

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on October 11, 2007 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07003 for Glenwood Hills, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject detailed site plan (DSP) application is for approval of 90 single-family detached units, 117 townhouses, and a community center in the M-X-T Zone.

The proposed residential units and community center covered in this application comprise the first phase in a multiphase development known as Glenwood Hills. The subsequent phases will be reviewed under future detailed site plans.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Single-family residential
Acreage	121.08	121.08
Parcels	1	6
Lots	207	207
Of which single-family detached lots*	90	90
Single-family attached –Townhouse lots	117	117

*Note: Of a total of 90 single-family detached lots, seven houses with attached garages, and six houses with detached garages have a lot size of 6,000 square feet or more; 33 houses with attached garages, and 44 houses with detached garages have a lot size of less than 6,000 square feet.

OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Total Parking Spaces	480	539
Of which handicapped spaces	9	6*

*Notes: A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to provide a total of nine handicapped parking spaces on the site plan prior to certification.

ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA

Single-Family Detached Models

Model	Base Finished Square Footage
Austin II	2,288 (2-car garage)
Belvedere	1,998 (2-car garage)
Carroll II	2,772 (detached 2-car garage)
Halifax	1,665 (optional 1- or 2-car garage)
Hammond	2,010 (2-car garage)
Hemingway	1,904 (detached 2-car garage)
Kipling	3,061 (2-car garage)
Michener II	2,552 (detached 2-car garage)
Melville	1,977 (detached 2-car garage)
Montgomery	2,884 (2-car garage)
Oberlin	2,632 (2- or 3-car garage)
Ravenwood	2,261 (2-car garage)
Sheridan	2,459 (2-car garage)
Taylor	2,808 (2-car garage)
Tolstoy	3,596 (2-car garage)
Victoria	2,439 (2-car garage)
Zachary	2,249 (2-car garage)

Single-Family Attached Townhouse Models

Model	Base Finished Square Footage
Fairgate	1,961 (2-car garage)
Fairmont	1,320 (1-car garage)
Hazelton	2,109 (2-car garage)

3. **Location:** The larger Glenwood Hills site is located on the south side of Central Avenue, approximately 4,500 feet east of its intersection with Addison Road, in Planning Area 75A and Council District 6. The site included in this DSP is the first phase of the Glenwood Hills development, and most of the site is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Central Avenue and Karen Boulevard.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Central Avenue (MD 214). The site has approximately 1,100 linear feet of frontage on MD 214. Across the arterial are single-family detached homes in the R-55 and the R-80 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zones, and vacant property in the R-55, R-80 and C-M (Commercial Miscellaneous) Zones. The northern part of the subject site is traversed by an approximately 65-foot-wide strip of R-R- (Rural Residential) zoned property owned by Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO). The property is bounded to the east by two parcels in the R-R Zone, which are also owned by PEPCO, with electric

ducts and pipes. The northernmost parcel contains a structure used for public utility operations while the parcel to the south remains vacant. The property south of the subject site will constitute Phases II and III of Glenwood Hills and will be reviewed under future detailed site plans. To the west of the subject site is vacant property in the R-R Zone and the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone, which is owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The western border of the subject site is also flanked by one single-family detached unit in the R-55 Zone owned by Teen Challenge of Maryland Incorporated and used for staff housing. Adjacent to the site's southwest corner is Wilburn Estates, a community comprised of single-family detached units in the R-55 Zone. The commercial/office component of Glenwood Hills (approximately 8.75 acres) is located to the north of the subject site across the PEPCO property.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The Glenwood Hills property (previously identified as Parcel 165) was formerly zoned R-R (Rural Residential). The 1986 sectional map amendment for Suitland-District Heights rezoned the property to the M-X-T (Mixed-Use Transportation-Oriented) Zone. The Glenwood Hills property has a Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020, entitled Meridian, which was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board (PGCPB No. 88-303) on September 8, 1988. CSP-88020 included 2,146,700 square feet of office, 1,794 residential dwelling units, a 300-room hotel, and 85,100 square feet of retail. That plan was revised, renamed Glenwood Hills, and approved by the Planning Board on March 31, 1994 (after a request for reconsideration of the original Planning Board's decision to disapprove the plan). Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/01 was approved (PGCPB No. 93-269) with 785 dwelling units (105 detached units, 310 townhouse units, and 370 multifamily units) and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. Another revision to the Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/02, was approved (PGCPB No. 04-170) on July 15, 2004, for 202 single-family detached units, 117 single-family attached units, 278 multifamily residential units, and 203,000 square feet of office/retail space.

Following the approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/01, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94066 was approved on November 10, 1994, and the resolution, PGCPB No. 94-351, was adopted on December 1, 1994. Because of the size of the proposed development, the preliminary plan was valid for six years with the possibility of two 2-year extensions. Two extensions were granted and the preliminary plan expired on December 1, 2004. A new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04081, was approved with conditions on October 28, 2004, and the resolution, PGCPB No. 04-252, was adopted on November 18, 2004. The subject DSP covers a portion of the development approved in CSP-88020/02 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081. The site also has a Stormwater Management Concept Approval, #39362-2002-00.

6. **Design Features:** The subject DSP proposes 90 single-family detached dwelling units and 117 townhouse units as Phase I of Glenwood Hills. The site is accessed from Central Avenue (MD 214) by a curvilinear 80-foot-wide right-of-way, known as Karen Boulevard. Single-family detached dwelling units are located along both sides of the main entry roadway but are accessed from the rear via a series of smaller internal roads and alleys. Additional single-family detached units are accessed via internal 50-foot-wide rights-of-way west of the main entry roadway. The townhouses are located on the east side of the main entry roadway. Units located along the periphery of the townhouse pod are accessed mainly from the front, while the interior units are accessed primarily from the rear via a

network of alleys. Extension of the main entry roadway and the interior streets to its west are proposed during a later phase of the project. The community center is located in the northeast quadrant of Karen Boulevard and Zoe Loop. Of the 90 single-family detached houses, 50 houses have a freestanding garage that will be accessed through alley, and only 40 houses have an integrated two-car garage.

