

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on July 5, 2007, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-0608 for The Preserve at Piscataway – Golf Course, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is limited to grading of the golf course and construction of parking associated with the clubhouse and the maintenance facility.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	R-L	R-L
Use(s)	Vacant	Golf course
Acreage	317.61	317.61
Lots	0	0
Parcels	4	12
Square Footage/GFA	0	0
Dwelling Units:	N/A	N/A

3. **Location:** The site is located in Planning Area 84, Council District 9, north and south of Floral Park Road near and at its intersection with Danville Road.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The golf course property is located south of new Piscataway Road and will have frontage on the road. The golf course winds around the villages within the development. The golf course will also have frontage along Danville Road.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On September 14, 1993, the County Council, sitting as District Council for the part of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, adopted CR-60-1993 approving the master plan and the sectional map amendment for Subregion V in Prince George's County. Comprehensive Design Zone Amendment Three (Zoning Applications A-9869 and A-9870), known as Villages at Piscataway, rezoned 858.7 acres in the R-A Zone to the R-L Zone (Residential-Low Development, 1.0 to 1.5 du/acre) and 19.98 acres to the L-A-C Zone (Local Activity Center—Village Center). The basic plan was approved with 39 conditions and 11 considerations. The base residential density of the R-L Zone was approved as 818 dwelling units; the maximum residential density in the R-L Zone was approved as 1,000 dwelling units.

On March 24, 1994 the Prince George's County Planning Board reviewed and approved a comprehensive design plan (CDP-9306) for the subject property known as Villages at Piscataway, as described in PGCPB Number 94-98(C). The comprehensive design plan (CDP) was

approved with 36 conditions. The CDP included the entire 878.7 acres of land zoned R-L and L-A-C to be developed as a village community with a golf course component. The CDP approved 800 single-family detached units and 200 single-family attached units in the area of the subject application.

On June 17, 2003 the Planning Board approved preliminary plan 4-03027, The Preserve, which includes the area that is the subject of this application. Variation requests for impacts to sensitive environmental features and a revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP-I/9/94-02, were included in that approval.

Specific Design Plans have been approved for all of the five villages within the development including Bailey's Village, Glassford Village, Edelen Village, Lusby Village and Danville Village.

6. **Design Features:** This site plan for infrastructure covers 317.61 acres of the site for the golf course. This site plan shows grading, tree conservation areas, proposed stormwater management, landscaping, a driving range, cart paths, a maintenance building and facilities, and the proposed location of the clubhouse and associated parking. The future architecture of the maintenance building and the clubhouse is not included in this application.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. The site plan is in general conformance with Sections 27-514.08-514.11 of the Zoning Ordinance dealing with the R-L Zone.
8. The site plan is in general conformance with the Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306 and applicable conditions of approval. The following conditions of approval for the CDP-9306 were included to be reviewed in conjunction with the golf course:

2.
  - b. **In those areas where New Piscataway Road is adjacent to the golf course, the full width of the required 50-foot golf course buffer shall be shown and full details shall be provided for landscape treatment of the buffer.**

Comment: This buffer is shown on the plans and was also approved as part of the required Specific Design Plan for Piscataway Road, SDP 9806.

- c. **When the Specific Design Plan for the golf course is submitted, the required 50-foot buffer shall also be shown along Danville Road and Floral Park Road, and shall be treated as described above for New Piscataway Road.**

Comment: Parts of the 50 feet located adjacent to the right-of-way of Floral Park Road and Danville road are encumbered with wetlands and tree conservation. However, the plans should be revised to indicate the 50-foot-wide buffer along each of the right-of-ways and provide for plant materials where none exists.

**d. The Specific Design Plan for the golf course shall also include information on the exact provisions of the plan which shall grant to each purchaser of a home and all future purchasers in the Villages at Piscataway some preferential membership terms at the golf course. This plan shall include one or more of the following or items similar to the following:**

- (1) Discount on initiation fees**
- (2) Discount on green fees**
- (3) Preferential right to become member**
- (4) Preferential starting times**
- (5) Discount on yearly membership**
- (6) Discount on lockers and/or other services**

**The plan shall be set forth in recorded covenants that run with the land and are noted on all record plats for the Villages at Piscataway.**

Comment: The condition above was addressed at the time of the first specific design plan for the overall property. It appeared that the original condition of the CDP as stated above may have assumed that the SDP for the golf course would be the first SDP filed for the project. However, that did not occur, as nearly all of the residential lots for the project have been recorded with a reference to the establishment of certain preferential rights of homeowners in the Preserve to become members of the golf course to be built on the property and that such homeowners may have certain preferential rights to starting times.

**e. The Specific Design Plan for the golf course shall show the location of proposed streets and of all residential lots (as approved on the Comprehensive Design Plan) which are located adjacent to or in close proximity to the golf course. The Specific Design Plan shall show overlaid on the golf course and adjacent streets and lots a graphic study, prepared by a certified golf course architect, of the most likely direction and distance of the errant golf shots expected from all tee locations of all holes except Numbers 12, 13 and 14, and from all other locations on these holes from which errant shots may be expected.**

**If, in the judgment of the Planning Board, the layout of the golf course presents too great a hazard to residents or their property, the golf course layout shall be revised or, if this is not possible, the affected areas of residential lots shall be prohibited for residential use and shall become homeowners' open space or part of the golf course.**

Comment: The proposed layout of the golf course has changed since the layout was shown on the comprehensive design plan, due to the relocation of the new Piscataway Road. However, the plan that has been submitted includes an errant shot study. The golf course architect, Bill Love, W.R. Love, Inc., explained verbally to the staff that the golf course has

been designed to take into consideration the existing and proposed features of the site, including typography, woodland, prevailing winds and other factors. The staff has reviewed the layout and believes some adjustments to the golf course layout may need to be made and/or additional landscaping provided in specific areas on the proposed golf course in an attempt to reduce the likelihood of errant shots landing on private homeowners' property and from adjoining roadways (or hitting moving vehicles). The staff reviewed the plans for buffering between the golf course and the adjacent roadways and the adjacent residences, and found that the following areas are of concern:

