

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 April 3, 2008, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07048 for Glenwood Hills, Phase III, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** This application proposes to construct a mix of residential single-family detached and multifamily dwelling units as part of a larger mixed-use community.
2. **Development Data Summary**

|                              | <b>EXISTING</b>      | <b>PROPOSED</b>   |
|------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Zone(s)                      | M-X-T                | M-X-T             |
| Use(s)                       | Vacant               | Residential       |
| Acreage                      | 121.08 (entire site) | 43.21 (Phase III) |
| Single-family detached units | 0                    | 45                |
| Rear-loaded                  | 0                    | 5                 |
| Small lot front-loaded       | 0                    | 3                 |
| Large lot front-loaded       | 0                    | 37                |
| Multifamily units            | 0                    | 144               |
| Total residential units      | 0                    | 189               |

## ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA

## Single-Family Detached Models

| <b>Model</b> | <b>Base Finished Square Footage</b> |
|--------------|-------------------------------------|
| Austin II    | 2,288 (detached 2-car garage)       |
| Belvedere    | 1,998 (2-car garage)                |
| Carroll I    | 3,143 (2-car garage)                |
| Carroll II   | 2,772 (detached 2-car garage)       |
| Hammond      | 2,010 (2-car garage)                |
| Hemingway    | 1,904 (detached 2-car garage)       |
| Kipling      | 3,061 (2-car garage)                |
| Michener I   | 2,552 (detached 2-car garage)       |
| Melville     | 1,977 (detached 2-car garage)       |
| Oberlin      | 2,632 (2- or 3-car garage)          |
| Ravenwood    | 2,261 (2-car garage)                |
| Tolstoy      | 3,596 (2-car garage)                |
| Victoria     | 2,439 (2- or 3-car garage)          |

Zachary 2,249 (2-car garage)

12-Unit Multifamily Buildings

| Model   | Base Finished Square Footage |
|---------|------------------------------|
| Windsor | 1,658 per unit               |

3. **Location:** The Glenwood Hills development is located south of MD 214 (Central Avenue) along Karen Boulevard.

Karen Boulevard runs north and south through the center of the property, roughly bisecting the site. The Glenwood Hills development is divided into four phases along this north-south axis. A Detailed Site Plan for Phase I (DSP-07003) was approved for the area north of the subject phase, consisting of 90 single-family detached houses and 117 townhouses, along with a community recreation area to serve the whole development. A Detailed Site Plan for Phase II (DSP-07046) has been submitted concurrently with this application and is proposed to consist of 63 single-family and 134 two-family dwelling units. The subject application is for Phase III. Phase IV will consist of the commercial retail and office portion of the development and will be located at the northern end of the site, adjacent to Central Avenue.

The conceptual site plan for Glenwood Hills identified five phases of development, but the land area and dwelling units proposed in the second phase of development in that plan have been divided between the submitted Phase I and Phase II detailed site plans. Therefore, the detailed site plan for Phase III corresponds with the fourth phase proposed in the CSP, while the detailed site plan for Phase IV is expected to correspond with the fifth phase proposed in the CSP.

4. **Surroundings and Uses:** Immediately north of the Phase III site is the Glenwood Hills Phase II development, proposed to consist of a mix of single-family detached houses and two-family attached units. Further north from this are Phase I, consisting of a mix of single-family detached houses and townhouses, as well as the central recreational area serving the Glenwood Hills community. To the north of this is Parcel P, intended for future development as the commercial phase of the mixed-use community. Parcel P is immediately south of Central Avenue.

To the south of the Phase III site is Walker Mill Middle School.

To the east, the site borders land owned by PEPCO, which also owns a strip of land running east-west between the Phase I and Phase IV sites. PEPCO possesses a structure on the northern end of this land, adjacent to Central Avenue, and overhead power lines run south alongside the eastern edge of the Glenwood Hills development.

On the west side, the subject site borders an existing single-family residential development in the R-55 Zone.

5. **Prior 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 was originally planned under the name Meridian in a Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020, 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 PGCPB Resolution 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 PGCPB Resolution 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.

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07003 for Phase I of the development was approved on October 11, 2007, with the resolution approved on October 18, 2007. This DSP was for 90 single-family detached houses, 117 townhouses, and the central recreational pod.

6. **Design Features:** The plan proposes three distinct residential types: front-loaded single-family detached houses, rear-loaded single-family detached houses, and multifamily dwellings.

Like the overall Glenwood Hills development, this phase is built on either side of Karen Boulevard.

Near the northern boundary of the Phase III area, Karen Boulevard is proposed to form a roundabout intersection with two smaller roads (Sabrina Court and Dabney Drive) providing access to the residential pods to the east and west.

West of the roundabout, Sabrina Court is the main access to a pod of single-family houses. The five neo-traditional houses with detached garages are located along the frontage of Karen Boulevard, which allows them to face directly onto the main public street while their vehicular access is via the access streets behind them. The remaining 40 houses are developed according to the more conventional model of front-loaded garages and are laid out along Sabrina Court, which terminates in two culs-de-sac near the western edge of the site.