Seventeen single-family detached models and three townhouse models have been proposed with this DSP application. Both the single-family detached models and attached townhouse models are standard NV/Ryan Homes products shown in various styles. The front elevations of the 17 single-family detached houses are finished with either brick veneer, vinyl siding, or a combination of the two. The rear and side elevations are finished with standard siding. Each front elevation features various architectural details such as brick arched windows with keystone, frieze board with dentil molding, quoined brick corners, etc. Thirteen single-family detached models have a two-car garage as a standard feature. Four models have a freestanding two-car garage at the rear of the lot that will be accessed from an alley. The base finished square footage of the single-family detached models varies from 1,665 to 3,596 square feet. The three townhouse models are similar to the single-family detached houses in terms of design features and architectural details. The townhouse models are three stories in height and all include either one- or two-car integrated garages as standard features. The base finished square footage of the townhouse models varies from 1,320 to 2,109 square feet.

The proposed entrance feature consists of two monument-style, 125-foot-long, 4-foot-high brick wall segments that are located on both sides of the site's entrance along Central Avenue. These walls are anchored by five-foot-high brick pilasters. Two of the pilasters are embellished with a pre-cast GH (initialization for Glenwood Hills) insignia. The dimensions of the sign portion of the entrance feature are provided and 12 square feet of letter area is proposed, which is consistent with the requirements of Part 12, Signs, of the Zoning Ordinance. During the public hearing, the Planning Board approved 23 square feet for each sign for a total of 46 square feet.

In addition, the dimensions of the pre-cast "GH" insignia are provided and a total of 1.8 square feet per pre-cast "GH" is proposed. There are eight locations where the pre-cast "GH" insignia is proposed for a total of 14.4 square feet of letter area; two are within the pilasters of the monument-style signs at the site's entrance along Central Avenue, four are within the bridge abutments on Karen Boulevard, and two are within monuments on each side of the lead walk to the main entrance of the Community Center. The total combined lettering area for the monument signs and the pre-cast "GH" insignias is 60.4 square feet.

7. **Recreational Facilities:** At the time of conceptual site plan approval, the on-site recreational facility package was evaluated and a condition was attached to the approval to ensure that sufficient recreational facilities will be provided for future residents. In accordance with Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines, with a development of 90 single-family detached and 117 single-family attached dwelling units, for a total of 207 units, in Planning Area 75, approximately \$218,000 worth of recreational facilities is required to serve the part of the subdivision contained in this DSP. An additional conceptual site plan condition as approved in CSP-88020/02 for the entire Glenwood Hills

project requires that on-site private recreational facilities be located within particular sections of the development as follows:

Townhouse pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)

Multifamily pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.

Central recreational area consisting of the following:

- Clubhouse with meeting room large enough to accommodate seating for 100 persons, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), 1,000-square-foot fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons
- 25-meter swimming pool
- One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)
- Possible trail connection from the townhouse development along the stream to the central recreational area.
- One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)
- One tennis court
- Appropriately sized parking facility for residents only

The DSP for Phase I includes both single-family detached houses and townhouses. The amenities and recreational facilities contained in the central recreational area shown on the DSP include a 6,636-square-foot clubhouse (with an aerobics room, exercise room, locker rooms, larger meeting/ party room, large TV room, library, computer room, and a kitchen with appliance), a 25-meter swimming pool, one 2,550-square-foot multiage playground, one tennis court, two picnic areas with eight picnic tables and nine benches, four spring animals, and segments of 5-foot and 8-foot sidewalks. A 5,152-square-foot multiage playground has also been provided in the middle of the townhouse section. A multipurpose play structure, picnic tables, benches, and spring animals have been shown on the site plan. According to the applicant, the estimated value for the proposed facilities including the construction of the community center building is approximately \$1.2 million, which is well above the site's recreational facility obligation. However, no product information for the proposed recreational facilities has been provided. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to provide the cut sheet for each facility on the site plan prior to certification.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

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

- a. The proposed single-family detached houses and the townhouses as the first phase of the residential component of a larger mixed-use development, as approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02, are permitted in the M-X-T Zone. The subject application is in general conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires findings in addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve a detailed site plan as follows:

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

The purposes of the M-X-T Zone as stated in Section 27-542 include the following:

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

Comment: The subject DSP includes the first phase of the residential component as approved in a mixed-use transportation oriented community in CSP-88020/02, known as Glenwood Hills, which is in conformance with the purposes and provisions of the M-X-T Zone. Glenwood Hills as a whole will promote the orderly development of land in the vicinity of the Addison Road Metro Station and will maximize the private development potential of the area. The development is also in conformance with the master plan. The proposed mixture of residential uses on the subject property will provide additional diversity in the housing choices in the area. The proposed retail and office uses will provide an expanding source of desirable employment.

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

Comment: The value of the land has been conserved by maximizing the floor area ratio of the development pods allowed by the Zoning Ordinance on the site and preserving significant natural features on the site.

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

Comment: Vehicular and pedestrian connections from the proposed development to the Addison Road Metro Station have been a concern throughout the review of the plans. The project will have access to Central Avenue for the most effective vehicular route to the Metro station. Crosswalks will be necessary for pedestrian access at the main entrance to the development. Conditions have been added to previous approvals to require the applicant to show the location of the future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision and detailed site plans. A future connection from the residential section to the commercial section that is fronting on Central Avenue has also been preserved. The subject DSP conforms to this condition.

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

Comment: This DSP is for a portion of the residential component of a larger Glenwood Hills development which has a mixture of uses that may encourage a 24-hour environment in the ultimate development of the project. The residential units will generate activity on the site from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The office tenants are anticipated to operate on regular 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. business hours. The retail component is expected to generate activity all day, including anticipated service retail uses open from 7 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

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

Comment: In the larger Glenwood Hills project, the residential and commercial land uses as shown on the plan are completely separated from one another by land owned by PEPCO. The commercial development is concentrated along MD 214 on a parcel separated from the residential development by the public utility and floodplain. However, the approved architectural standards and development standards will create a visually harmonious development.

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

Comment: The residents in the Glenwood Hills development will patronize the proposed retail/office uses, particularly if the retail uses include convenience products and services. The subject project could create a dynamic, functional relationship between the residential and the commercial development within a distinctive visual character and identity if the approved development standards, sign design, and architectural standards will be implemented. A distinctive visual character and identity for the project will be created by the use of quality architectural, landscape and design features.

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

Comment: Development of a project of this size (as shown in the larger Glenwood Hills) would promote optimum land planning, which would permit the use of economies of scale and a flexible response to the market.

The larger Glenwood Hills project also provides pedestrian connections among internal uses, thereby reducing trips generated from the site and encouraging pedestrian and vehicular connections with adjacent properties. The DSP is a portion of the proposed residential component and is in general conformance with this condition.

