is not legible on the plan. On Sheet 2 add a corresponding symbol to the legend for the aff/reforestation signage and at the required spacing in relation to the 0.29-acre reforestation area because the current spacing is incorrect. Add the "5-Year Management Plan for Re/Afforestation" to the detail sheet and remove the "Afforestation/Reforestation Agreement" information on Sheet 4 of 4.

The qualified professional who revised the plan did not sign and date it and did not update the revision boxes. After these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and update the revision boxes.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

a. Identify in the legend with a corresponding symbol the heavy dashed line symbol shown on the plans.

b. Show the limits of disturbance symbol as it is shown on TCPI/03/02-01 so there is only one LOD symbol.

c. Label the woodland treatment in the southwest portion of the site as "Woodland Saved, Not Counted" and show the area to the closest $1/100^{th}$ of an acre with the corresponding symbol in the legend.

d. Add standard TCPII Note 5 on Sheet 4 of 4 regarding all required off-site mitigation.

e. Show the standard detail on Sheet 4 of 4 for the permanent two-rail split rail tree protection fence.

f. On Sheet 2 of 4 show the permanent two-rail split rail tree protection fence symbol in relation to the 0.29-acre reforestation area so it is legible.

g. On Sheet 2 show the aff/reforestation signage symbol on the plan at the required spacing in relation to the 0.29-acre reforestation area.

h. Add the "5-Year Management Plan for Re/Afforestation" to the detail sheet and remove the "Afforestation/Reforestation Agreement" information on Sheet 4 of 4.

i. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and update the revision boxes.

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section commented on the revised plans submitted December 19, 2007 in a memorandum dated December 31, 2007 (Shoulars to Lareuse), and found that only 4(b) and (i) continue to be outstanding. Therefore, the remaining conditions were deleted from the staff recommendation and the Planning Board agreed.

21. The Urban Design Section recognizes that the plan proposes a very compact development with a density over 17 units per acre. This is significantly more density than would normally be allowed were the project developed under the regulations governing townhouse development in the R-T Zone (which allows for six units per acre), or if the project were developed under the regulations governing two-family dwellings in a Euclidian zone (which allows for up to eight units per acre). The green area requirements for the development of townhouses and two-family dwellings in a Euclidian zone state that 50 percent of the net tract area should be green area. The subject application proposes approximately 44 percent green area. The comparison was provided for the Planning Board's information to understand the compactness of the proposed development.

The Planning Board reviewed the case on November 15, 2007 and continued the case to the January 17, 2008 Planning Board hearing, to address Urban Design issues and concerns expressed at the hearing.

In response, on December 19, 2007, the applicant filed revised plans that have addressed many of the conditions of approval as stated in the original staff report. The revised plans included the site plan, the landscape plan, and the TCP II. The applicant did not submit revised architectural elevations.

In addition, the applicant submitted a letter dated December 21, 2007, Megan Bramble to Steve Adams, outlining the applicant's understanding of a meeting held between the applicant and staff on December 10, 2007. That letter also included the applicant's proposed revision to Finding 21 of the original staff report (see attached). The staff's most important findings regarding the design and layout of the subdivision from an urban design standpoint includes conformance to Section 27-548(h) which states the following:

There shall be no more than six townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than six dwelling units (but not more than eight dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive.

It was staff's opinion that the revised plans do not justify the construction of more than six units in a row. In fact, staff are of the opinion that the reduction of certain building groups that are currently shown as seven in a row to six in a row, will create a more attractive living environment and would be more environmentally sensitive. Staff recommended the deletion of the following townhouse units for the following reasons:

Unit 50—Deletion of unit 50 will reduce the number of townhouse units in a row from seven to six within the building group and will reduce the potential for a vehicular conflict between backing vehicles from driveways serving units 49 and 50. Deletion of unit 50 will allow for a visual window into the open space and woodland beyond and will allow room to create a curved radius along the streetscape rather than the awkward 90-degree angle currently shown along Dorsey Lane.

Unit 63—Deletion of unit 63 will reduce the number of townhouse units in a row from seven to six within the building group and will allow for additional room to place the gate and piers associated with the gated main entrance into the development. Currently the plans indicate that one of the piers associated with the main entrance gate is within a public utility easement, which may not be a desirable situation for the public utility company. Deletion of unit 63 will provide additional area for landscaping, which will enhance the visual appearance of the entrance area. It will also provide for more privacy for the unit located closest to Aerospace Road.