East of the roundabout, Dabney Drive provides access to the multifamily portion of the phase. Twelve buildings, each containing 12 dwelling units, are proposed to be developed in this area. Eleven of the 12 buildings are shown in two rows on the east and west sides of a central parking lot. The remaining building is proposed closer to the roundabout.

Each multifamily building is four stories tall, with the first floor consisting of an open-air internal parking garage. Each of the three floors above includes four two-bedroom dwelling units, laid out at the corners of the building around a central core service area housing elevators, stairs, and lobby area.

7. **Urban Design Review:** The bulk of the development's recreational facilities are considered to be within the recreational center in Phase I, including 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 appliances), 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 five-foot and eight-foot sidewalks (as reviewed in DSP-07003).

Within the subject phase, there is a multiage play area of 5,340 square feet proposed just south of the roundabout, on the eastern side of the development. This play area is proposed to contain two benches, one climbing structure, and two spring animals. Most of the space designated in the play area is not utilized for these structures, however, and instead is proposed to contain ten trees. Although the trees would to some extent create a more pleasant environment for the play area, the amount of recreational equipment does not seem adequate for the size of the development or the claimed area of the playground. The Urban Design Section recommends that most of the trees should be moved to other areas surrounding the play area to allow space for additional recreational equipment, including a horizontal ladder and a swing set.

Adjacent to the play area is a picnic area, containing four picnic tables. As per the Park and Recreation Guidelines for recreational facilities, the picnic area should also include a trash receptacle and two fixed picnic grills.

The proposed arrangement of buildings is very closely spaced. As noted below, some of the proposed detached houses are located within three feet of the side property line, while rear decks behind some

houses could be as close as five feet from the rear property line. Within the multifamily building pod, minimum spacing of 20 feet between the buildings has been maintained. The close spacing is largely consistent with the approved conceptual site plan, as the requested modifications to the approved development standards are minor in nature. Overall the development will offer a variety of housing choices.

As listed in the table above, the applicant has proposed nine conventional house types (with forward-facing attached garages) and five neo-traditional house types (with rear-facing detached garages). The different house types utilize a variety of roof and window treatments, and feature numerous options including brick facades and expanded living space. All of these house types were also approved in Phase I of the development under DSP-07003.

The multifamily buildings on the eastern portion of the site are rectangular in shape. They are well fenestrated and mostly brick-clad on their long sides, where the pedestrian entrances are located. Unfortunately, the short sides of the rectangles are less appealing, with siding on most of the facades. The basic elevations of the short sides of the buildings are nearly featureless walls, with no apertures or other decoration—optional windows can be added to the sides. The internal garages on the first floors of the buildings are accessed from the short sides of the buildings, and the proposed arrangement of the buildings orients the short sides of the buildings to be the most publicly visible. Most of the multifamily buildings are oriented with the plain short sides of the buildings facing onto the central parking lots or towards Karen Boulevard, while the more attractive longer sides are relatively concealed by facing towards the other multifamily buildings. A reorientation of the buildings to face the more attractive sides towards the public areas of the development does not appear feasible because the buildings are designed with the vehicular access on the plainer sides of the building and the development scheme's placement of stormwater management facilities and woodland preservation areas next to the multifamily pod does not allow much room for adjustment. The shorter sides of the buildings should be improved to the fullest extent possible in order to match the more attractive sides in materials and features. The sides of the units facing towards Karen Boulevard should also be screened with landscaping to the fullest extent possible.

Each of the single-family houses includes adequate parking within garages and on the driveways. The parking arrangements for the multifamily buildings are more problematic. Each building of 12 units requires a total of 20 parking spaces (1.66 per two-bedroom dwelling unit, calculated at this rate because the site is located within one mile of the Addison Road Metro Station). The total requirement for the multifamily section is therefore 240 parking spaces, including seven handicapped spaces. The site plan claims that the multifamily section provides a total of 144 spaces in the interior garages (including 12 handicapped spaces) and 151 spaces in the nearby surface parking lots (including two handicapped spaces), for a total of 295. However, the spaces within the interior garages do not meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for standard parking spaces, which should be 9.5 feet wide by 19 feet long. Each garage provides one handicapped space and 13 other spaces, ranging in size from nine feet wide by 18 feet long to 12 feet wide by 18 feet long for the handicapped space. The 144 spaces shown in the garages qualify only as compact parking spaces, not standard or handicapped spaces. As compact spaces may not constitute more than one-third of the required number of parking spaces, an additional 160 standard parking spaces must be demonstrated within

the surface parking lots. However, of the 151 spaces claimed in the surface parking lots, 53 are compact spaces, which cannot be utilized because of the limitations on the number of compact spaces. If these areas were resized as standard parking spaces the surface lots would provide 140 standard parking spaces, which is 20 fewer than required, and two handicapped spaces, which is five fewer than required.

It may be possible to expand the size of some of the surface parking lots in order to provide the additional required standard-sized spaces and handicapped spaces, or to resize the interior spaces to meet size requirements. Prior to signature approval, the applicant should pursue these possibilities in order to provide the required number of spaces. The applicant could also apply for a departure from design standards for parking space size. However, if these solutions should prove unworkable there would be no alternative but to remove one of the multifamily buildings in order to provide the minimum amount of required parking.