- (8) To permit a flexible response to the market; and**

Comment: The subject DSP as a portion of a larger mixed-use development project includes 17 single-family detached architectural models with either an attached garage or a detached garage and three townhouse models that will provide great flexibility in response to market demand. The mixed-use and multiphase development with diverse products as shown in Glenwood Hills will permit a flexible response to the market. The DSP is in general conformance with this condition.

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

Comment: The previously approved conceptual site plan that governs the subject DSP has established specific architectural design conditions in order to achieve excellence in physical, social and economic planning of this project and at the same time provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer. The conditions require a certain percentage of unit fronts to be brick, additional architectural features to be provided on the highly visible endwalls, etc. As shown in the architectural models submitted with this DSP, the design standards allow freedom in design and provide the developer an opportunity to achieve excellence in physical, social and economic planning. See Finding 9 for a detailed discussion.

- (2) 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 proposed Glenwood Hills development will have an outward orientation and will be physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development based on the approved conceptual site plan

The proposed mix of uses is integrated visually by the use of similar landscaping,

streetscape, and architectural materials. The proposed architectural materials are also compatible with the architecture of the adjacent properties. The mix of uses is physically integrated by pedestrian connections and shared vehicular access.

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

Comment: The mix of single-family detached units, townhouses, and multifamily dwellings is generally compatible with the mix of housing types in the vicinity. The architectural design will ensure visual compatibility with the existing and proposed surrounding uses.

(4) 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: The mix of uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements as approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 would be certain to reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

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

Comment: At the time of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 approval, the applicant proposed the following phasing schedule:

PROPOSED PHASING SCHEDULE

Phase 1:	26 single-family detached lots, 117 townhouses.
Phase 2:	87 single-family detached lots.
Phase 3:	134 condos (2 over 2 units) in 16 total buildings, 44 single-family detached lots, community center/pool/multipurpose court.
Phase 4:	144 condo multifamily units in 12 total buildings, 45 single-family detached lots.
Phase 5:	203,000 square feet commercial/retail.

The retail/office component was proposed to be constructed after all of the residential development has occurred. The Planning Board revised the above staging plan to require the applicant to construct a minimum of 50,750 square feet (25 percent of the total) of the office retail GFA prior to the issuance of any building permits in Phase Four. Condition 28

attached to the approval of CSP-88020/02 has established the timing mechanism for the development of the retail/office component. During the public hearing for this DSP, the Planning Board determined that the Condition 28 be carried forward as condition of approval to guide the timing of the development of the retail/office component of this project.

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

Comment: At time of CSP-88020/02 approval, many of the trail-related recommendations were incorporated into conditions of approval. The pedestrian connectivity of the Glenwood Hills development has been greatly improved as shown on the approved CSP-88020/02. The Transportation Planning Section recommended additional conditions such as to separate the eight-foot-wide trail along Karen Boulevard by a landscape strip to fine-tune a previously approved pedestrian system. The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development.

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

Comment: This application is a detailed site plan. The above requirement has been fulfilled by CSP-88020/02.

(9) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be approved by the applicant.

Comment: A finding of public facility adequacy for this subject development was made at time of approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 in 2004 and Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 in 2005. The DSP complies with this condition.

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

Comment: The larger development known as Glenwood Hills where the subject DSP is located was approved under the provisions of the M-X-T Zone.

- b. The DSP is also consistent with the additional regulations for the M-X-T Zone as stated in Section 27-548 that are applicable to the review of this DSP as follows:

- (a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):**

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

Comment: The Glenwood Hills development was approved without the use of the optional method of development with a FAR between 0.36-0.40.

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

Comment: All design standards that govern the development of Glenwood Hills were approved in CSP-88020/02, except for the setback of decks that will be discussed in the following findings. The subject DSP is in general compliance with the approved design standards.

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

Comment: The proposed development for the first phase of the residential component of Glenwood Hills is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets; and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*. The respective requirements have been satisfied accordingly as discussed in Finding 11 below.

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

Comment: The DSP complies with this requirement. No private streets are proposed for the single-family detached portion of the detailed site plan.

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

Comment: A total of 117 townhouse units in 23 building sticks has been proposed in this DSP. There are no more than six dwelling units in any building stick. The lot width of the end units varies from 26 to 30 feet and lot width of the internal units varies from 20 to 22 feet. The base finished square footage for the proposed townhouses is between 1,320 and 2,109. A minimum of 60 percent of the front elevations of the townhouse units will have a full brick façade. The townhouses in the subject DSP meet the above requirements. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to provide a brick façade tracking table for townhouses.

- c. The DSP is also in general conformance with the site design guidelines and development standards for this development as specified in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02, except for several lots that cannot meet the side yard, front yard or garage setbacks as approved in CSP-88020/02.

The Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 with 29 conditions on July 15, 2004. Condition 28 prescribes specific bulk standards for each type of lot. The District Council affirmed the Planning Board approval of CSP-88020/02 on January 10, 2005. On October 28, 2004, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 for Glenwood Hills with 29 conditions. However, the bulk standards shown on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision are less stringent compared to those approved in CSP-88020/02. For example, the minimum side yard setback approved in CSP-88020/02 is

five feet for traditional single-family detached lots, but only three feet in Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081; the minimum rear yard setback approved in CSP-88020/02 is 20 feet, but only 15 feet in Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081. The applicant claims that both CSP-88020/02 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 are still valid. However, in a memorandum dated September 19, 2007, the Subdivision Section provided a clarification on the two sets of standards and concluded that the development standards as approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 should take precedence and govern development on the site.

9. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020 and its revisions:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020 was first approved by the Planning Board under the project name of Meridian for a mixed-use project consisting of 2,146,700 square feet of office, 1,794 residential dwelling units, a 300-room hotel, and 85,100 square feet of retail. The conceptual site plan was revised in 1994 (as CSP-88020/01) for approval of 785 dwelling units (105 detached units, 310 townhouse units, and 370 multifamily units) and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. In 2004, the conceptual site plan was revised once again (as CSP-88020/02) for a primarily residential development with an office/retail component. The plans propose 202 single-family detached units, 117 single-family attached units (townhouses), 278 multifamily units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. The multifamily units are proposed consisting of two types of product, 134 two-over-two units distributed over 16 buildings and 144 three-story multifamily units distributed over 12 buildings (or 12 units per building). The District Council affirmed the Planning Board's decision with 29 conditions. The subject DSP contains the first phase of the residential development as approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02. Of the conditions of approval attached to CSP-88020/02, the following conditions are applicable to the review of this DSP:

4. **Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary, DPW&T for a possible signal at the intersection of MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard. 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 the responsible agency. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, 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 the responsible permitting agency. Also, prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (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. **The provision of an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MD 214.**
 - b. **The addition of a westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.**
 - c. **The construction of the northbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn**

lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.