Hole	Errant Ball Limit	
3	Approximately 30-feet from New Piscataway Road	
4	Approximately 20-feet from Lot 13, Block A	
	Approximately 15-feet from Lot 1, Block A	
6	Approximately 20-feet from the maintenance building	
	Approximately 26-feet from Danville Road	
7	Approximately 20-feet from St. Mary's View Road	
	Approximately 6-feet from Danville Road	
	Encroaching 1-foot into Lot 1, Block C	
8	Within 50-feet of	Lots 3-6 & 9-14, Block E
		Lots 2-5 & 8-9, Block B
	Encroaching approximately	1-foot into Lots 6 & 7, Block B
		23-feet into Lot 20, Block D
		25-feet into Lot 21, Block D
		17-feet into Lot 22, Block D
9	Approximately 6-feet from Lot 6, Block A	
	Approximately 45-feet from Medinah Ridge Road	
10	Within 50-feet of Lots 4-7, Block J	
15	Approximately 5-feet from Lots 7, 8 & 10, Block C	
	Within 50-feet of Lots 6-10, Block C	
16	Approximately 20-feet from Medinah Ridge Road	
	Approximately 30-feet from Lot 1, Block C Glassford Village	
17	Approximately 10-feet from Lot 4, Block A	
	Within 50-feet of Lots 2-5, Block A	
	Approximately 25-feet from New Piscataway Road	
18	Within 50-feet of Lots 8 & 9, Block H	
	Encroaching approximately 5-feet into Lots 6-8, Block P	
	Within 50-feet of Lots 4 & 5, Block P	
	Approximately 5-feet from drive aisle of parking lot for tennis facility	

Staff recommends that the plans be revised prior to signature approval to address the 50-foot-wide buffers along the roadways of Piscataway Road, Floral Park Road, and Danville Road. In addition, the plan should be adjusted to provide the equivalent of a

“B” bufferyard, as required by the *Landscape Manual*, where an errant ball limit falls within 20 feet of the property line of any residential lot. The additional landscaping shall be provided on the golf course.

- f. The specific design plan for the golf course shall set forth the detailed design of the proposed surface and groundwater monitoring program for the golf course, all measures proposed to reduce the transport of nutrients and pesticides into the watershed, exact operational details of the integrated pest management system, and proposed measures for incorporating wildlife habitat enhancement into the golf course design.**

Staff comment: The required information regarding the proposed surface and groundwater monitoring was not included in the application. A wildlife management plan for the entire Preserve at Piscataway project was submitted and approved with the first SDP for the Villages of Piscataway. The plan includes the preservation of wooded stream corridors; retention of woodland communities that have a low “area to edge” ratio; and best management practices for stormwater management to provide for water quality control and avoid excessive water quantity flows. The plan includes details such as the placement of bluebird boxes throughout the golf course and the installation of wood duck nest boxes at stormwater management ponds.

The Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) is responsible for regulating the sale, use, storage and disposal of pesticides and for enforcing the Maryland Pesticide Applicators Law. MDA is responsible for establishing guidelines and requirements for the application of pesticides, the certification of pesticide applicators, and the licensing of businesses to ensure that pesticides are applied properly by competent individuals. A private firm or corporation (e.g., golf course or country club, grain elevator, manufacturing or processing plant, apartment complex, etc.) whose employees apply restricted-use pesticides on the employer's property is required to maintain a pesticide business license and pest control applicator certificate.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the SDP, the applicant shall submit a plan that sets forth the detailed design of the proposed surface and groundwater monitoring program for the golf course, all measures proposed to reduce the transport of nutrients and pesticides into the watershed, and exact operational details of the integrated pest management system. The integrated pest management plan (IPM) portion shall be approved by the Maryland Department of Agriculture. The IPM shall include protocols on how nutrients, pests and toxins will be managed on a routine basis as part of the overall maintenance and upkeep of the golf course and lake.

- g. The specific design plan for the golf course shall illustrate the entire network of golf cart paths and demonstrate that they are completely separate from all other proposed trails.**

Comment: After review of the submitted SDP, staff has concluded that there are no conflicts between the golf cart paths and the internal trail network. The golf cart paths are entirely separate from the master plan trails and bikeways and are largely buffered from the other walkways and recreation facilities on the site. There is a short segment (130 linear feet) of walkway adjacent to the tennis courts that appear to serve as both a connection to the tennis courts and as a golf cart path connection to the club house. However, this is in a more intensely developed portion of the golf course/open space that also includes tennis courts, parking lots, and the club house. One of the primary intents of condition g. was to ensure that pedestrians are not placed in areas conflicting with the golf course or in areas subject to errant balls. Along the trails in the vicinity of the tennis courts, pedestrians will not interfere with the golf course. The facilities and trails in the area are removed from the actual golf course, and the trails serve as connections to the club house and adjacent recreational facilities. Staff concludes that the golf course path network as proposed on SDP-0608 is in conformance with the spirit and intent of this condition. No modifications are necessary to the proposed golf cart paths.

9. The site plan is in general conformance to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. In a memorandum dated May 1, 2007 the Environmental Planning Section indicated that the site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and provides a recommendation of approval with conditions as stated below.
10. The detailed site plan is not technically subject to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*, as all Comprehensive Design Zones are exempt. However, the relationship of the golf course to the adjacent residential development is critical. On the one hand, the lots that back onto the golf course usually sell for a premium compared to those without lot frontage on the golf course due to the views and open space component. On the other hand, buffering for some degree of privacy and protection of the rear yards from errant golf shots is also important. In conventional zones the *Landscape Manual* would require a minimum 20-foot landscaped yard where a golf course is adjacent to single-family detached lots. At the time of reviewing the specific design plans for the residential areas adjacent to the golf course, staff reviewed the relationship of the lots to the preliminary layout of the golf course. Additional landscaping was added to the lots where it was thought that the design of the golf course could negatively impact the lots by errant shots. However, since this plan represents the final design of the golf course, where specific grading and contouring of the land and preservation of existing trees are shown on the golf course property for the first time, the staff believes that certain areas should be further buffered from the golf course, particularly those areas that indicate lots are within close proximity to the arc of the errant ball limit.