8. **Required Findings of the M-X-T Zone:** Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the following findings be made for the Planning Board to approve a detailed site plan in the M-X-T Zone.

**In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:**

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

The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes of the M-X-T Zone, because it will promote the orderly development of land in the vicinity of a major transit stop and create a compact, mixed-use, walkable community (in concert with the other phases of Glenwood Hills).

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

This requirement does not apply to the subject property as it was rezoned by the 1986 sectional map amendment.

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

The proposed development has an outward orientation as buildings front directly onto the public right-of-way on Karen Boulevard and pedestrian connections are made to the adjacent neighborhood. The impact of developing the entire Glenwood Hills project is also likely to catalyze improvement and rejuvenation within adjacent communities.

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

The proposed development of single-family homes and low-rise multifamily buildings is compatible with the existing development in the vicinity. The existing development in the immediate vicinity consists nearly entirely of single-family houses, while garden apartments and commercial properties are to be found closer to the major transportation routes of Central Avenue and Addison Road.

The proposed development is also compatible with the other phases of Glenwood Hills, which feature a similar mix of conventional single-family houses, neo-traditional single-family houses, and denser attached dwelling units.

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

When all the phases of the Glenwood Hills community are built, including the commercial space and the central recreational facilities, the design will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

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

The residential units within Phase III of the development are self-sufficient to the extent that they could be realized without the rest of the phases being completed; however, the phase depends on the completion of Karen Boulevard within the other phases of the development for its access to public roads. Other features of the overall Glenwood Hills that will serve Phase III—including the commercial area and the recreational amenities—are also within other phases. The design clearly allows for effective integration of subsequent phases, as the adjacent phase of development will be compatible uses developed in a manner consistent with Phase III.

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

A convenient pedestrian system has been provided by sidewalks along all the streets (not along the alleys, where pedestrian activity should be minimal and vehicular traffic will be heavy). Pedestrian links have been created to the existing single-family houses on the western side of the site. As noted in the referral from the trails coordinator, there are some intersections that do not show delineated crosswalks. This should be corrected prior to signature approval of the plans.

**(8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types**

**and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

Areas of the development to be used for pedestrian activities or gathering spaces include the play areas and the sidewalks in the development. The Urban Design Section believes that adequate attention has been paid to the design of these areas.

- (9) **On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant, or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, 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.**

This requirement is not applicable to the subject detailed site plan.

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

The site was the subject of conceptual site plan approval and preliminary plan approval fewer than six years ago.

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

The area of the entire Glenwood Hills site is 121.08 acres.

9. **Other Requirements of the M-X-T Zone:** The M-X-T Zone regulates density by floor area ratio (FAR), permitting a base density of 0.4 FAR, which may be increased to 1.4 when developing a mix of residential and commercial uses and may be increased further by providing additional amenities through the optional method of development. The Glenwood Hills development does not propose to utilize the optional method of development because the proposed development is less than the base permitted 0.4 FAR.



10. **Conceptual Site Plan:** CSP-88020/02 was approved by the Planning Board on July 15, 2004, with 29 conditions of approval as contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-170. A number of these conditions have already been fulfilled during the review of the preliminary plan and of the Phase I detailed site plan. The following conditions warrant discussion at this time:

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*.**
13. **The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.**

The recreational facilities within this phase are shown located on HOA land and are in compliance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. The applicant has affirmed that there will be a single umbrella HOA to administer the overall development and the central recreational facilities. Smaller suborganizations would be organized for the different types of units and pods of development. To ensure that the facilities will be available to all residents, the applicant should demonstrate evidence of a legal arrangement in the governing documents of the overall HOA that will ensure all recreational facilities on the site (including but not limited to those in the central recreational area) will be available to all members of the Glenwood Hills community.

14. **Submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**
15. **The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.**
18. **The following schedule shall govern bonding and construction of recreational facilities and shall be included in the recreational facilities agreement(s):**
- a. **Prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.**
  - b. **Prior to the issuance of the 300<sup>th</sup> building permit in the development, the applicant shall complete the central recreational facilities.**
  - c. **The bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development pods shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each pod respectively, and the completion of the same**

**facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each pod of development.**

This condition remains in effect. Therefore the recreational facilities within the multifamily development area must be bonded before the issuance of building permits for the multifamily dwelling units, and must be completed prior to the completion of the 101<sup>st</sup> multifamily unit.

- 21. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500<sup>th</sup> dwelling unit, the Applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to 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.**

This condition remains in effect for the entire development.

- 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 feet (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.**

The proposed design adheres to most of the above requirements, but in some places within the development the requirements have not been met. The applicant has applied for modifications to the conditions in order to allow these requirements to be relaxed.

The applicant requests that the side yard setback for single-family detached houses be reduced to three feet. As shown on the plans, this modification would be necessary for the houses and garages on Lots 2, 3, 42, 43, 44 and 45. Except for Lot 42 these lots are neo-traditional rear-loaded houses. All of these lots have frontage onto the roundabout at the intersection of Karen Boulevard and Sabrina Court.