- d. The modification of the southbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
- e. Prior to bonding of the signalization for MD 214/Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard, the applicant shall make a request to DPW&T and/or SHA for approval of a left turn/right turn (no through movement) north approach. Copies of the request shall concurrently be provided to representatives of the Pepper Mill Village Association.**

The scope of access improvements may be modified at the time of preliminary plan review at the direction of SHA if the alternative improvement(s) provide an acceptable service level that meets the requirements of Subtitles 27 and 24.

Comment: According to the review by the Transportation Planning Section (Mokhtari to Zhang, June 15, 2007) and the State Highway Administration (Foster to Zhang, May 21, 2007), the applicant has provided the required signal warrant study and SHA concurs with the recommendation of the study that a signal is warranted. The Transportation Planning Section recommends that a median along MD 214 prohibiting through movement between Karen Boulevard and Pepper Mill Drive be constructed. The provision of the signal and the required geometric improvements will be enforced at time of permit.

- 5. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T for the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The performance of a new study may be waived by DPW&T in writing if DPW&T determines that an acceptable recent study has been conducted. 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 DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, 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 DPW&T.**

Comment: The applicant has provided DPW&T with the required traffic signal warrant study. DPW&T concurs with the study recommendation that a traffic signal is warranted at the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The provision and installation of the traffic signal will be enforced at time of permit. A condition that carries forward the last part of this condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to bond the signal prior to the issuance of any building permits.

- 8. Total development within the subject property under this Conceptual Site Plan shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 780 AM and 933 PM new peak-hour**

vehicle trips, in consideration of the rates of trip generation, internal satisfaction, and pass-by travel that are consistent with assumptions in the traffic study.

Comment: According to the review by the Transportation Planning Section (Mokhtari to Zhang, June 15, 2007), the development covered in this DSP is the first phase of the Glenwood Hills project and the projected trips that will be generated by this phase would not exceed the established AM and PM trip caps as noted in this condition.

10. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the property, the applicant shall demonstrate the following have been or will be fulfilled to the satisfaction of the State Highway Administration:

- a. Provide a diagram that demonstrates stopping and intersection site distance.**
- b. Provide an adequate left-turn lane along westbound MD 214 approach to Karen Boulevard.**
- c. Provide adequate turning lanes along eastbound MD 214 approach and departure at Karen Boulevard.**
- d. Provide a full movement traffic signal.**

Comment: According to the reviews by both the Transportation Planning Section (Mokhtari to Zhang, June 15, 2007) and the State Highway Administration (SHA) (Foster to Zhang, May 21, 2007), the subject DSP conforms to this condition by providing the signal and by constructing the required right-turn lane on eastbound MD 214. The provision of the signal and the intersection geometric improvements will be enforced by SHA at the time of permit.

12. A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Board which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

Comment: The subject DSP includes a central recreational area that will serve the entire Glenwood Hills development. In addition to a clubhouse and an outdoor swimming pool, the central recreational area also has a tennis court, an outdoor play area, and a surface parking lot. A stormwater management pond is also located on the site. There are two gazebos and a trail segment in the area of the proposed stormwater management pond. The quantity, location and orientation of the proposed recreational facilities are consistent with the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. As long as the proposed central recreational area is completed along with the first phase of this development, it will meet the recreational needs of the residents. A condition has been proposed to ensure that the central recreational area will be completed and open to the residents with the completion of the first phase of the Glenwood Hills development.

In addition, a 5,152-square-foot multiage playground has also been proposed in the townhouse section. A condition has been proposed to ensure the multiage playground will be completed and open to the townhouse residents.

- 19. Prior to submission of a Detailed Site Plan for the office/retail component, the Applicant shall provide a copy of the approved/proposed stormwater management concept plan for that area.**

Comment: This condition is not applicable to this DSP, which is a first phase of the residential development and has no office/retail component.

- 22. Prior to approval of any Detailed Site Plan, a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision application shall be approved.**

Comment: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 has been approved for the entire Glenwood Hills. The subject DSP covers only the first phase of Glenwood Hills development.

- 24. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review, if residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.**

Comment: No residential uses included in this DSP are within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour line.

- 25. The following development standards apply and shall be demonstrated throughout the review of future plans:**

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED:

Traditional SFD

Minimum Net Lot area—6,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—2,200 square feet

Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—40%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—50-60 feet (Footnote 1)

Front yard setback—20 feet (Footnote 2)

Side yard setback—5/10 combined feet

Rear yard setback—20 (excluding decks)

Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at DSP

Small Lot SFD Front Load

Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet

One or Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—50%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—45-50 feet

Front yard setback—15 feet (Footnote 2)

Side yard setback—4 feet

Rear yard setback—20 (excluding decks)

Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Small Lot SFD Rear Load

Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet

Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—60%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—40-45 feet (Footnote 1)

Front yard setback—15 feet, 20 feet along Karen Boulevard (Porches may extend up to 9 feet into the setback area)

Side yard setback—4 feet

Rear yard setback—3 feet

Accessory building rear yard setback—three feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Footnote 1 Excludes cul-de-sacs, flag lots and lots which front on pocket parks.

Footnote 2 A minimum of 20 feet shall be provided to the garage door

TOWNHOUSES:

All townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance.

MULTIFAMILY:

12-plex multifamily units:

Minimum distance between two buildings—20 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a property line—20 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a parking lot—5 feet

Minimum green space (minimum percent of net lot area)—45%

Minimum of 60% of all facades shall be brick

Two over two units:

Not more than six ground level units in a row

Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 16 feet wide

Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet.

Minimum of 60% of the front façade shall be brick

The Planning Board may make minor modifications to the Development Standards noted above, as a part of any subsequent approval, without the need to amend the Conceptual Site Plan if the Planning Board finds such modification is appropriate and consistent with the character and quality of the development envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan.