In addition, the relationship of the golf course to existing and proposed roadways is also a concern. Landscaping could be used in these areas to shield the roadways from errant shot balls. Prior to signature approval of the plans, they should be revised to show adequate buffers along the roadways, existing and proposed, as well as along the lots subject to possible errant ball shots.

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

- a. In a memorandum dated April 20, 2007 the Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

The overall project area is specifically recognized in the 1993 *Subregion V Master Plan* as appropriate for comprehensively designed, planned recreational community development. SDP-0608 is for the development of the golf course that is a key component of this comprehensively planned community (The Preserve at Piscataway) and pertains to approximately 317 acres of this 879 acre development.

The 1993 Subregion V SMA approved a Comprehensive Design Zone Basic Plan that classified the property in the R-L (A-9869) and L-A-C (A-9870) Comprehensive Design Zones. The development concept was for a planned recreational community designed around a golf course and other facilities. The Basic Plan and a subsequently approved Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-9306) addressed all master plan issues regarding this development project. The subject application, SDP-0608, for development of the golf course, should be evaluated for consistency with the previously approved plans. There are no additional master plan or General Plan issues related to this SDP application.

- b. Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated April 20, 2007, Masog to Lareuse, stated that the Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the Specific Design Plan (SDP) application referenced above. The entire subject property consists of approximately 879 acres of land, with 859 acres in the R-L Zone and 20 acres in the L-A-C Zone. The property is located along proposed Piscataway Road extended, immediately to the east of the historic Piscataway village and south of Floral Park Road.

The subject application covers approximately 317.61 acres. It proposes the development of a golf course on areas of the plan. The development of this site must be in accordance with CR-60-1993, CDP-9306 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027. There are several transportation-related conditions associated with these approvals, and they are summarized below:

**CR-60-1993:**

Condition 3: The alignment of Piscataway Road extended has been coordinated with the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) during review of past plans. The property covered by this SDP is adjacent to the approved alignment for this facility and consistent with it.

Condition 11: Primary review of this condition occurred between Urban Design Review and Historic Preservation Sections, along with the highway agencies and trails staff, at the time that the previous SDPs have been reviewed.

Condition 16: This condition is discussed as a part of the CDP conditions.

Condition 17: The alignment of A-54 (also termed Piscataway Road extended) has been coordinated with the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). The alignment includes the construction of the initial two lanes through the subject property. This condition is discussed further below.

Condition 18: Appropriate dedication is shown along all facilities.

Condition 19: The various SDP's approved thus far have included the following:

SDP-9804 – 203 single family detached residences	Status: approved
SDP-0318 – 148 single family detached residences	Status: approved
SDP-0318 – 108 single family townhouse residences	Status: approved
SDP-0320 – 126 single family detached residences	Status: approved
SDP-0401 – 214 single family detached residences	Status: approved
SDP-0401 – 51 single family townhouse residences	Status: approved

**The level of development that has been approved or is pending approval – 691 detached and 159 attached residences – is well within the trip cap that is identified in this condition.**

Consideration 2: The alignment of Piscataway Road extended has been coordinated with the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). The alignment is acceptable to the transportation staff; however, the transportation staff would defer to other Divisions, along with the SHA and DPW&T, for any final comments regarding impacts on the historic setting and their impact on the design of the roadway.

**CDP-9306:**

Condition 20: This condition provides transportation improvements that must be constructed during the initial phase of the project. While the actual construction is enforceable at the time of building permit, there are traffic signal warrant studies that are required to be submitted prior to SDP approval. All traffic signal warrant studies were submitted when the original SDP-9804 was approved, and they were reviewed by the appropriate agencies at that time.

Condition 21: This condition provides transportation improvements for a later phase of the project. The subject application is within the initial phase.

Condition 22: All master plan transportation facilities within the area of the subject SDP are proposed to be dedicated.

Condition 23: Areas within Parcels C and D are included in the subject application. Past approved plans have included the roadways identified in 23a, 23b, and 23c, and no further



action is required of this plan.

**Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027:**

Condition 35: See Condition 20 of the CDP.

Condition 36: See Condition 21 of the CDP.

Condition 37: See Condition 21 of the CDP.

Condition 38: This condition was enforceable at the time of the initial building permit. The roadway is currently under construction.

Condition 39: See Condition 22 of the CDP.

Condition 40: See Condition 23 of the CDP.

Conditions 41 and 42: All elements of the streets described in these conditions have been reviewed and approved as a part of earlier plans, and no further action is required of this plan.

The transportation staff has no further comments on the plans submitted. In consideration of the above findings, therefore, the transportation staff finds that the subject application does indeed conform to the approved subdivision plan, the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and the approved Basic Plan from the standpoint of transportation.

The subject property is required to make roadway improvements pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 2003 and supported by a traffic studies and analyses done in 1994 and 2002. These conditions are enforceable with the submission of building permits. All required signal warrant studies required for submittal prior to SDP approval have been submitted.

**TRANSPORTATION FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS:**

To summarize, the Transportation Planning Division finds that the subject application does conform to the approved subdivision plans, the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and the approved Basic Plan from the standpoint of transportation. Furthermore, the transportation staff finds that the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed transportation facilities, or with transportation facilities to be provided as a part of the subject development.