The applicant also requests that the rear yard setback for front-loaded single-family detached houses be reduced from 20 feet to 15 feet, and that the 20-foot setback of front-loaded garages should be measured from the back of the sidewalk rather than the front property line.

The Urban Design Section feels that these requested modifications to the development standards are relatively minor and are consistent with the character and quality of development envisioned by the conceptual site plan. The requested modifications are also in line with the modifications that were granted with the approval of DSP-07003 for similar setback modifications within the Phase I development.

The CSP development standards state that deck standards are to be determined at the time of detailed site plan. The applicant has proposed the following:

“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 accessed through a public alley, the deck shall be placed between the house and the garage.”

This standard, in combination with the proposed rear-yard setback modifications above, would mean that decks for some of the front-loaded single-family houses could be placed as close as five feet from the rear property line. This is consistent with the deck standards approved for Phase I under DSP-07003.

The plans do not demonstrate the required 45 percent green area and 60 percent brick façade requirements for the multifamily buildings. This should be demonstrated prior to signature approval of the plans, after the architectural and parking issues of the multifamily buildings are resolved.

**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.**

This condition will remain in effect—the applicant has provided a tracking table on the cover sheet of the DSP to monitor fulfillment of the condition. However, the table does not include Lots 3 and 42, which are highly visible from the Karen Boulevard roundabout and should be added to the table.

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

The clubhouse is within the Phase I area.

- c. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.**

The proposed residential buildings utilize a variety of rooflines, many of which include reverse gables.

- d. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.**

The plan proposes two entrance features located on either side of Karen Boulevard at the southern end of the development. These features are five feet, nine inches in height, constructed of brick with the letters “GH” on a concrete display insert. These signs are appropriate in size and scale and match similar features provided at the northern end of the site.

- 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.**

Freestanding signs are not proposed in this phase.

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

The applicant has included lighting fixtures to be used within this phase that are the same as those utilized in the Phase I and Phase II 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.**

The applicant has shown a detail of paving materials as recommended by the Department of Public Works and Transportation for use on pedestrian crosswalks. The detail is acceptable; however, there are a number of intersections where the crosswalk has not been shown on the plan. This should be corrected prior to signature approval of the DSP.

- 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.**

The plans show trees planted within the median on Karen Boulevard and along the sidewalks as required by this condition.

- 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.**

The two-family dwelling units are located in Phase II of the development.

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

The plan shows proposed locations for future bus stops and pedestrian connections. Crosswalks are shown on the plans but are not shown at all intersections as would be appropriate. The plans should be revised to show crosswalks at all intersections where sidewalks cross vehicle rights-of-way.

- 11. **Preliminary Plan 4-04081:** This preliminary plan of subdivision was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2004, with 29 conditions of approval as laid out in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-252. The following conditions warrant discussion at this time:

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

The Department of Public Works and Transportation has affirmed that this plan is in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #39362-2002-02, a revision to the above-referenced plan.

- 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.

The required Phase I study was submitted at the time of review of the first DSP in accordance with this condition. Two archeological sites were identified but neither was considered to be significant in nature. Therefore the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section agreed that no further archeological study would be required on the property.

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.**

The applicant has indicated that the streets serving the single-family dwelling units will be public streets in conformance with the subdivision regulations.

27. **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.**

This condition remains in effect.

12. ***Landscape Manual:*** The development is subject to some portions of the *Landscape Manual*. Specifically, it is subject to Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 4.7.

- a. Section 4.1 requires that residential yards of less than 9,500 square feet (i.e., all of the lots in Glenwood Hills) be planted with a minimum of one major shade tree and one ornamental or evergreen tree per lot. The plan shows an adequate number of trees within the single-family detached portions of the plan in order to meet this requirement.

For multifamily dwellings, a minimum of one shade tree should be provided per 1,600 square feet of green area provided on the parcel. The green area used to calculate this amount does not include the stormwater management pond or parking lot landscaping areas. The submitted landscape plan calculates that this would require at least 60 shade trees, and that 98 shade trees have been provided. If any of the necessary revisions to the multifamily section alter this amount, the plans should reflect the changes and demonstrate full compliance to the *Landscape Manual*.

- b. Section 4.3 requires landscape strips and internal green area for parking lots. This is required for the parking lots of the multifamily buildings. It appears from the plans that there will be adequate space to provide this landscaping, but the plans do not demonstrate that they meet the requirement. This should be revised prior to signature approval of the plans.
- c. Section 4.7 provides for buffering of incompatible uses. Most of the uses on the west side of Karen Boulevard are single-family houses that are compatible with their neighbors, but on the east side of Karen Boulevard the multifamily parcel is adjacent to PEPCO power lines on the east side, and adjacent to Walker Mill Middle School on the south side. These are considered incompatible uses. The multifamily pod requires a type B bufferyard along its east and south sides. The proposed landscape plan did not anticipate the need for this amount of buffering, so the plan does not demonstrate the required bufferyards.