Comment: The above development standards have been approved by CSP-88020/02, except for the deck standard for the single-family detached houses that needs to be decided at time of detailed site plan. There are two types of single-family detached houses for the purpose of establishing deck standards in this DSP: one with an attached garage and the other with a freestanding garage. In order to be consistent with previous similar approvals, the Urban Design Section recommends that for single-family detached houses with an integrated garage, the deck can intrude into the rear yard setback by a maximum 10 feet, which is halfway into the 20-foot rear yard setback; and for single-family detached houses with a freestanding garage that is accessed through a public alley, the deck should be placed between the house and the garage. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to provide a site plan note prior to certification.

As discussed previously, approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 for Glenwood Hills shows the minimum side and rear yard setbacks that are not consistent with those approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02. The proposed development in the subject DSP is in general compliance with the above standards with the exception of several lots that follow the more relaxed standards as approved in Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081. The applicant has provided a statement of justification that identifies those lots that have been designed in accordance with the standards in the preliminary plan of subdivision instead of meeting the standards in the CSP-88020/02. Specifically there are four lots (Lots 101, 107, 108, Block A, and Lot 10, Block F) that have the minimum side yard setback of 3 feet and 18 lots (Lots 75, 88, 89, 91, 92, 98, 99, 111, 112, 113-117, Block A; Lots 1-3, Block F; and Lot 13, Block H) that have the minimum rear yard setback of 15 feet. The development pattern envisioned in the approved CSP-88020/02 is a high-density, mixed-use development which meets the woodland conservation requirements on site. The development standards were formulated at time of CSP approval in order to achieve this vision. As noted in the memorandum (Lockard to Zhang, September 19, 2007) from the Subdivision Section, only the development standards approved in CSP-88020/02 are applicable to the review of this DSP.

However, the last part of Condition 28 also provides flexibility for minor modifications to the development standards as part of any subsequent approval, without the need to amend the

conceptual site plan if the Planning Board finds such modification is appropriate and consistent with the character and quality of the development envisioned by the conceptual site plan. The applicant claims that the possible modifications to the minimum rear and side yard setbacks for a total of 22 lots are minor in nature. The Urban Design Section believes that the modifications to the development standards affect 24 percent of the single-family detached lots proposed in this DSP and, therefore, cannot be considered a minor modification. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to either revise the plans to be consistent with the development standards regarding the side and rear yard setbacks for the affected 22 lots prior to certification, or file a revision to the CSP standards and obtain approval from the Planning Board prior to issuance of the first building permit for the single-family detached houses. However, the Planning Board believed that the requested revisions are minor and approved the modification to the above mentioned standards in the public hearing for this DSP.

The above Footnote 2 requires a minimum of 20-foot setback to be provided from the front lot line to the garage door in order to avoid the intrusion of a parked vehicle into the sidewalk along both sides of the public street. Twenty-two lots have a garage that cannot meet the 20-foot setback from the front property line. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section to require the applicant to provide a minimum 20-foot setback of the garage door from the front lot line and to place the development standards on the coversheet of the site plan prior to certification. The Planning Board approved the applicant's request to maintain a minimum 20-foot clearance between the back of the sidewalk and garage door.

The above development standards also prescribe minimum finished living area for both the traditional single-family detached houses and small-lot single-family detached (SFD) houses, in addition to townhouses. The three townhouse models are larger than the minimum allowed, 1,110 square feet. However, one single-family detached house model, Halifax, which has a minimum finished area of 1,665 square feet, is smaller than the minimum allowed, 1,800 square feet for the small lot SFDs. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant either to increase the base finished area of the Halifax to 1,800 square feet and above or remove this model from the product list.

28. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

- a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for 60 percent of all single-family detached units fronting on Karen Boulevard, and picket fences shall be provided for single-family detached units along Karen Boulevard in a manner that provides for a separation element to the pedestrian area.**

Comment: The DSP provides a tracking table in order to enforce this condition. However, since the final percentage of front façades that have brick will not be known until the issuance of building permits, the brick fronts requirement will be carried forward as a site plan note to be placed on the coversheet of the DSP.

The second part of the condition requires picket fences to be provided for single-family detached units along Karen Boulevard. The landscape plan provides the required fence and details.

- b. Sixty percent of all facades of the clubhouse shall be brick, and the building shall be placed in a visually prominent location.**

Comment: The clubhouse proposed with this DSP is a two-story building fronting Karen Boulevard and meets this condition.

- c. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.**
- d. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.**

Comment: This DSP includes 17 single-family detached housing models and 3 townhouse models that show varied rooflines. The entrance features are also included in this DSP for review. The DSP satisfies the above conditions.

- e. Pole-mounted freestanding signs shall be prohibited for the office/retail component of the development. Freestanding and building-mounted signage shall not be internally lit.**

Comment: This condition is not applicable to this DSP because there are no office/retail uses included in this DSP.

- f. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design.**

Comment: A pole-mounted street light will be used in all townhouse and community center areas and will be used in other parts of the Glenwood Hills development.

- g. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate areas such as the entrance to the subdivision off of Central Avenue, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily 12-plex development, and the office/retail development.**

Comment: No special pavers have been shown on the landscape plan. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to provide special paver details to be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section prior to certification.

- h. If allowed by DPW&T, shade tree plantings shall be provided within the**

median of Karen Boulevard and be of a size and type to create the residential, pedestrian friendly boulevard envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan. A single row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along both sides of Karen Boulevard on one side of the sidewalks.

Comment: The applicant has provided the trees as required by this condition on the site plan in the required locations. However, staff has not yet received any confirmation of approval from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). The applicant has indicated a willingness to keep working with DPW&T and would like to have additional time to pursue the full implementation of this condition. Staff recommends carrying this condition forward to the time of building permit to allow the applicant additional time to work with DPW&T. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to resolve this issue prior to issuance of building permits and revise the DSP to reflect any changes.

- i. The multifamily (two over two units) pod of the development shall increase the number of units fronting onto Karen Boulevard and ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.**

Comment: There are no multifamily or two-over-two units included in this DSP and those units will be reviewed in future detailed site plans.

- j. The location of future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks shall be shown on the plans.**

Comment: The DSP has shown the locations of pedestrian connections and crosswalks. However, no information regarding bus stops has been provided. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to provide the bus stop location information prior to certification.