Unit 64—Deletion of unit 64 will reduce the number of townhouse units in a row from seven to six and will allow for a more attractive living environment through the provision of more open space within the subdivision at the main entrance to the development. This is a particularly highly visible area at the intersection of the private street and an alley. Additional landscaping would also visually enhance this area, a focal point could be created, or the side entry unit at that location could be enhanced with landscaping framing the entrance and creating a park-like setting.

In addition, the staff recommended that three of the two-family units (two-over-two units) also be deleted from the plan in order to achieve a more attractive living environment and provide for a more environmentally sensitive community as a whole. Section 27-274, the Site Design Guidelines, provides language which supports such modifications in the context of detailed site plan review. In this case, the provision for parking suggests the minimization of views of vehicles from public areas.

The guidelines for green areas suggest that spaces should be linked and continuous, and that the proportion of the spaces should be appropriately scaled. The staff recommended the deletion of the following two-over-two units for the following reasons:

Units 99/100 and 115/116—Deletion of unit 99/100 and 115/116 will reduce the number of two-family dwellings in a row from 12 to 10 within the building group and will eliminate an unfortunate orientation of unit fronts toward garages of the adjacent units. The fronts of these units are oriented directly toward the alley garages and the alley serving the garages. Deletion of these units would also provide additional area for parking spaces within the alley.

The building group identified as units **101–114 should delete one of the units** in order to reduce the length of the building group such that the green space between the front of adjacent units and the subject building group is widened. This will result in a reduced building length and a widening of the space between the front façade of adjacent structures to the end walls of the subject building group from 30 feet to approximately 40 feet. The relationship of the front of facing units has been set at 50 feet where the mews or courtyard has been created to serve the front of buildings that face each other. The relationship of the front to the side of units is as important, or even more so, because the endwall of a building shows the full height of the gable in one plane, whereas as viewed from the front the gable recedes and has a lesser impact on the space between the buildings. On the endwall of the building, the end gable does not recede and therefore the height of the building is perceived as taller. Therefore the widening of the space to at least 40 feet is appropriate; any further widening of the space would require the deletion of additional units within building group 101–114.

Comment: The Planning Board elected to delete only units 99/100 and 115/116, as stated in Condition No. 10.

22. In regard to conformance to CSP-06001, it should have been noted in earlier staff reports that the CSP contained the following condition:

1. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan for the single family detached dwelling units, a new preliminary plan of subdivision shall be approved. Upon issuance of the building permit for each residential unit, the applicant shall pay the applicable public safety surcharge and schools facilities surcharge.

Comment: It should be clear that the second sentence of this condition was included in the Planning Board action in order to require the applicant to pay the public safety surcharge and the schools facilities surcharge, even though a preliminary plan of subdivision was not required prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the section of the development which is the subject of DSP-06072. Therefore the staff included a condition of approval which reiterates the second sentence of the condition of the CSP above.

23. **Comments on Original Conditions (10-30-07) conditions not addressed in Findings 1-22.**

The conditions of the original recommendation are provided below, and are followed by comments based on the revised plans:

8. Prior to certification of the plans, the following revisions shall be made to the plans:

b. The sidewalk along the north side of Dorsey Lane shall be designed as an integral curb and five-foot-wide sidewalk. All units shall be set back from the face of curb a minimum of 15 feet to the front façade or endwall (entrance) of any building. Bay windows may encroach into the front setback.

Comment: In discussions with the applicant it was discovered that staff and the applicant had differing opinions on the meaning and intent of the language above. Staff recommended the following language be adopted by the Planning Board as clarification of the condition and its intent.

b. The sidewalk along the north side of Dorsey Lane shall be designed as an integral curb and five-foot-wide sidewalk, where the adjacent units are proposed as rear-load garages. In all other locations where units are proposed as front-load garages, the driveway entrance shall be designed in accordance with the standards set forth in the DPW&T Urban Driveway Entrance Standards 200.01 and 200.02.

c. All units shall be set back from the face of curb a minimum of 15 feet to the front facade or endwall of any building. Bay windows may encroach into the front setback.