There are some areas where Section 4.7 would normally require bufferyards between different use types within the Glenwood Hills development. Moreover, because the DSP is in the M-X-T zone, Section 4.7 bufferyards are traditionally not required between two internal uses.

It appears that there is adequate space to provide the full required bufferyards along the east and south sides of the parcel. The plans should be revised to provide the necessary bufferyards.

## REFERRALS

13. **Transportation Planning Section:** In a memorandum dated December 31, 2007 (Mokhtari to Lindsay), the Transportation Planning Section stated the following:

There is an approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-88020) and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-04081) for the site, each with several transportation-related conditions. Since all of the CSP transportation-related conditions were either fully addressed or were restated as new conditions in accordance with the findings made for the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following summarizes the status of relevant transportation-related conditions of the approved preliminary plan of subdivision which must be addressed:

13. **MD 214 at Addison Road: 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. **Option 1: The construction of a northbound free right-turn lane along Addison Road.**
  - b. **Option 2: The construction of an eastbound right-turn lane along MD 214.**



**The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 will be implemented shall be made at the time of the initial detailed site plan.**

The applicant has provided SHA with the required feasibility study and SHA concurs with the study recommendation that Option 2 would best address the noted inadequacies for this intersection. Provision of this improvement is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 14. MD 214 at Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road: 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 modification of westbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
  - b. The modification of northbound Ritchie Road to a five-lane approach, which includes two left-turn lanes, a shared through/left-turn lane, a through lane, and one right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 15. Walker Mill Road at Addison Road: 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 modification of westbound Walker Mill Road to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a left-turn/right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 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 applicant has provided SHA and DPW&T with the required signal warrant study and SHA concurs with the study recommendation that signal is warranted. The SHA and DPW&T concurred with the staff to modify items c. and d. above by requiring construction of a median along MD 214 which would prohibit through movements between Karen Boulevard and Pepper Mill Drive. Provision of the signal and needed geometric improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 17. Walker Mill Road at Karen Boulevard: Prior to the approval of the 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.**

The applicant has provided DPW&T with the required signal warrant study and DPW&T concurs with the study recommendation that signal is warranted. Provision of the signal is enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 18. MD 214 at Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive: 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 modification of southbound Hill Road to a five-lane approach, which includes two left-turn lanes, a shared through/left-turn lane, a through lane, and a right-turn lane.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

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.**

The subject plan is a portion of the approved development, and the projected trips that will be generated by this phase would not exceed the established AM and PM trip caps noted above.

20. **Karen Boulevard: 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. **Construct Karen Boulevard as a four-lane collector roadway between MD 214 and the southern end of the site.**

This condition is enforceable at the time of building permit.

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.**

The needed studies have been submitted, and appropriate discussions are included with each condition.

Vehicular access within the site is deemed acceptable if all proposed public and private streets and alleys are constructed to DPW&T standards, with adequate turnaround as required by DPW&T.

Provided that the preliminary plan of subdivision 4-04081 approved in October, 2004, **is still valid**, the transportation staff finds the submitted site plan meets the transportation requirements of Subtitle 27 for approval provided the above modifications to the approved preliminary plan of subdivision conditions are noted.

14. **Subdivision Referral:** In a memorandum dated November 14, 2007 (Lockhart to Lindsay), the Subdivision Section offered the following:

This property was the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04081 which was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2004. The resolution adopting that action (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-252) was adopted on November 18, 2004. The site is approximately 4,000 feet east of the Addison Road Metro Station. The Glenwood Hill development is approved for 220 single-family detached units, 117 townhouse units, 278 multifamily dwelling units, and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. The submitted detailed site plans are for 63 single-family detached units, and 134 two-family units in Phase II; and 45 single-family detached units, and 144 multifamily units in Phase III. The layout shown on the DSP is generally consistent with the approved preliminary plan.

As discussed in the referral for Phase I (DSP-07003), staff is concerned with 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. Staff is uncertain whether this belief also impacts on Phases II and III. While it is true that the approved preliminary plan document contains notes setting a three-foot-minimum side yard setback and a 15-foot rear setback, this does not amend the five- 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 and was not agreed to by the District Council.

The District Council has recently amended the Subdivision Regulations to give preliminary plans of 400 dwelling units or greater a six-year validity period. Previously that length of time was only for plans of 400 or more **lots**. Consequently, the approved preliminary plan for this case remains valid until November 18, 2010, or until a final plat is recorded, whichever comes first.

Urban Design Comment: Staff and the applicant are in agreement that the development standards were set by the conceptual site plan and were not modified by approval of the preliminary plan.

15. **Community Planning referral:** In a memorandum dated October 30, 2007 (Fenwick to Lindsay), the Community Planning South Division found the following:

This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the corridors in the Developed Tier. The existing zoning approved in 1986 allows for mixed-use development at this site and at intensities envisioned by the General Plan for selected locations along the corridor.

This application generally conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1985 approved Suitland-District Heights and vicinity master plan.

The development plan for Glenwood Hills, DSP-07048, reflects the third phase of construction for the subject property. Subsequent construction phases will include additional housing and commercial

development. However, the detailed site plans for phase III do not indicate future commercial development.