- 29. Prior to the approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Detailed Site Plans, the plan shall reflect the following:**

- a. The minimum number of traditional single-family detached lots shall be not less than 20 percent of the single-family detached lots.**

Comment: Traditional single-family detached lots are defined as those that are a minimum of 6,000 square feet in size pursuant to approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02. The total percentage of traditional single-family lots is 27.6 percent, or 55 of the 199 single-family units in the Glenwood Hills development. The subject DSP is the first phase of the development and contains six traditional single-family detached lots.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081:** The applicant filed this preliminary plan of subdivision in accordance with the requirements of Condition 22 attached to the approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02. The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 on October 28, 2004, with 29 conditions. The following conditions are applicable to the review of this DSP.

2. **A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved at the time of approval of the DSP.**

Comment: A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted and will be heard by the Planning Board along with this DSP.

7. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #39362-2002-00, and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: The subject DSP has an approved stormwater management concept plan, 39363-2002-00, which was approved based on a previously approved stormwater management concept plan. However, at the time this staff report was written, the Department of Public Works and Transportation had not responded to the referral request. A condition has been proposed in the recommendation section of this report to require the applicant to provide approval evidence prior to certification.

8. **Prior to submittal of the DSP, the applicant shall determine the extent of the land that should be the subject of a Phase I archeological investigation with the concurrence of DRD. The applicant shall complete and submit a Phase I investigation with the application for DSP (including research into the property history and archeological literature) for those lands determined to be subject. At the time of review of the DSP, the applicant shall submit Phase II and Phase III investigations as determined by DRD staff as needed. The plan shall provide for the avoidance and preservation of the resources in place or shall provide for mitigating the adverse effect upon these resources. All investigations must be conducted by a qualified archeologist and must follow *The Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Schaffer and Cole: 1994) and must be presented in a report following the same guidelines. Grading permits may be issued for areas not subject to a Phase I archeological investigation, subject to the required order of approvals.**

Comment: In a memorandum dated April 20, 2007, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section noted that a Phase I archeological survey was completed on the Glenwood Hills Property in August 2006. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Section staff concurred with the recommendations of the report that no additional archeological investigation is necessary on the subject site. Staff reviewed and accepted the Phase I final report on March 5, 2007.

9. **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 and will be reflected on the DSP:**

- **Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide trail along the subject property's entire frontage of Karen Boulevard. This trail will accommodate north/south pedestrian and bicycle movement through the site as envisioned by the sector plan.**
- **Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip, along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.**
- **Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**
- **Provide a trail connection from the end of Road "G" or Road "I", to Quarry Place and Fawncrest Drive.**
- **Provide a trail connection from Road "J" to Quarry Avenue.**
- **Provide a trail connection from the residential community to the commercial component (Outlot "A" to be relabeled Parcel "P"). This connection may be appropriate along the sewer right-of-way indicated on the conceptual site plan. An exact determination regarding the location of the trail will be made at the time of detailed site plan for Parcel "P".**

A more detailed analysis of pedestrian and trail connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional trail connections, sidewalks, and pedestrian safety measures may be warranted.

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated May 10, 2007, provided a detailed review of the subject DSP's conformance to the above condition. Staff concludes that Phase I of the Glenwood Hills development is consistent with this condition.

- 10. Development of this property is subject to the approval of a detailed site plan in accordance with Part III, Division 9, of the Zoning Ordinance. At the time of detailed site plan, a 30-scale drawing shall be submitted detailing of the recreational area on Parcel I. That plan shall demonstrate conformance with the *Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines*. The combined play area and the stormwater management area should be designed as an amenity to the site. It should be a naturalized form, with a path and benches incorporated into the perimeter of the pond.**

Comment: The applicant has submitted the 30-scale drawing for the recreational area that includes the recreational facilities identified in CSP-88020/02. The site design and location of the facilities are in general conformance with the Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines. Additional facilities

and amenities such as outdoor play area, gazebos, and a walking path have been introduced, and the site layout around the SWM pond is considered acceptable given the constraints of the site's topography.

- 12. At the time of review of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall remove the private streets serving the single-family dwelling units as required by Section 24-128(b)(7) or shall demonstrate a legal alternative.**

Comment: The subject detailed site plan shows that the single-family dwelling units proposed are served by a combination of public streets and private alleys. There are no private streets serving the single-family dwelling units.

- 16. Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary, DPW&T for a possible signal at the intersection of MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard. 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 the responsible agency. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, 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 the responsible permitting agency. Also, prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (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. The provision of an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MD 214.**
- b. The addition of a westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.**
- c. The construction of the northbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
- d. The modification of the southbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**

The scope of access improvements may be modified at the time of preliminary plan review at the direction of SHA provided that alternative improvements provide an acceptable service level that meets the requirements of Subtitles 27 and 24.

Comment: See above Finding 9 for a detailed discussion.

- 19. Total development within the subject property under this preliminary plan shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 780 AM and 933 PM peak hour vehicle**

trips, in consideration of the rates of trip generation, internal satisfaction, and pass-by travel that are consistent with assumptions in the traffic study. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

Comment: See above Finding 9 for a detailed discussion.

- 21. At the time of the initial detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall demonstrate the feasibility and constructability of the improvements described in Conditions 13, 14, 15, 16, and 18. This shall include consideration of right-of-way issues.**

Comment: According to the review by the Transportation Planning Section (June 15, 2007), the needed studies have been submitted and the subject DSP complies with this condition.

- 22. The Detailed Site Plan for Parcel P (commercial property) shall include the requirement for the construction of a pedestrian connection from the commercial portion of the property (Parcel P) to the townhouse portion of the property (Parcel F) by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees. The Detailed Site Plan for Parcel P shall include the details and triggers for trail construction, including RFA and bonding requirements.**

Comment: This DSP includes the townhouse section that is adjacent to Parcel P. A possible connection from the subject site to Parcel P has been preserved in this DSP.

- 24. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/66/94-02). The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:**

“Development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/66/94-02), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”

Comment: A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/049/07, has been submitted with this DSP. A review by the Environmental Planning Section (Shoulars to Zhang, September 18, 2007) concludes that TCPII/049/07 is consistent with the previously approved TCPI and meets the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, subject to three conditions that have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

25. At time of review of the detailed site plan the following impacts to the expanded buffer shall be eliminated or reduced to the extent possible as described below:

- a. Impact 5 for the stormwater management pond behind lots 17-21 on Streets D and E shall be revised to eliminate impacts to the 50-foot-wide stream buffer and shall be further evaluated and reduced wherever possible.**
- b. Impact 11 associated with the construction of lots 1-11, Block H, shall be further evaluated and minimized to the extent possible or eliminated.**
- c. Impact 21 shown along the rears of lots 60 through 79, Block G, shall be eliminated. Only the impact associated with the stormwater pond outfall adjacent to lot 61 is approved and this impact shall be minimized during the review of the detailed site plan.**

Comment: Impact 5 is not included in this phase of Glenwood Hills development.