Staff believed that by breaking the original condition into two conditions it became clearer. As was explained in the Planning Board hearing on November 15, 2007, the design of the sidewalk is typically done in conjunction with the provisions for street tree placement and independent of the driveway aprons. Sidewalks need to be relatively flat and should not include a cross slope of more than two percent. On the subject application, the sidewalk and the driveway apron have been combined, which is not a typical design for front-load townhouse layout, but is shown as an option in the DPW&T standard 200.02. The DSP provides for the specifications for a roll curb detail. It is important that the DSP incorporates the DPW&T driveway entrance detail on the plans so that the construction of the sidewalk and driveway apron meets the minimum and maximum grades, in order to meet ADA requirements for cross slopes of sidewalk and so that the water is drained properly to the stormdrain inlets. Therefore, staff recommended that DPW&T Standards 200.01 and 200.02 be added to the plans or other sidewalk detail deemed acceptable to Urban Design and Transportation Planning that is ADA compliant.

f. All rear-loaded garage townhouses shall be built with a minimum size 20-foot-wide by eight-foot-deep standard feature deck at the rear of the units.

Comment: The plans do not indicate that the decks will be standard. Staff have researched a number of other cases and list the following cases in which the Planning Board required decks as a standard feature in the design of rear-loaded garage townhouses. In the following cases the Planning Board included conditions as follows for each of the cases:

SDP-0318/01 PGCPB No. 06-14

c. All deck details and specifications shall be shown on the plans and the decks shall be indicated to be stained. Decks shall be a standard feature on the rear load garages**.**

DSP-05057 PGCPB No. 06-93

q. The plans shall be revised to incorporate the details and specification for decks as standard features on the single-family attached units that have an integral rear-load garage. The deck size shall be no less than 10 feet deep and 20 feet wide.

DSP-05072 PGCPB No. 06-94

m. The plans shall be revised to incorporate the details and specification for decks as standard features on the single-family attached units that have an integral rear-load garage. The deck size shall be no less than 10 feet deep and 20 feet wide.

Staff continued to recommend that decks be a standard feature on the rear-load garage townhouses since there is no rear yard, as the rear of the unit is a parking pad and beyond, an alley. The Planning Board agreed with the staff recommendation and adopted Condition No. 7(e) requiring decks as a standard feature on the rear-load garage townhouses.

g. The detail of the fence/wall enclosure located along Aerospace Road and Hubble Drive shall be revised to indicate brick as a material and shall be coordinated in color with the front facades of the buildings along the same streets.

Comment: Staff accepted the proposal of a stone-like appearance for the fence/wall enclosure contingent on the proper detailing and specifications are added to the plans as stated in Condition No. 7(f).

h. The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate a minimum of sixty percent brick on the front facades of all of the units. Highly visible end walls, as viewed from Aerospace Road and Hubble Road, shall be 100 percent brick. All end walls of units adjacent to Dorsey Lane shall be a minimum of one story brick.

Comment: The applicant requested that the Planning Board adopt the following modified language:

"The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate a minimum of sixty percent brick on the front facades of all of the units. Highly visible end walls, as viewed from Aerospace Road and Hubble Drive, shall be 100 percent brick or an appropriate mix, as determined by the Planning Board's designee, of other architectural elements such as side entry, window treatments, porches, etc. All end walls of units adjacent to Dorsey Lane shall be a minimum of one story brick."

Staff believe that the use of full brick end walls on highly visible lots is a standard condition implemented by the Planning Board when reviewing and approving townhouse developments. The low number of highly visible lots, seven, is not an unreasonable burden on the applicant. Staff recommended the original condition of approval and the Planning Board agreed, accepting Condition No. 7(g) requiring both 100 percent brick on highly visible end walls and the balanced design of end wall features.

l. The pedestrian system shall be improved to provide direct access to the open play area. Sidewalks shall align and crosswalks shall be provided where appropriate. Changes in paving material shall be provided at the crosswalks along Dorsey Lane.

Comment: The plans show an improved pedestrian system by providing crosswalks in strategic locations. However, the plans do not indicate the specifications for the crosswalks, whether they are a change in paving material or simply striped on the asphalt. Staff recommend that the plans provide for a change in paving material for the crosswalks and that the details and specifications be added to the plans. Based on the revised plans, staff recommend that the last sentence of the condition above be retained, and the Planning Board agreed.

m. Crosswalks shall be provided from the development across Aerospace Road and Hubble Drive, using a change in pavement type and/or color to easily identify the pedestrian links.