- c. The Transportation Planning Section, in a memorandum dated June 11, 2007, stated that the *Approved Subregion V Master Plan* recommends three master plan trail facilities that impact the Preserve at Piscataway development. These have been addressed through the

previously approved Basic Plans A-9869 and A-9870, CDP-9306 and 4-03027, as well as separate specific design plan applications. The master plan trails recommended in the master plan and incorporated into subsequent approvals include:

- a trail facility along Floral Park Road
- a trail in or adjacent to the Pepco right-of-way
- a master plan bikeway along Danville Road

These and other pedestrian related issues have been addressed in previous approvals. Preliminary Plan 4-03027 requires an eight-foot-wide asphalt trail along the subject property's frontage of Floral Park Road from Piscataway Road to the entrance into Bailey Village (Condition 26). 4-03027 also requires the provision of the master plan trail parallel to the Pepco right-of-way (Condition 30). This was reflected on the approved Preliminary Plan 4-03027 as a trail parallel to the Pepco R-O-W within adjacent Parcels F and G.

Condition 31 of 4-03027 requires an eight-foot-wide asphalt master plan trail along the north side of Piscataway Road relocated east of Floral Park Road. The bikeway along Danville Road was addressed at the time of 4-03027 with the placement of Share the Road signage and the provision of wide, asphalt shoulders along the subject property's frontage. Similarly, bikeway signage was also required along several internal roads, per Conditions 28 and 29 of the preliminary plan.

Finally, in keeping with the modified grid street pattern and village concept, sidewalks were recommended along both sides of all internal roads. Condition 32 of 4-03027 requires the provision of standard sidewalks along both sides of all public roads, unless modified by DPW&T.

The majority of these recommendations are beyond the scope of the subject application. The submitted SDP is for the golf course only, which only interacts with or impacts the road and trail network where the golf cart paths intersect with the roadways. All previously approved conditions for pedestrian and trail facilities are still in effect.

#### GOLF CART CROSSINGS:

Staff's only comment regarding the subject application pertains to the golf cart crossings. The applicant has provided refuge islands at most of the locations where the golf cart paths cross internal roadways. This treatment is similar to the pedestrian refuge (or island) provided at the crosswalk treatment provided at the traffic circles. Staff supports this as a means of both traffic calming and increased pedestrian safety. Research has indicated that providing a median or other form of pedestrian refuge can be the single most effective means of improving the safety for pedestrians at most at-grade crossings. The refuge serves not only to raise the visibility or awareness of the crossing, but also to break up the streetscape, visually narrow down the travel lanes, and provide a safe and attractive place for pedestrians

to wait until there is a break in the second direction of traffic.

As noted above, the applicant has incorporated refuges into most of the golf cart path crossings. Staff supports these treatments as attractive safety enhancements to the crossings. The width of these proposed refuges or medians is 15 feet, which should be ample space for one or two carts to wait until there is an opportunity to cross the second direction of traffic safely.

The only crossing where the plans do not include this treatment is the golf cart crossing of Medinah Ridge Road (see Sheet 8). Staff recommends that a median or refuge be incorporated into this crossing as well. This refuge should be consistent with the refuges provided elsewhere in the development. This additional refuge can either be in the form of a separate island (like the other crossings), or could be incorporated as an extension of the median already shown on the plans just to the west of the crossing. Special attention should be given to the safety at this crossing as it is along one of the major roads into the development and it is located approximately 320 feet from the entrance off Piscataway Road where some motorists may not be thinking about or cognizant of the possibility of a golf cart crossing at grade.

#### TRANSPORTATION RECOMMENDATION:

1. Provide a refuge or median extension for the golf cart crossing of Medinah Ridge Road, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
  - d. In a memorandum dated May 1, 2007, the Environmental Planning Section indicated that they had reviewed the specific design plan for The Preserve at Piscataway–Golf Course, SDP-0608, and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/044/07, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on March 23, 2007. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of SDP-0608 and TCPII/044/07 subject to the condition noted at the end of this memorandum.

#### **Background**

On September 14, 1993 the County Council, sitting as District Council for the part of the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George's County, adopted CR-60-1993 approving the Master Plan and the Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V in Prince George's County. Comprehensive Design Zone Amendment Three (Zoning Applications A-9869 and A-9870) rezoned 858.7 acres in the R-A Zone to the R-L (Residential-Low Development, 1.0 to 1.5 du/acre) Zone and 19.98 acres to the L-A-C (Local Activity Center—Village Center) Zone. The rezoning was approved with 39 conditions and 11 considerations.

On March 24, 1994 the Prince George's County Planning Board reviewed and approved a Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-9306) for the subject property known as the Villages at

Piscataway as described in PGCPB No. 94-98(C). The Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) was approved with 36 conditions. The Comprehensive Design Plan included the entire 858.7+ acres of land zoned R-L and L-A-C to be developed as a golf course community. The Comprehensive Design Plan approved 202 single-family detached units and 64 single-family attached units in Glassford Villages. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94) was also approved.

On June 23, 1994 the Prince George's County Planning Board reviewed and approved a Master Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-94017), Villages at Piscataway, for the entire acreage of the site, as described in PGCPB No. 94-213. The Master Preliminary Plan of Subdivision was approved with 20 conditions. A revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94) was also approved, dated June 14, 1994.

On November 14, 1996 the Prince George's County Planning Board reviewed and approved a Detailed Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-96047) for Villages at Piscataway, Glassford Villages for approximately 74 acres of the site, as described in PGCPB No. 99-31(A)(C). The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision was approved with 15 conditions and approved 195 single-family detached units and 46 single-family attached units in Glassford Villages. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94-01), as revised by PGCPB No. 94-213, was reapproved.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027 was approved by PGCPB. No. 03-122 on June 17, 2003. Variation requests for impacts to sensitive environmental features and a revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/009/94-02, were include in that approval.

### **Site Description**

This Specific Design Plan for The Preserve at Piscataway—Golf Course containing 317.61 acres in the R-L Zone is located in Planning Area 84, primarily south of Floral Park Road and west of Danville Road. According to current air photos about 65 percent of the site is wooded. Floral Park Road, Piscataway Road and Danville Road are designated historic roads. There are no nearby noise sources. The proposed use is not expected to be a noise generator. There are streams, wetlands and floodplain associated with Piscataway Creek in the Potomac River watershed on site. No species listed by the State of Maryland as rare, threatened or endangered are known to occur on the subject property or on adjacent properties. The "Prince George's County Soils Survey" indicates that the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Galestown, Othello, and Sassafras soils series. Marlboro Clay is known to occur on the site. The site is in the Developing Tier according to the General Plan.

### **Environmental Issues Addressed in the Subregion V Master Plan.**

The Subregion V Master Plan indicates that there are substantial areas designated as natural reserve on the site. The natural reserve has been superseded by the regulated areas as designated by the *Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*.

#### ***Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan***

The design of the woodland conservation areas is in conformance with TCPI/009/94-02. Except for areas where variation requests were approved during the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027, all priority woodland areas are to be preserved. Many areas where grading and clearing of woodland of expanded stream buffers has been approved will be reforested. The overall design not only fulfills, but also exceeds, the goals of the *Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* by preserving woodland along not only the primary stream valleys but also along the secondary stream valleys.

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

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

#### **A-9869 & A-9870, CR-60-1999, September 14, 1993**

**Consideration 4. Woodland conservation of 35 percent should be a Phase II design consideration as well as the preservation of a large contiguous wooded area in the southern portion of the site.**

The approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/009/94-01, proposes woodland conservation of 276.72 acres. The above condition has been met through the provision of woodland conservation at 35.5 percent. All required woodland conservation must be met on-site. The plan proposes extensive preservation of priority woodland including preservation on large lots. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan does not allow woodland conservation areas on lots less than 20,000 square feet in area, does not allow the use of fee-in-lieu, and does not permit the use of an off-site easement. The proposed TCPII is in conformance with the approved TCPI.

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

Consideration 6. A wetlands report shall be approved by the Natural Resources Division prior to approval of the Phase II Comprehensive Design Plan.

A wetlands report was included as part of the CDP submission and was reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section.

**Comment:** Impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers are discussed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**PGCPB No. 94-98(C), File No. CDP-9306, March 31, 1994**

**Condition 9. A 100-year Floodplain Study or Studies shall be approved by the Flood Management Section of the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) for each drainage area greater than 50 acres in size. Prior to approval of each Specific Design Plan or detailed Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, whichever comes first, a floodplain study shall be approved for any floodplain that is adjacent to or affecting the area of the plan.**

**Discussion:** A floodplain study has been approved by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources. The approved 100-year floodplain is shown on the plans. No further action is required.

**Condition 10. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan shall be approved by DER prior to approval of the first Specific Design Plan or the first detailed Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, whichever comes first.**

**Discussion:** A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, CSD 8008470-1994-01, has been approved by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources. No further action is required.

**Condition 11. Prior to approval of the master Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees, shall submit a geotechnical report verifying the presence or absence of Marlboro clay in the southwest portion of the property in accordance with DER criteria. In areas where it is determined that Marlboro clay might affect structural stability, a detailed geotechnical report shall be submitted for review and verification by the Natural Resources Division prior to approval of any detailed Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.**

A soils report was submitted with 4-96047. That study indicated that Marlboro Clay occurs on the site between elevations 40 to 55. A more detailed study was submitted with SDP-9804.

**Comment:** Marlboro Clay is discussed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 13. Prior to submittal of each Specific Design Plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall field locate the specimen trees specified by the Natural Resources Division.**

**Discussion:** All specimen trees are shown on the Type II Tree Conservation Plan. This issue is addressed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 14. Prior to submission of each Specific Design Plan, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees, shall confer with the Natural Resources Division regarding appropriate wildlife management measures to be employed in the portion of the development which is the subject of that Specific Design Plan.**

A wildlife management plan for the entire Preserve at Piscataway project has been submitted. The plan includes the preservation of wooded stream corridors; retention of woodland communities that have a low "area to edge" ratio; and best management practices for stormwater management to provide for water quality control and avoid excessive water quantity flows. Although there is an extensive internal roadway system, green space areas provide for retention of most of the existing wildlife corridors.

**Comment:** No further action is required.

**PGCPB No. 94-213, File No. 4-94017, June 24, 1994**

**Condition 1. Prior to certificate approval of the Preliminary Plat, the following revisions shall be made or information supplied:**

- g. The Tree Conservation Plan (Type I) shall be revised and resubmitted to the Natural Resources Division. The revised TCP shall incorporate the following changes requested by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR):**
  - (1) Subtract the two specific areas of woodland preservation on future DPR property.**
  - (2) Adjust the calculations or substitute elsewhere on the plan for these areas.**
  - (3) Add a specific note regarding passive activities within DPR property woodland preservation areas reflecting the exact language in Condition 19 of CDP-9306.**
- h. The Forest Stand Delineation or TCP I shall be revised to:**
  - (1) Show the approximate location of all 172 specimen trees.**
  - (2) Update the specimen tree information table.**
- k. Along the southern edge of Parcel F5, the wetland boundary shall be moved to the southern property line.**

**I. The 25-foot buffers from all wetlands shall be drawn on the Preliminary Plat.**

**Discussion:** All of these changes were made. No further action is required.

**Condition 13. All specimen trees shall be field surveyed and their exact, surveyed locations shall be shown on all detailed Preliminary Plats, Specific Design Plans and Type II TCPs.**

**Discussion:** All specimen trees are shown on the Type II tree Conservation plan. This issue is addressed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 16. A soils report shall be submitted with each detailed Preliminary Plat, if determined to be necessary by the Natural Resources Division prior to submission. When required by the Natural Resources Division in areas where Marlboro Clay may affect structural stability, a detailed geotechnical report shall be submitted with the detailed Preliminary Plat, or earlier if possible, to the Natural Resources Division for review. Prior to submission of the Specific Design Plan for the golf course, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall consult with the Natural Resources Division concerning the need to submit a soils study and/or geotechnical report with the Specific Design Plan for the golf course.**

A soils report was submitted with 4-96047. That study indicated that Marlboro Clay occurs on the site between elevations 40 to 55. A more detailed study was submitted with SDP-9804.

**Comment:** Marlboro Clay is discussed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 17. On all detailed Preliminary Plats and Specific Design Plans (or on supporting documents), all slopes exceeding 15 percent shall be identified and located in order to address concerns about erodible soils.**

There are portions of the Villages of Piscataway project where extensive areas of highly erodible soils coincide with slopes exceeding 15 percent. The purpose of this condition is to ensure a careful review of grading and erosion/sediment control plans.

**Discussion:** Steep and severe slopes have been shown on the specific design plan and the Type II tree conservation plan. No further action is required.

**Condition 19. Appropriate State and Federal permits shall be obtained for disturbance to streams, wetlands and wetland buffers.**



**Comment:** Impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers are discussed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**PGCPB No. 03-122, File No. 4-03027, May 29, 2002**

**Condition 9. Prior to the issuance of permits, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.**

**Comment:** A Type II tree conservation plan is under review with this application. This issue is addressed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 18. Development of this property shall be in conformance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan.**

**Comment:** The plan shows stormwater management facilities consistent with CSD 8008470-1994-01. No further action is required.

**Condition 19. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the expanded stream buffer, excluding those areas where variation requests have been approved, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certification. The following note shall be placed on the record 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.”**

**Comment:** This condition remains in effect.

**Condition 20. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

The applicant has obtained wetlands permits CENAB-OP-RMS (Villages at Piscataway) 95-63445-7 from the US Army Corps of Engineers and 95-NT-0129/199563445 from the Maryland Department of the Environment.

**Comment:** Impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers are discussed in more detail in the Environmental Review section below.

**Condition 21.** At the time of review of the specific design plan for the portion of the site containing Bailey Village, a geotechnical report focusing on Marlboro Clay, including soil borings, boring logs, a plan showing borehole locations, an evaluation of potential problems, and recommendations for mitigating potential problems, shall be submitted.

**Comment:** Bailey Village is not part of this SDP application.

**Condition 22.** 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/9/94-02), 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:** This condition remains in effect.

**Condition 23.** Prior to signature approval of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/9/94-02, shall be revised to:

- a. revise the specimen tree table to indicate which trees cannot be currently located and the proposed disposition of each tree that can be located.
- b. show all existing specimen trees on the plan.
- c. ensure that the limit of disturbance coincides with the approved variation requests.
- d. recalculate the worksheet.
- e. have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

**Discussion:** All of these changes were made. No further action is required.

### **Environmental Review**

This site contains natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. These areas contain the expanded stream buffers, wetlands and wetlands buffers. The Specific Design Plan and Type II Tree Conservation Plan show streams on the site, the required minimum 50-foot stream buffers, wetlands, the required 25-

foot wetland buffers, a 100-year floodplain, all slopes exceeding 25 percent, all slopes between 15 and 25 percent, and the expanded stream buffers.

The SDP proposes impacts to stream buffers and wetland buffers. Impacts to these buffers are prohibited by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the Planning Board grants a variation to the Subdivision Regulations in accordance with Section 24-113. All of the impacts proposed on SDP-0608 were granted variations by the Planning Board during the review and approval of Preliminary Plan 4-03027.

**Comment:** No further action regarding sensitive environmental features is required in regard to this SDP review.

1. This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the entire site is more than 40,000 square feet in size and has more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required.

A forest stand delineation was reviewed with CDP-9306. A revised forest stand delineation was reviewed with 4-94017. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94) was approved with CDP-9306. A revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94-01) was approved with 4-94017. A revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/009/94-02) was approved with 4-03027. The Type I tree conservation plan provides for all woodland conservation requirements to be met on-site and does not allow woodland conservation areas on lots less than 20,000 square feet in area, the use of fee-in-lieu, or the use of an off-site easement.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/044/07) was submitted with this application. This TCPII includes 317.61 acres of the entire 793.2-acre project. This portion contains 196.69 acres of upland woodland and 16.75 acres of floodplain woodland. The plan proposes clearing 80.75 acres of upland woodland and clearing of 0.65 acres of floodplain woodland.

The phased worksheet for the Preserve at Piscataway shows the overall woodland conservation for the project. The golf course is the eighth and final phase of the overall development. The project will preserve 229.40 acres of upland woodland; plant 24.74 acres of woodland on-site for a total of 254.14 acres. An additional 9.94 acres will be preserved onsite but not as part of any requirement. The proposed on-site woodland conservation is 36.9 percent of the net tract and the overall project remains in compliance with Consideration 4 of A-9869 and A-9870, CR-60-1999, September 14, 1993. Additionally the plan provides for the preservation of a large contiguous wooded area in the southern portion of the site.

The design of the woodland conservation areas is in complete conformance with TCPI/009/94-02. Except for areas where variation requests were approved during the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03027, all priority woodland areas are to be preserved. Many areas where grading and clearing of woodland of expanded stream buffers

has been approved will be reforested. The overall design not only fulfills, but also exceeds, the goals of the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan by preserving woodland along, not only the primary stream valleys, but also along the secondary stream valleys.

There are some technical errors that need to be corrected. The symbol used to illustrate the expanded stream buffers should be in a heavier line weight to make it easier to read. The plan should have a cover sheet that illustrates the area of each previously approved Specific Design Plan and their companion Type II tree conservation plans. Standard TCP approval blocks are not on every sheet.

**Recommended Action:** The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of TCPII/044/07 subject to the following condition:

- a. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the Type II TCP shall be revised to:
  - i. Use a bolder symbol to illustrate expanded stream buffers on the plan and in the legend.
  - ii. Add a cover sheet that illustrates the area of each previously approved specific design plan and their companion Type II tree conservation plans.
  - iii. Provide standard approval TCPII approval blocks on each sheet.
  - iv. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
2. Marlboro Clay is known to occur on the site. A soils report was submitted with 4-96047. That study indicated that Marlboro Clay occurs on the site between elevations 40 to 55. A more detailed study was submitted with SDP-9804. Because of the elevation of the clay and local topography, slope failure is not an issue.

**Comment:** No further action regarding Marlboro clay is required with regard to the review of this SDP.
3. Floral Park Road, Piscataway Road and Danville Road are designated historic roads. Proposed applications on or adjacent to scenic and historic roads are reviewed for conformance with “Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads” prepared by the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation.

The approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan shows a band of woodland conservation averaging 100 feet-wide along Danville Road in this portion of the overall project and the Type II tree conservation plan shows the same area of woodland conservation. The approved Type I tree conservation plan shows preservation of the wetlands and wooded floodplain

along the portion of Floral Park Road and the Type II tree conservation plan shows the same area of woodland conservation.

**Comment:** No further action regarding scenic and historic roads is required with regard to the review of this SDP.

4. The “Prince George’s County Soils Survey” indicates that the principal soils on the site are in the Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Elkton, Galestown, Othello, and Sassafras soils series. Condition 17 of PGCPB No. 94-213, File No. 4-94017, dated June 24, 1994, was specifically included to require future review of areas where highly erodible soils occur on slopes in excess of 15 percent. Aura, Beltsville, Elkton, and Othello soils are highly erodible.

**Discussion:** This information is provided for the applicant’s benefit. No further action is needed as it relates to this Specific Design Plan review. A soils report may be required by Prince George’s County during the permit process review.

6. **A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, CSD #8008470-1994-01, has been approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources. The current plans show stormwater management facilities that are consistent with that approval.**

**Comment:** No further action regarding the stormwater management is required with regard to this Specific Design Plan review.

- e. Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section, in a memorandum dated April 11, 2007, Berger to Lareuse, indicated that the subject specific design plan application to construct a golf course at the Preserve at Piscataway is adjacent to two designated historic sites, Edelen House (Historic Site Number 84-023-06), 2401 Floral Park Road, and St. James Hill (Number 84-001), 14200 Livingston Road near the historic village of Piscataway. The Edelen House is included within The Preserve at Piscataway development and St. James Hill is adjacent to the development to the southwest. The Edelen House is subject to a number of conditions of approval associated with other development applications for The Preserve at Piscataway that have been met or are outside the scope of the subject specific design plan application.

An application to construct a golf course adjacent to a historic site would normally require the provision of a D bufferyard (40-foot landscape strip and an additional 10-foot building restriction line) according to the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*. Because of the open character of the golf course in this vicinity (Hole 16), this portion of the golf course is similar to the open farmland that formerly characterized the property adjacent to St. James Hill. Therefore, it is more important to screen the view from St. James Hill of the nearby houses within The Preserve at Piscataway, rather than screen the view of the intervening golf course. For this reason, staff suggests that SDP-0608 include an equivalency of a B

bufferyard (20-foot landscape strip and a 10-foot building restriction line) adjacent to the rear property lines of the houses within the Glassford Village South section of The Preserve at Piscataway that are visible from the St. James Hill Historic Site (lots 1-9, Block C). The bufferyard should include a naturalized mix of deciduous and evergreen plantings that provides for significant year-round screening of the rear yards and rear elevations of the houses on (lots 1-9, Block C).

- f. In another memorandum from the Historic Preservation and Public Facility Planning Section, also dated April 11, 2007, Stabler to Lareuse, that office indicated that a Phase I archeological survey was conducted on The Preserve of Piscataway property in 1996 and 1997 when Bailey's Associates, L.P. applied for a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The issuance of the Section 404 permit constituted an undertaking pursuant to the provisions of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, which requires that the federal agency take into account the effects on cultural resources. Fifty-four archeological sites were identified in the Phase I survey. Phase II investigations were conducted on fourteen of these sites. Of the fourteen, eight sites were determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

In May 2001 a Memorandum of Agreement was signed by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Bailey's Associates, L.P. pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6 (a) and 33 CFR Part 325, Appendix C. In Part I.(b) Avoidance and Protection of Historic Properties, it states: "In the event that the redesigned undertaking will have an adverse effect on archeological sites 18PR470b, 18PR476, 18PR478, 18PR482, 18PR496, 18PR521, and 18PR531, and prior to construction activity of any kind within any portion of any of these archeological sites, Bailey's Associates, LP shall submit a data recovery plan meeting the requirements listed in Appendix B of this MOA." The data recovery plan submitted by URS Group, Inc. stated that "As a result of the proposed engineering plans, Bailey's Associates, L.C. will avoid and protect four of the sites." The data recovery plan only covered the four sites that would be affected at that time, 18PR476, 18PR478, 18PR482, and 18PR496.

Two of the sites listed in the memorandum of agreement as eligible for the National Register, 18PR470b and 18PR521, lie within the golf course plan, SDP-0608. These sites have not been mitigated by Phase III archeological investigations.

The Historic Preservation office was informed by one of the developer's representatives that it was agreed that sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 would be buried with fill, thereby preserving them in place. However, the Historic Preservation section has no written documentation that this was the agreed upon method of mitigation for sites 18PR470b and 18PR521.

According to the Prince George's County Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review*, "Preservation in place is generally preferable for archeological sites with high

interpretive value, and is encouraged by the Prince George's County Planning Board. The objective of preservation in place treatment is to safeguard the resource for future research, interpretation, and appreciation."

**Archeology Recommendations:**

The applicant should contact the Army Corps of Engineers, Baltimore District, and advise the Corps of their construction plans. If the Army Corps of Engineers determines that sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 fall within the area of potential effects, the Corps will become the lead agency on any archeological mitigation of these sites.

- a. If sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 are to be preserved in place, golf course plans shall be altered to avoid the site completely. If the sites cannot be avoided, a plan for burying the sites with fill to protect them from construction activities shall be provided by the applicant.
- b. Prior to any ground disturbance or the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall meet with the Army Corps of Engineers' archeologist and the Prince George's County Planning Department's archeologist to coordinate a plan for preserving the sites in place. All parties shall discuss the impact to the site of any heavy machinery to be used in this operation and devise methods to minimize those impacts. An archeologist shall be present at any preconstruction meetings for the golf course.
- c. If sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 cannot be avoided or preserved in place by filling, a Phase III research design shall be presented to the Army Corps of Engineers and to the Prince George's County Planning Department. Phase III data recovery investigations may not begin until the Army Corps of Engineers and Historic Preservation staff have given written approval of the research design. The Phase III (treatment/data recovery) final report must be reviewed and be determined to have complied with the Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review* prior to approval of any ground disturbing activities or the approval of any grading permits.

12. As required by Section 27-528(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Specific Design plan satisfies the site design guidelines as contained in Section 27-274, prevents off-site property damage, and prevents environmental degradation to safeguard the public's health, safety, welfare, and economic well-being for grading, reforestation, woodland conservation, drainage, erosion, and pollution discharge.

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/044/07), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-0608 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a specific design plan revision shall be submitted, which contains the final architectural elevations for the golf course club house, and maintenance

building, to be reviewed by the Planning Board.

2. The plans shall be reviewed and signed by a golf course designer who is a member of the American Society of Golf Course Architects.
3. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the Type II TCP shall be revised to:
  - a. Use a bolder symbol to illustrate expanded stream buffers on the plan and in the legend.
  - b. Add a cover sheet that illustrates the area of each previously approved specific design plan and their companion Type II tree conservation plans.
  - c. Provide standard approval TCP II approval blocks on each sheet.
  - d. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
4. Prior to certification of the plans the following revisions shall be made:
  - a. Provide a refuge or median extension for the golf cart crossing at Medinah Ridge Road, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
  - b. The plans shall be revised to provide a minimum 50-foot wide landscaped buffer along Piscataway Road, Danville Road, and Floral Park Road (25-foot buffer and six-foot “sight-tight” fence adjacent to the Maintenance Building along Floral Park Road) adjacent to the golf course where woodland does not exist.
  - c. The plans shall be revised to provide a minimum 20-foot-wide landscaped area on the golf course property along any lot line where the errant ball limit is located within 20 feet of the property line where woodland does not exist.
  - d. The plans shall be revised to provide the equivalent of a “B” bufferyard adjacent to the rear property lines of Lots 1–9, Block C of Glassford Village.
5. If, within 3 years after the golf course is completed and in use and the adjacent residential areas are completed and occupied, it becomes apparent that errant golf balls are creating an unexpected hazard to persons or property off the golf course by repeatedly leaving the golf course property, the developer and/or golf course operator shall be required to consider options, sufficient to prevent the travel of golf balls beyond the lot lines of the site on which the golf hole is located. The options, which shall be reviewed by a qualified Golf Course Architect, shall be considered in the order noted below:
  - a. Increase landscaping to provide additional buffers in problem areas;



- b. Modify the features of that golf hole as deemed appropriate and consistent with the golf hole;
  - c. Retrofit the golf course with landscape screens or nets, as determined by the Developer/Golf Course Operator and the Planning Director and in heights and locations specified by the Developer/Golf Course Operator and the Planning Director. Such screens or nets shall be continuously maintained so as not to fall into disrepair.
- 6. Prior to signature approval of the plans, one of the following determinations shall be made:
  - a. If sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 are to be preserved in place, golf course plans shall be altered to avoid the site completely, or;
  - b. If the sites cannot be avoided, a plan for burying the sites with fill to protect them from construction activities shall be provided by the applicant and shall be reviewed by the Historic Preservation and Planning Section.
- 7. Prior to any ground disturbance or the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall meet with the Army Corps of Engineers archeologist and the Prince George's County Planning Department archeologist to coordinate a plan for burying the sites with fill to protect them from construction activities. All parties shall discuss the impact to the site of any heavy machinery to be used in this operation and devise methods to minimize those impacts. An archeologist shall be present at any pre-construction meetings with the Department of Environmental Resources for the golf course.
- 8. If sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 cannot be avoided or preserved in place by filling [as stated in 6(a) and (b) above], a Phase III research design shall be presented to the Army Corps of Engineers and to the Prince George's County Planning Department. Phase III data recovery investigations may not begin until the Army Corps of Engineers and Historic Preservation staff have given written approval of the research design. The Phase III (treatment/data recovery) final report must be reviewed and be determined to have complied with the Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review* prior to approval of any ground disturbing activities or the approval of any grading permits.
- 9. Prior to certification of the SDP, the applicant shall submit a plan that sets forth the detailed design of the proposed surface and groundwater monitoring program for the golf course, all measures proposed to reduce the transport of nutrients and pesticides into the watershed, and exact operational details of the integrated pest management system. The integrated pest management plan (IPM) portion shall be developed by a qualified environmental consultant or certified golf course superintendent based on the applicable regional climatic conditions, specific site conditions, operational and maintenance requirements of the golf course and consistent with the guidelines established by the Golf Course Superintendents Association of America and the Maryland Department of Agriculture, if applicable. The IPM shall include information on how nutrients and pesticides will be managed as part of the overall maintenance and upkeep of the golf course and lake.

10. A note shall be placed on the Final Plat that Archeological Sites 18PR470b and 18PR521 are located beneath the surface of fill material on this property and shall not be disturbed except with written approval of the Prince George's County Planning Board or designee and any other legal entity with jurisdiction over these sites.
11. Prior to approval of any ground disturbance within 50 feet of the area of 18PR470b and 18PR521, the applicant shall deliver all artifacts and appropriate associated documentation to the Maryland State Archeological Conservation Laboratory, and shall provide documentation of the State's acceptance of the materials to the M-NCPPC Planning Department's archeologist, unless such delivery is in conflict with any directive of the Memorandum of Agreement between the Army Corps of Engineers, the Maryland State Historic Preservation Office, and the applicant.

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, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 5, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 19th day of July 2007.

R. Bruce Crawford  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

RBC:FJG:SL:bjs