In a review by the Environmental Planning Section (Shoulars to Zhang, September 18, 2007), the staff recommends the elimination of Impacts 11 and 21.

28. The first Detailed Site Plan shall include Parcel I, the central recreational area, and the land area associated with Lots 128-132, Block G, as shown on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision. The Detailed Site Plan shall demonstrate that sufficient land area is available to provide a visual focal point for the community. In order for the applicant to retain Lots 128-132, Block G the plan shall demonstrate adequate land area for all of the required recreational facilities, a naturalized storm water management pond with gentle slopes and parking facilities for the residents.

Comment: The subject DSP includes Parcel I as noted in this condition. The site plan for the central recreational area shows only two lots which is a three-lot reduction from the approved preliminary plan of subdivision in order to accommodate the recreational facilities as approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02. The central recreational area as shown on the site plan is acceptable as a visual focal point for the community.

11. *Landscape Manual:* The proposed development for the first phase of residential component of Glenwood Hills is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Residential Development from Streets; and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the *Landscape Manual*.

- a. In accordance with Section 4.1(d), all one-family detached lots which are smaller than 9,500 square feet shall be planted with a minimum of one major shade tree and one ornamental or evergreen tree per lot. The landscape plan shows 90 single-family detached lots that are smaller than 9,500 square feet and a total of 152 shade trees, 101 ornamental trees and 33 evergreen trees has been provided. The landscape plan is consistent with the requirements of Section 4.1(d).**

Section 4.1(f) requires that for a townhouse, a minimum of 1.5 major shade trees and one ornamental or evergreen tree per dwelling unit shall be planted on an individual lot and in common open space. The landscape plan shows 117 townhouse units and a total of 188 shade trees and 125 ornamental trees and thus meets the requirements of Section 4.1(f).

- b. Section 4.3(c), Interior Planting, requires a certain percentage of the parking in accordance with the size of the parking lot to be an interior planting area with one shade tree for each 300 square feet of the planting area. The landscape plan identifies the parking lot for the community center to be subject to a five percent requirement because the total parking lot area is between 7,000 and 49,999 square feet. The landscape plan provides approximately 14.9 percent of the total parking lot area as the interior planting area and 11 shade trees, which satisfies the requirement of Section 4.3(c).
 - c. Section 4.6 requires that when the rear yards of one-family attached or detached dwellings in any zones are oriented toward any streets classified as a collector or higher, a bufferyard shall be provided between the dwelling and the public right-of-way. The subject detailed site plan has a portion of the proposed single-family pod with rear yards oriented toward Central Avenue. The landscape plan acknowledges and provides the bufferyard schedule, but does not identify the bufferyard and associated planting on the landscape plan. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to revise the landscape plan to properly identify the required 75-foot bufferyard and associated planting prior to certification.
 - d. Section 4.7 requires a landscape buffer to be placed between two adjacent incompatible land uses in all conventional zones. In this case, the DSP includes a community center, which is defined as a medium impact use by the *Landscape Manual*. The community center is adjacent to two single-family detached houses. Technically, a Type C bufferyard is required between the community center and the single-family detached houses to the north of the community center. However, since the DSP is in the M-X-T Zone, traditionally Section 4.7 bufferyard is not required between two internal uses. Additional screening and landscaping is required in order to minimize the negative impact between two incompatible uses. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to revise the Landscape Plan to provide additional screening and landscaping between the community center and the rear of the two single-family detached houses.
 - e. The plant materials table on the landscape plan does not contain all acronyms for the proposed plant materials on the landscape plan. A condition has been proposed to require the applicant to revise the table to include all acronyms for the proposed plant materials on the plan.
12. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland,

and there is an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/66/94-01, in association with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 for this site.

- a. A detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was submitted for this application and was found to address the requirements for a detailed forest stand delineation as described in the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual. No further action is required with regard to the natural features of this site.
- b. Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/049/07, submitted with this application, has been reviewed and was found to be consistent with approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/66/94-01 .

13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. The Community Planning Division in a memorandum dated May 11, 2007, noted that the application is consistent with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* Development Pattern policies for the corridor in the Developed Tier and is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the 1985 approved Suitland-District Heights and vicinity master plan.

The community planner also indicates that the General Plan's vision for corridors and centers is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The proposed Glenwood Hills development as a whole is consistent with the vision of the General Plan.

- b. The Subdivision Section, in a memorandum dated September 19, 2007, noted that since the District Council has recently amended the Subdivision Regulations to give preliminary plans of 400 dwelling units or more a six-year validity period, the approved preliminary plan for this case remains valid until November 18, 2010, or until a final plat is recorded, whichever comes first. Subdivision staff also provides a clarification of the development standards that have been shown on the approved preliminary plan, but are different from what have been approved in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 as follows:

“Of concern is the applicant's apparent belief that some of the applicable development standards set by the District Council in their approval of CSP 88020/02 were somehow ‘relaxed’ by the approval of the preliminary plan. While it is true that the approved preliminary plan document contains notes setting a 3-foot minimum side yard setback and a 15-foot rear setback, this does not amend the 5- and 20-foot setbacks approved in the CSP, nor could it by any statute staff is aware of. Staff must conclude that these notes were placed on the plan in anticipation of a favorable outcome as requested in the /02 revision to the CSP. However, this proposed amendment to the side and rear setbacks was clearly rejected by the staff in their technical staff report for CSP-88020/02 (see attached)

and was not agreed to by the District Council.”

Comment: As discussed in Finding 9, staff believes that the development standards approved in CSP-88020/02 govern the review of this DSP. As such staff recommends that the applicant revise the site plan for those noted lots to satisfy both the side and rear yard setbacks prior to certification.

- c. The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated June 15, 2007, provided a complete review of the subject DSP’s conformance with all transportation-related conditions attached to the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 and CSP-88020/02. The transportation planner concluded that the access and on-site circulation within the site are acceptable and recommended approval of this DSP.

In a separate memorandum from the Transportation Planning Section dated May 10, 2007, on detailed site plan review for master plan trail compliance, the trails planner noted that the adopted and approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and vicinity sector plan recommends two master plan trails that impact the subject site. Connection to one master plan trail may not be feasible due to the fact that the trail corridor is within the PEPCO right-of-way. The trails planner recommends that this connection be accommodated through widening and improvement of the sidewalk along the site’s frontage of MD 214. In addition, the trails planner indicates that a number of internal HOA trail connections are needed. The trails planner recommends five conditions that have been incorporated into the recommendation section of this report.

- d. The Environmental Planning Section, in a memorandum dated September 18, 2007, indicated that the plans as submitted have been found to address the environmental constraints for the site and the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. The staff recommends approval of this application subject to six conditions that have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report
- e. The subject application was also referred to the Department of Environmental Resources (DER). At the time the staff report was written, DER had not responded to the referral request.
- f. The Permit Review Section, in a memorandum dated April 20, 2006, provided 28 comments and questions. Many of these comments have been addressed in the review process. The outstanding issues have been incorporated as conditions in the recommendation section of this report.
- g. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) in a memorandum dated June 19, 2007, provided comments on issues such as right-of-way dedication, frontage improvement, sidewalks, street trees and lighting, and storm drainage systems and facilities in order to be in accordance with the requirements of DPW&T. Those issues will be reviewed and enforced at time of issuance of access permits by DPW&T.

- h. The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) in a memorandum dated May 21, 2007, indicated that SHA concurs with the signal warrant study that a traffic signal should be installed at the MD 214 (Central Avenue) at the Karen Boulevard/Pepper Mill Drive intersection. In addition, SHA recommends an exclusive right-turn lane be constructed on eastbound MD 214.
 - i. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section in a memorandum dated April 20, 2007, stated that a Phase I archaeological survey was conducted on the subject site. The survey identified two archeological sites, neither of which contained significant research potential. Staff concurred with the recommendations of the survey report, *Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Glenwood Hills Development, Prince George's County, Maryland Preliminary Plan Number 4-04081*, that no additional archeological investigations are necessary on the Glenwood Hills property.
 - j. The Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) in a memorandum dated April 26, 2007, stated that water is available for the development. Sewer extension will be required. Further review may be necessary to address the proposed lot layout. The reviewer indicated that several other revisions will need to be made and demonstrated on the Detailed Site Plan. These requirements have been incorporated into conditions in the recommendation section of this report.

Comment: The requirements prescribed by WSSC will be enforced at time of permit review by the respective office of the WSSC.
 - k. The Fire/EMS Department of Prince George's County in a memorandum dated July 18, 2007, provided standard comments that list all applicable regulations regarding access for fire apparatus, fire lane, and the location and performance of fire hydrants. The reviewer has met with the applicant and reviewed the DSP specifically regarding the portion of the site plan that has a public alley.
 - l. The Division of Environmental Health, Prince George's County Health Department, had not responded to the referral request at the time the staff report was written.
 - m. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) in a memorandum dated April 4, 2006, provided no comments on this DSP.
14. As required by Section 27-285(b), the detailed site plan is in general conformance with the approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/02, and represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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/47/07) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-07003 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide a total of nine parking spaces specifically designated for the physically handicapped.
 - b. Revise the landscape plan as follows:
 - (1) Identify graphically the required Section 4.6 bufferyard and associated planting on the landscape plan.
 - (2) Identify additional screening by showing fence and associated planting between the community center and the single-family houses on the Landscape Plan.
 - (3) Include the plant initials in the plant materials table for all proposed plant materials on the landscape plan.
 - c. Provide a copy of the approved stormwater management concept plan to show compliance with the DSP. The TCPII shall be revised as necessary to be in conformance with the approved concept plan. Any new impacts shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - d. Provide a minimum 20-foot setback of garage doors of all single-family detached houses from the back of the sidewalk.
 - e. Provide the bus stop location information.
 - f. Place the development standards as approved in the Council Order for approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 for the Glenwood Hills development on the coversheet of the site plan and revise the site plans to reflect those standards.
 - g. Add the site plan note as follows:

“For single-family detached houses with an integrated garage, the deck shall not intrude into the rear yard setback for more than 10 feet; and for single-family detached houses with a freestanding garage that is accessed through a public alley, the deck shall be placed between the house and the garage.”
 - h. Show the following trail-related conditions:

- (1) Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide trail along the subject property's entire frontage of Karen Boulevard. This should be separated from the curb by a landscape strip, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - (2) Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip, along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.
 - (3) Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads (including Verna Road), unless modified by DPW&T.
 - (4) Provide the trail connection from Layla Court to Quarry Avenue on designated HOA land. This trail shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for Lot 81 and Lot 82.
 - (5) Provide a trail connection from the residential community to the commercial component (Outlot "A"). This trail shall be completely on HOA land and shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for Lot 29 and Lot 30.
 - i. Provide a brick façade tracking table for townhouses.
 - j. Provide special paver details for review by the Urban Design Section
 - k. Provide a cut sheet for each proposed recreational facility on the plan.
 - l. Either increase the base finished area of Halifax model to be 1,800 square feet or above or remove this model from the model list included in the DSP.
 - m. Revise the plan to allow 15 foot rear yards throughout the development and to allow for three-foot side yards for Lots 101, 107, 108 Block A and Lot 10, Block F.
2. 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.
 3. Prior to issuance of any building permits, the applicant shall
 - a. Bond the traffic signal to be installed at the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The applicant shall install the traffic signal at a time directed by DPW&T.
 - b. Provide written evidence from DPW&T that indicates a complete resolution of shade tree planting on Karen Boulevard. The approved DSP shall be revised to reflect any physical changes to the site.

4. Prior to issuance of the 300th building permit, the construction of the central recreational area shall be completed and be open to the residents.
5. Prior to issuance of the 87th building permit for the townhouse units, the construction of the multiage playground shall be completed and be open to the townhouse residents.
6. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500th dwelling unit, the applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided M-NCPPC Urban Design Division evidence of its good faith efforts marketing of the commercial component along with third-party data on the existing market for office and/or retail development at the Property and adjoining area.
7. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the expanded buffer and adjacent planting areas, except for areas of approved variations, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”
8. If in the future, residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour line, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.

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 Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Cavitt and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Vaughns absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, October 11, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 18th day of October 2007.

R. Bruce Crawford

PGCPB No. 07-165
File No. DSP-07003
Page 35

Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

RBC:FJG:HZ:bjs