The property is located on a General Plan-designated corridor (Central Avenue). It is also located conveniently between two centers designated by the General Plan (Addison Road Metro Station, a community center and the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station, a regional center). 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 General Plan supports this intensive, mixed-use development at local centers and at other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections of transit stops along the corridor. The existing zoning approved in 1986 allows for mixed-use development at this site and at intensities envisioned by the General Plan for selected locations along the corridor. Planning Board Resolution No.04-170, Condition 21 states:

**“Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500<sup>th</sup> dwelling unit, the Applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to 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.”** [emphasis added]

The development plan for Glenwood Hills Subdivision proposes to construct in three phases. Construction of 117 townhouses and 90 single-family homes are to be built in Phase I; 63 detached single-family and 134 two-family units in Phase II; and 45 detached single-family and 144 multifamily units in Phase III. The total number of units proposed is 593 with 404 units in the first two phases. Pursuant to the above condition, the project needs to be monitored to ensure that the commercial development originally planned is built in accordance with the Planning Board's requirements before all building permits for subsequent phases are issued. All the plans should reflect the development of office/retail use on the site plan along Central Avenue.

Pedestrian connections are especially important to the commercial area (along Central Avenue), transit routes, focal points, and other public places within the proposed development. The General Plan emphasizes walkability for development in the Developed Tier and along corridors. The plan **does not** clearly indicate sidewalks. All sidewalks should be labeled with dimensions. The road network must facilitate safe pedestrian connections throughout the proposed development. Pedestrian connections to adjoining residential and existing public uses such as Central High School (south of MD 214 and west of the proposed development) and Walker Mill Middle School (southeast corner of the proposed development) are critical in the future phases of development which may require separate trails.

16. **Department of Public Works and Transportation referral:** In a memorandum dated January 25, 2008 (Abraham to Zhang), the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) offered the following comments:

- a. The property is located on the south side of MD 214, in the vicinity of the 7100 and 7200 blocks. The property will be accessed through a proposed extension of Karen Boulevard in the Glenwood Hills subdivision. MD 214 is under the jurisdiction of the State Highway Administration (SHA). Access requirements and frontage improvement will be established by SHA. Karen Boulevard is a county-maintained roadway; therefore, right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's standards modified to provide 11-foot travel lanes and median widths of ten feet narrowing to four feet at floodplain crossings and the Americans With Disabilities Act are required.
- b. Any proposed master plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission and DPW&T and may involve right-of-way reservation, dedication, and/or road construction in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards.
- c. Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments. Coordination with the various utility companies is required.
- d. The detailed site plan is consistent with the approved DPW&T Stormwater Management Concept Plan #39362-2002-02.

Urban Design comment: It should be noted that DPW&T usually enforces its conditions through its own permitting process.

17. **Trails Coordinator referral:** In a memorandum dated December 6, 2007 (Shaffer to Lindsay), the trails coordinator made the following comments:

The approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and vicinity sector plan recommends two master plan trails that impact the subject site. These trails are identified on Map 16 as the Eastern Trail along the Karen Boulevard corridor and the Railroad Trail along the Chesapeake Beach Railroad right-of-way.

The Railroad Trail impacts the northern portion of Glenwood Hills and is beyond the scope of the subject application.

The Eastern Trail is proposed to follow Pepper Mill Drive and Karen Boulevard to form a continuous north-south trail for walkers and bikers, connecting Seat Pleasant Drive with Walker Mill Road. This trail will ultimately link Peppermill Village and the proposed Glenwood Hills development to the Peppermill Community Center, Walker Mill Middle School, Baynes Elementary School, and the town center. This trail is shown on the submitted DSP.

At the time of preliminary plan, staff recommended several neighborhood connector trails linking the subject site to the surrounding community. Central High School, an existing ball field, and the Addison Road Metro Station are west of the subject site. At the time of preliminary plan, several trail connections were required as part of the conditions of approval. These connections included a trail

linking the residential community with the commercial component of the development. These trail connections are beyond the scope of the subject application.

Condition 9 of approved Preliminary Plan 4-04081 (PGCPB No. 04-252) included the following trail and sidewalk requirements:

In conformance with the 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.

Conditions appropriate for the subject application are listed in the recommendations section.

#### SIDEWALK CONNECTIVITY:

The subdivisions immediately to the west of the subject site include standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads. Sidewalks are an integral part of the overall trail and pedestrian network and are necessary to facilitate safe pedestrian movement through the community and to nearby destinations such as Central High School, Walker Mill Middle School, Saint Margarets Elementary School, and local parks. Condition 9 of Preliminary Plan 4-04081 requires the provision of sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.

The sidewalk network provided is comprehensive and includes standard or wide sidewalks along all roads. Included are eight-foot-wide sidewalks along one side of Karen Boulevard (the master plan trail), Sabrina Court (east of Tabitha Court), and Zoe Loop. Supplementing these standard and wide sidewalks are pedestrian walkways between units and a trail around the southeastern corner of the site connecting Zoe Loop, Racquel Drive and Karen Boulevard. Staff supports the sidewalk network as shown on the site plan and believes that it fulfills the master plan recommendation along Karen Boulevard, meets the intent of Condition 9 of 4-04081, and provides for a walkable and accessible community.

Curb cuts and designated crosswalks should be indicated at all intersections, unless modified by DPW&T. The submitted plans do not include curb cuts and crosswalks at all intersections, with the Zoe Loop and Karen Boulevard intersection on Sheet 4 being one example. These curb cuts and crosswalks shall be marked and labeled on the approved detailed site plan.

18. **Environmental Referral:** In a memorandum dated March 17, 2008 (Shoulars to Lindsay), the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of DSP-07048 and TCPII/049/07-02 subject to conditions.

The Environmental Planning Section originally reviewed the subject property as Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020 and subsequently as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94066 and Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/66/94, which were approved with conditions. The subject property was again reviewed as Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 and TCPI/66/94-01, which were approved with conditions. A Detailed Site Plan (DSP-07003) and Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/049/07) for Phase I of the development of this site were approved by the Planning Board on October 11, 2007. Phase II of this site, DSP-07046 and TCPII049/07-01, are currently under review. This application proposes the construction of additional residential units as part of Phase III of this development.

#### Site Description

This 121.08-acre site in the M-X-T Zone is located on the south side of Central Avenue (MD 214) approximately 4,500 feet east of the intersection with Addison Road. A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and erodible soils do occur on the subject property. Central Avenue (MD 214), a planned arterial road has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator and noise impacts are anticipated. The soils found to occur on-site according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey are in the Adelphia, Collington, Sassafra,



Howell clay and Westphalia soil series. Some of these existing soils have limitations that will have an impact during the building phase of the development. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. This property is located in the Beaverdam Creek watershed of the Anacostia River basin. This property is located in the Development Tier as delineated on the approved General Plan.

#### **Review of Previously Approved Conditions**

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject applications. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides the comments on the plan's conformance with the applicable conditions.

#### **PGCPB No. 04-94-351(C/A), File No. 4-94066**

**20. The following shall be provided with the Detailed Site Plan.**

- a. **A noise study to address townhouse lots located less than 50 feet from the collector right- of- way and single-family lots with a lot depth of less than 100 feet from the collector; or a noise mitigation package to be submitted in conjunction with the architectural review of dwelling units on the referenced lots.**
- b. **A complete forest stand delineation.**
- c. **A Type II Tree Conservation Plan.**

All elements of Condition 20, a through c, have been addressed. No further revisions are required.

#### **PGCPB No. 04-252(C/A), File No. 4-04081**

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

A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted with the DSP and will be addressed in the environmental review section.

- 26. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the streams and their associated buffers, 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.”**

This condition will be addressed at the time of final plat review.

**PGCPB No. 04-170 (C/A), File No. CSP-88020/02**

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

The subject property has an approved stormwater management concept letter for the entire development; however, a copy of the associated plan is required. Conditions regarding stormwater management are discussed in the Environmental Review Section below.

- 24. At 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.**

There are no noise impacts with regard to this phase of development.

As revisions are made to the plans, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe the changes, the date made, and by whom.

### **Environmental Review**

- 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 and as described in the Prince George's Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual.

The site contains a mixed deciduous forest, with a combination of upland hardwoods and bottomland species. Much of the bottomland areas of the site have been previously impacted by the dumping of trash, vehicles and other debris. There is an area of extremely high quality woodlands comprised of oak, hickory and beech species that is located adjacent to the power line easement on the north portion of the property. This area also contains a stream valley that intersects with the power line easement.

**Comment:** No additional information is needed with regard to the Forest Stand Delineation.

- b. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted for review.

This 121.08-acre property in the M-X-T Zone has a 15 percent woodland conservation threshold of 17.43 acres. In addition, there is a ¼:1 replacement requirement of approximately 18.78 acres due to the proposed clearing of approximately 75.13 acres of existing woodland and a 1:1 replacement requirement of 0.78 acre due to the proposed clearing of forested floodplain. This results in a total woodland conservation requirement of 36.99 acres. The TCPH proposes to satisfy the woodland conservation requirement through the preservation of 33.40 acres on-site and 3.59 acres of on-site reforestation.

The woodland conservation threshold of 17.43 acres is being met on-site through the preservation of high quality and high priority woodlands. In addition to meeting the threshold on-site, the current design shows the provision of almost twice the threshold acreage on-site. The high-priority woodland areas are being preserved, with the exception of areas where necessary impacts are proposed for the construction of roads and utilities. The TCPH is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

The plan needs only one minor revision. The critical root zone for each specimen tree must be shown on the detail sheets of the plan.

Areas of afforestation are proposed in order to fulfill woodland conservation requirements on this site. In order to protect the afforestation areas after planting, so that they may mature into perpetual woodlands, afforestation areas shall be protected by permanent tree protection devices, such as two-rail split fences or equivalent, and all afforestation areas must be placed in conservation easements at time of final plat. Afforestation areas must also be planted prior to building permits issuance to ensure the longevity of the planted areas. The plat note for conservation easements has been revised accordingly. The following condition is needed to ensure timely installation of the afforestation.

- c. The Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter (39362-2002-00) dated August 21, 2006, was submitted with the application; however, a copy of the associated plan is required for a review for consistency with other plans. The conditions associated with the stormwater management concept approval will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources.
- d. Grading or filling of streams and nontidal wetlands requires the permission of the appropriate state and/or federal agencies.
19. **Permit Review section referral:** In a memorandum dated October 16, 2007 (Chaney to Lindsay), the Permit Review Section noted a number of issues with the plan. Some of these issues were addressed through the submittal of revised plans, while others remain outstanding and are the subject

of recommended conditions.

20. The detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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 (TCP/049/07-02) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-07048 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows:
  - a. On Sheet 1 of the DSP, list the following modifications to the approved CSP development standards:
    - i. Front garages for single-family detached dwellings shall have a minimum 20 foot setback from the back of the sidewalk.
    - ii. A minimum 15 foot rear yard shall be provided for front-loaded single-family detached dwellings.
    - iii. A minimum side yard of 3 feet shall be provided for Lots 2, 44, and 45 of Block A, and 4 feet for Lots 3, 42, and 43 of Block A.
    - iv. 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 accessed through a public alley, the deck shall be placed between the house and the garage.
  - b. Show all of the CSP development standards on Sheet 1.
  - c. Change the house on Lot 3 to a rear-loaded neo-traditional house facing towards the roundabout with vehicular access from the rear alley, or revise this house to provide a brick front and sides..
  - d. Revise the architecture of the lower visibility sides of the multifamily buildings (facing onto the PEPCO property) to indicate that all optional windows on the side elevations will be standard. All other sides shall include materials and detailing comparable in quality of design to the front façade, including making all of the optional windows on the side elevations standard.

- e. Revise the architecture of the fronts of the multifamily buildings to include arched brushed aluminum railings in the large rectangular openings to the parking garage to match the style of railings within the small openings.
  - f. Add additional landscaping in order to screen the sides of the multifamily buildings that face towards Karen Boulevard.
  - g. Add Lots 3 and 42 to the brick front tracking table on Sheet 1.
  - h. Demonstrate the required 45 percent green space for the multifamily parcel.
  - i. Demonstrate that each multifamily building collectively utilizes a minimum of 60 percent brick on its facades, exclusive of window areas.
  - j. Add a horizontal ladder and swing set to the play area, moving proposed trees as necessary to accommodate the additional equipment.
  - k. Add a trash receptacle and two grills to the picnic area.
  - l. Include details of all recreational equipment proposed.
  - m. Demonstrate full conformance to Sections 4.1, 4.3, and 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*.
  - n. Clearly indicate all sidewalks using a stippled pattern and provide dimensions for the width of sidewalks.
  - o. Provide a detail for a rolled curb to be utilized along all streets with single-family houses unless modified by DPW&T.
  - p. Revise the TCPII to show the critical root zone of each specimen tree on site.
  - q. Revise the architectural elevations of the Michener I model to provide an additional feature on the right side endwall.
2. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, a copy of the approved stormwater management concept plan shall be submitted to show compliance with the DSP. The TCPII shall be revised as necessary to be in conformance with the conditions of the approval letter. Any new impacts to the regulated areas shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision.
3. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall revise the site plan and the multifamily floor plans as necessary to demonstrate the required number of standard-sized and handicapped parking spaces for the multifamily buildings. If the required number of spaces cannot be demonstrated in this manner, the applicant shall, prior to signature approval, either receive

approval of a departure from design standards for parking space sizes, or else reduce the number of multifamily buildings so that the required amount of parking is provided.

4. The applicant shall 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.
5. The applicant shall provide standard and wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads as shown on the submitted site plan, unless modified by DPW&T.
6. The applicant shall provide ADA-compatible curb cuts and well-marked crosswalks at all intersections, unless modified by DPW&T. Curb cuts and crosswalks shall be marked and labeled on the approved detail site plan to the satisfaction of the Urban Design Section and the trails coordinator.
7. Prior to issuance of building permits for housing in this phase, the applicant shall record HOA documents which minimally ensure that all residents of the Glenwood Hills community will have equal access to all of the private recreational facilities, including but not limited to the central community facilities.
8. Prior to issuance of permits for the entrance features at the southern edge of the site, the applicant shall prepare a covenant for approval by the Department of Environmental Resources for the maintenance of the entrance features. The applicant shall demonstrate that the approved covenant has been filed with the Prince George's County Land Records Division.
9. Afforestation and associated permanent protection fencing shall be installed prior to the issuance of building permits for adjacent lots. A certification prepared by a qualified professional shall be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken.
10. 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.
11. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500<sup>th</sup> dwelling unit in Glenwood Hills, the applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to the M-NCPPC Urban Design Section 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.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Vaughns, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Vaughns, Clark, Cavitt and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 3, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 24<sup>th</sup> day of April 2008.

Oscar S. Rodriguez  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:CL:bjs