Comment: The applicant responded to this condition with the following modification to the condition in letter dated December 21, 2007, Bramble to Adams:

> "With regard to **Condition 8m**, you expressed a preference toward a change in material for the crosswalks being provided on Aerospace and Hubble Drive. As we discussed, we can only do what DPWT permits. As such, we would suggest that the condition state, "using a change in pavement type and/or color to easily identify the pedestrian links per DPWT standards."

The applicant suggests that DPW&T may not accept a change in paving within its right-of-way, due to its standard details and specifications; therefore, staff will revise the recommendation to allow for DPW&T review and approval. However, the Planning Board should note that the same issue does not apply to the private streets within the subject property, as is suggested by staff in 8(l) above.

n. All end units shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the edge of the sidewalk, or where sidewalks are not proposed, such as in the alleys, the unit shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the face of curb.

Comment: The applicant responded to this condition with the following modification to the condition in letter dated December 21, 2007, Bramble to Adams:

> "You requested that we propose language for the "doghouse" circumstance for **Condition 8n**. We would propose, "All end units shall be set back a minimum of 10 feet from the curb, or where sidewalks are not proposed, such as in the alleys, the unit shall be set back as close as possible to 10' not including the utility "dog house."

The utility houses on these units are substantial in size and form a significant part of the overall structure of the building. This is another example of where the requested exception in itself appears to be minor, but when all of the exceptions are added together, staff believe

that it will result in an overly congested development, with little green area within the living environment of the future residents. Staff generally agreed with the applicant's revised language, and so did the Planning Board, as stated in Condition No. 7(h).

o. Curb and gutter shall be provided in the alleys as edging to define these places. Rolled curbs made of asphalt shall not be utilized.

Comment: The Planning Board agreed that the condition should remain as the revised plans do not clearly indicate compliance with the condition above.

p. Additional landscaping shall be added to the plans to further enhance the existing stormwater management pond. The landscaping shall be installed prior to the release of any building permits for the subject site.

Comment: The Planning Board agreed that the shrub plantings should be added to the plans to create a multilayered vegetative buffer to the pond.

r. The six-foot-high board-on-board fence shall be revised to indicate a wrought iron fence where compatibility has been determined in accordance with the Landscape Manual. Where uses are incompatible, a sight-tight non-wood product shall be used as an alternative fencing, the details and specifications to be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

Comment: The applicant objected to the first sentence, but agreed to the second sentence. The Planning Board agreed with the applicant's desire to screen views to the west of the subject site.

24. The DSP 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 if the following conditions of approval are adopted.

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/156/03-02) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-06072 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, the landscape plan shall be revised to remove the two nonnative plants from the plant legend (leyland cypress and burkii junipers) and these shall be replaced with comparable native plants from a list available from the Maryland Native Plant Society and/or the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Chesapeake Bay Field Office) conservation landscaping publications.

2. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, submit a revised statement with an inventory of the proposed building materials to document the type of energy efficiency-rated materials proposed in the construction of the units.

3. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-06072, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

a. Show the limits of disturbance symbol as it is shown on TCPI/03/02-01 so there is only one LOD symbol.

b. After the revision above has been made, the qualified professional who prepared the plan shall sign and date it and update the revision boxes.

4. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 458 AM or 424 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require an additional preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

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 construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. Lengthen the existing substandard right-turn lane along northbound Good Luck Road approaching MD 193 to the County Department of Public Works standards within the existing right-of-way.

b. Provide a double left-turn lane from eastbound MD 193 onto northbound Forbes Boulevard and restripe or provide extra pavement along Forbes Boulevard to accommodate two receiving lanes with two southbound lanes (one left-turn lane and one right-turn lane, as currently exist). This improvement shall include any needed modifications to the traffic signal, signage, and pavement markings.

c. Install (or fund the installation of) a bus shelter at the existing bus stop at MD 193 and Aerospace Drive, or at a location, which serves the subject site to be determined by the Transit Division of the County Department of Public Works and Transportation, in order to serve patrons of the T15 and T17 bus routes.

6. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of $210.00 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of a bikeway sign(s) along Northern Avenue, designated a Class III Bikeway. A note shall be placed on the final plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit

7. Prior to certification of the plans, the following revisions shall be made to the plans:

a. The plans shall be revised to indicate rear-load garages served by an alley on all the units located on the north side of Dorsey Lane. Two or three alley access points shall be provided from Dorsey Lane.

b. The sidewalks along the north side of Dorsey Lane shall be designed as an integral curb and five-foot-wide sidewalk. The driveway entrances shall be designed in accordance with the standards set forth in the DPW&T Urban Driveway Entrance Standard 200.02 or other sidewalk detail deemed acceptable to Urban Design and Transportation Planning that is ADA compliant.

c. Except for Unit 64 as shown on the site plan exhibit, all units shall be setback from the face of curb a minimum of 15 feet to the front façade or endwall containing an entrance into any building. Bay windows, covered entrances, and steps may encroach into the 15-foot setback.

d. The plans shall be revised to require a minimum 19-foot-deep parking pad in front of the garages for all of the front-load townhouses, which shall be achieved by shifting Dorsey Lane east at its intersection with Aerospace Road.

e. All rear-loaded garage townhouses shall be built with a minimum 20-foot-wide by eight-foot-deep standard feature deck at the rear of the units.

f. The detail of the fence/wall enclosure located along Aerospace Road and Hubble Drive shall be revised to indicate either brick or stone as a material. A sample of the proposed material shall be provided for review and approval by the Urban Design Section, and the details and specifications shall be added to the plans.

g. The plans shall be revised to clearly indicate a minimum of 60 percent brick on the front facades of all of the units. Highly visible end walls, including Lots 1, 63, 64, 145, 150, 151/152 and 210, shall be 100 percent brick, and an appropriate mix, as determined by the Planning Board's designee, of other architectural elements such as side entry, window treatments, porches, etc., and the front façade of the same units shall also be brick. All end walls of units adjacent to Dorsey Lane shall be a minimum of one-story brick.

h. Parking shall be provided in a parking pad, tandem to the garage to a minimum depth of 19 feet for all rear-load garages.

i. Changes in paving material shall be provided at the crosswalks along Dorsey Lane.

j. Crosswalks shall be provided from the development across Aerospace Road and Hubble Drive, using a change in pavement type and/or color to easily identify the pedestrian links per DPW&T standards.

k. All end units shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the edge of the sidewalk, or where sidewalks are not proposed, such as in the alleys, the unit shall be set back a minimum of ten feet from the face of curb, excluding the utility "dog house."

l. Curb and gutter shall be provided in the alleys as edging to define these places. Rolled curbs made of asphalt shall not be utilized.

m. Additional landscaping shall be added to the plans to further enhance the existing stormwater management pond. The landscaping shall be installed prior to the release of any building permits for the subject site.

n. The plans shall be re-submitted for review and approval of alternative compliance to the *Landscape Manual* (with final approval delegated to the Planning Director) in order to address Condition 7(a) above and to justify the reduction in the width of Bufferyard B.

o. Where uses are incompatible, a sight-tight, non-wood product shall be used as an alternative fencing, the details and specifications to be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

p. The plans shall be revised so that the sitting areas and the open play area conform to the details and specifications as stated in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*, except for the size of the open play area.

q. The details and specifications for the retaining walls shall be revised to incorporate a brick or stone face (similar to entrance feature) on the wall located near the open play area. Railing details shall be provided as necessary.

r. The site plan shall be revised to demonstrate the 6-foot high, sight-tight fence along the entire north property line.

s. Bufferyard E shall be revised to incorporate 219 plant units and the schedule shall be revised to indicate that no woodland will remain.

t. Bufferyard C shall be revised to incorporate 240 plant units with shade trees sized at 3 ½-4 inch caliper and shrubs sized at 24-30 inches in height or spread, and the schedule shall be revised to indicate that no woodland will remain.

8. The plans shall be revised prior to signature approval to include details and specifications of the gate system and to resolve any conflicts between easement(s), gate and pier footings.

9. Upon issuance of the building permit for each residential unit, the applicant shall pay the applicable public safety surcharge and schools facilities surcharge.

10. Prior to the signature approval of the plans, units 99/100 and 115/116 shall be deleted. In order to reduce the loss of the total number of units, the conversion of units 205–210 from townhouses to two-family dwellings is permitted.

11. Prior to the complete construction of 50 percent of the total units in the DSP, an alternative recreation facility/community space will be available in Unit 1, which is a townhouse, that shall be ADA accessible and will include community meeting space and exercise equipment. However, if the central recreation area approved in the CSP is constructed prior to that event, Unit 1 can be constructed as a residential unit. If Unit 1 is converted to a recreation facility/community space, it shall remain available until the recreation facility is completed.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Cavitt, with Commissioners Squire, Cavitt,

Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Clark absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 17, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 3rd day of April 2008.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs