

## R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on March 8, 2001, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-00041 for Landover Mews Townhomes, the Planning Board finds:

1. Location - The subject property is located on the west side of Coopers Lane, approximately 200 feet south of the intersection of Coopers Lane and Annapolis Road (MD 450). The site is bounded to the north by occupied commercial/retail properties (zoned C-S-C); to the south by an occupied subdivision of detached single-family residential properties, Landover Knolls, (zoned R-55); to the east by vacant property and an occupied subdivision of townhouses, Oaklyn, (zoned R-RT); and to the west of, and adjacent to, the site is the Coopers Lane right-of-way.
2. The Proposed Development - The purpose of the subject application is for the approval of one hundred sixty-eight (168) townhouse units on the site. The site consists of 29.2 acres in the R-T Zone. The plan includes site, landscape, and tree conservation plans, and architecture. The proposed subdivision will have a single vehicular access point from the existing Coopers Lane right-of-way, via proposed road A.
3. Background - The Bladensburg-New Carrollton and Vicinity Master Plan (1994) recommends Low Suburban density development for the subject property. The Bladensburg-New Carrollton and Vicinity Sectional Map Amendment (1994) rezoned the property to the R-T Zone. The following comment was provided in a memorandum (Fisher to Jordan), from the Community Planning Division, dated January 2, 2001:  
  
■The master plan recommends there be a density of no more than 7 dus/acre. Subsequently, a subdivision application (4-97060) was approved that allows for 6 dus/acre.●  
  
No master plan issues are raised by the proposed development application.
4. The Approved Preliminary Plat - Preliminary Plat 4-97060 for the subject property was approved by the Planning Board on January 8, 1998. The overall lotting pattern, circulation pattern and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plat 4-97060. The approved Preliminary Plat included 17 conditions of approval. Four of these conditions required specific action be taken or additional information be supplied at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Below are the specific conditions warranting discussion pertaining to conformance to the approved Preliminary Plat:

1. Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan #978007170.

Comment: See Finding No. 8.

2. **If required by the Department of Environmental Resources, prior to Detailed Site Plan approval, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall submit a floodplain study to the Department of Environmental Resources, Watershed Protection Branch for review and approval.**

Comment: The applicant has satisfied the said condition, and submitted all required information to the Department of Environmental Resources/Watershed Protection Branch. The submitted information determined that no area of 100 year floodplain exists on the subject property.

5. **At time of Detailed Site Plan, the plan shall respect the expanded stream buffer as a non-disturbance area, except in areas of approved variation requests.**

Comment: See Finding No. 8.

7. **A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved by the Planning Board at the time of Detailed Site Plan.**

Comment: See Finding No. 8.

16. **The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the DRD for adequacy and proper siting, at the time of Detailed Site Plan (DSP). The amount of facilities in this area shall meet the minimum amount, as prescribed by the Guidelines.**

Comment: The proposed plans provide the general location of the private recreational facilities, but do not provide any specifics with respect to types and location of equipment, dimensions, materials, etc. The submitted plans do not satisfy the said condition, and do not provide the necessary information for staff analysis. Therefore, it is recommended that the applicant indicate on the site plans the proposed location of all equipment with the required fall-zones for each. Furthermore, the applicant shall provide specifications, model numbers, manufacturer, and details for all proposed recreational equipment.

5. The following is the development data for the site:

Zone	R-T
Gross Site Area	29.2 acres

Dwelling Units permitted (6 du./ac.)	175 units
Dwelling Units proposed (6 du./ac.)	168 units
Parking Required (2.04 spaces/du)	343 spaces
Parking Provided	371 spaces

6. Conformance to the Requirements of Sections 27-433 and 27-274(a)(11) for Development in R-T Zones (Townhouses) - In general, the Detailed Site Plan meets the requirements of Sections 27-433 and 27-274 for development in the R-T Zone.

Section 27-433(d) provides specific requirements for the exterior appearance of the structures within a development. The following are stated requirements and analysis with respect to the proposed development:

- (2) There shall be not more than six (6) nor less than three (3) dwelling units in any horizontal, continuous, attached group, except where the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, determines that more than six (6) dwelling units (but not more than eight (8) dwelling units) or that one-family semidetached dwelling would create a more attractive living environment, would be more environmentally sensitive, or would otherwise achieve the purposes of this Division. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than six (6) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width.

Comment: The proposed development provides for dwelling units to be attached in groups of four (4), five (5), and/or six (6), units per any horizontal, continuous stick. None of the proposed building groups contain more than six (6) dwelling units.

- (3) The minimum width of dwellings in any continuous, attached group shall be at least twenty (20) feet. Attached groups containing units all the same width and design should be avoided, and within each attached group attention should be given to the use of wider end units.

Comment: The proposed architecture does not provide horizontal dimensions across the individual unit types, nor the collective sticks. All of the proposed dwellings, when scaled, appear to meet the minimum width of 20 feet, but scaling a reproduction of an original drawing cannot be accepted as an accurate method for determining exact measurements for any element on

a plan. Therefore, it is recommended that horizontal dimensions be placed on the architectural elevations of each individual unit type. Furthermore, a note shall be placed on the plan that states that the minimum width of all proposed house types is twenty (20) feet.

The subject application provides for three building types, level entry, mid-level, and entry garage, for each unit, Fairfield, and the Fairmont. Both the Fairfield and the Fairmont have six (6) different models, A-F, for each building type. Therefore, there are a total of eighteen (18) models for each unit, and as depicted on the architectural elevations for each continuous, attached group of dwellings (4, 5, and 6 units), no two like models will appear in any one stick.

Although it appears that all of the proposed dwellings will be 20 feet in width, the proposed variety in building types and models will provide a comprehensive mix of units/sticks that will range in vertical height and exterior fenestration to the extent that the proposed units will offer a development which would be equal to, or better, than that provided with wider end units.

- (4) The minimum gross living space, which shall include all interior living space except garage and unfinished basement or attic area, shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet.

Comment: The applicant has provided statements of finished square footage minimums for both units, Fairfield (1,250 sq. ft.), and Fairmont (1,320 sq. ft.). These stated minimums are for the gross living space, thus both units meet the said requirement.

- (5) Side and rear walls shall be articulated with windows, recesses, chimneys, or other architectural treatments. All endwalls shall have a minimum of two (2) architectural features. Buildings on lots where endwalls are prominent (such as corner lots, lots visible from public spaces, streets, or because of topography or road curvature) shall

have additional endwall treatments consisting of architectural features in a balanced composition, or natural features which shall include brick, stone, or stucco.

Comment: The architectural elevations for the proposed models provide for a mix of architectural treatments which include windows, chimneys, and recesses, as required. All proposed endwall elevations provide the minimum two (2) architectural treatments, which are typically windows, but generally not more. There are a number of lots on which the endwalls are prominent, and will be visible from public spaces and, streets. Few of these lots can be designated as corner lots because of the plans curvilinear layout; nonetheless their visibility in potentially high traffic areas is a concern. The proposed architecture does not meet the subject requirement with respect to the provision of additional endwall treatments consisting of architectural or natural features in a balanced composition which include brick, stone, or stucco. Therefore, it is recommended that Lots 5, 16, 17, 22, 23, 40, 41, 52, 88, 89, 129, 130, 140, 141, 145, 146, 162, 163, and 168, provide a minimum of four (4) endwall architectural features in a balanced composition, or two (2) architectural features with the exterior endwall finished in brick, stone, or stucco.

- (6) **Above-grade foundation walls shall either be clad with finish materials compatible with the primary facade design, or shall be textured or formed to simulate a clad finish material such as brick, decorative block, or stucco. Exposed foundation walls of unclad or unfinished concrete are prohibited.**

Comment: Although the proposed elevations provide for the exterior finish materials to run to grade, the elevations are provided on level grade, and therefore do not give a clear indication of above-grade foundation walls with respect to lots located on slopes which necessitate a significant portion of the foundation walls to be exposed. Depending upon the slope and house type, if there is a walk-out basement at the rear, the foundation wall could be above-grade on three sides. The proposed elevations give no indication of how exposed foundation walls will be treated. It is recommended that a note be added to the architectural elevations that above-grade foundation walls shall either be clad with finish materials compatible with the primary facade design, or shall be textured or formed to simulate a clad-finished material such as brick, decorative block or stucco.

- (7) **A minimum of sixty percent (60%) of all townhouse units in a development shall have a full front facade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim and doors) of brick, stone, or stucco. Each building shall be deemed to have only one front.**

Comment: The proposed elevations indicate brick as an optional exterior finish material for a number of units. It is recommended that a minimum of 60 percent, or 101, of all townhouse units in the development should have a full front facade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim and doors) of brick, stone, or stucco.

Section 27-274(a)(11) provides specific requirements for site design with respect to townhouse development proposals. The following are the stated requirements and analysis with respect to the proposed development:

- (1) Open space areas, particularly areas separating the rears of buildings containing townhouses should retain, to the extent possible, single or small groups of trees. In areas where trees are not proposed to be retained, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council, as applicable, that specific site conditions warrant the clearing of the area. Preservation of individual trees should take into account the viability of the trees after the development of the site.

Comment: A significant portion of the proposed lots back up to existing woodland, or a combination of existing woodland and reforestation areas. Given the existing environmental constraints on the property, steep slopes, floodplain and wetland areas, and a stream, the most desirable location for development and clearing is at the center of the site. Although the proposed curvilinear road network for the site necessitates the least amount of disturbance and allows for development outside of the said environmentally sensitive areas, there is one centrally located pocket in which lots, 35 in total, will be back to back and trees are not proposed to be retained. As stated, the existing environmental constraints on the site limit development to, or prohibit development on, very specific portions of the site. Given the overall number of lots, 168, the environmental constraints that exist on the site, and the amount of woodland proposed to be preserved, only a small number of lots (35) will be back to back. A comprehensive assessment of all contributing factors and specific site conditions that dictate preferable development areas, layout, vehicular circulation, etc., finds that the tree clearing as proposed on the plan is warranted. The subject plan does not provide for the preservation of individual trees outside of the woodland preservation areas shown.

- (2) Groups of townhouses should not be arranged on curving streets in long, linear strips. Where feasible, groups of townhouses should be at right angle to each other, and should facilitate a courtyard design. In a more urban environment, consideration should be given to fronting the units on roadways.

Comment: As previously noted, the proposed vehicular circulation network is curvilinear, and has been dictated by existing environmental constraints which limit areas of development and prohibit development in other areas on the site.

Given the linear "fingers" on the site available as feasible development areas when all environmental constraints are considered, grouping townhouses at right angles would be impractical. In areas where the site, or development area, opens up somewhat the plan provides for groups of townhouses sited at right angles to each other to facilitate a courtyard design. The remaining portion of the proposed development on the site, notwithstanding the areas in which the courtyard design is provided, consists of four areas of townhouse lots sited along and fronting on essentially linear stretches of street. Three of the four areas will have lots on both sides of the right-of-way, while one will have lots on one side only. Taking into account all of the determinants which affect the proposed layout and design, the proposed plan satisfies the intent of the subject requirement.

- (C) **Recreational facilities should be separated from dwelling units through techniques such as buffering, differences in grade, or preservation of existing trees. The rears of buildings, in particular, should be buffered from recreational facilities.**

Comment: The subject plan provides for two private recreational facilities, a tot lot and a pre-teen lot. The pre-teen lot will be sited along the main entrance road, A, in a highly visible location, with a combination of evergreen and shade trees provided along its west perimeter to act as a buffer between the recreational area and the adjacent lots. The rears of the lots adjacent to the pre-teen facility will be buffered.

The proposed tot lot will be sited behind Lots 37-47. The topographical elevations at the rears of Lots 41-47 range from 160 to 168. The topographical elevation at

the tot lot is approximately 148. The topographical difference in grade mitigates the siting of the tot lot at the rears of Lots 41-47. The topographical difference between the tot lot and the rears of Lots 37-40 is negligible, and the applicant is proposing a minimal amount of landscaping, shade trees, at the recreational area/lot perimeters. Therefore, it is recommended that additional landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, be provided along the rears of Lots 37-40. The extent and location of the subject landscaping will be determined prior to certificate of approval upon the applicant's consultation with the Urban Design Section acting as the Planning Board's designee.

- (D) To convey the individuality of each unit, the design of abutting units should avoid the use of repetitive architectural elements and should employ a variety of architectural features and designs such as roofline, window and door treatments, projections, colors and materials.**

Comment: The proposed architecture has employed several typical architectural themes, none of which is repeated in any four, five, or six consecutive units. These themes employ varying roof lines, window and door treatments, projections and materials.

- (E) To the extent feasible, the rears of townhouses should be buffered from public rights-of-way and parking lots. Each application shall include a visual mitigation plan that identifies effective buffers between the rears of townhouses abutting public rights-of-way and parking lots. Where there are no existing trees, or the retention of existing vegetation is not practicable, landscaping, berming, fencing, or a combination of these techniques may be used. Alternatively, the applicant may consider the designing the rears of townhouse buildings such that they have similar features to the fronts, such as reverse gables, bay windows, shutters, or trim.**

Comment: See Finding No. 9.a.

- (F) Attention should be given to the aesthetic appearance of the offsets of buildings.**

Comment: Offsets occur at every unit and vary from 3 to 4 feet.

7. Conformance to the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-T Zone, including the requirements of the Prince George's County Landscape Manual - The proposed plan is in general conformance with the development regulations for the R-T Zone.

Sections 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, and 4.1, Residential Requirements, apply to the subject site. The landscape plans are in full conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.



8. Conformance to the Requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance - The subject application was referred to the Environmental Planning Section and in a memorandum (Finch to Jordan) dated February 25, 2001, the following comments were provided:

■The site is a 29.23 acre wooded site in the R-T zone, located between strip commercial development adjacent to Annapolis Road (Route 450) and an existing single-family development. The property is steeply sloping down from Annapolis Road and entirely wooded. A stream, with associated buffers, crosses the property from the northern point, and runs south to the southern property line. Another stream with associated wetlands runs along the southwest property line.

■Compliance with Conditions of Preliminary Plan

1. ■Condition #1 states:  
■**Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Plan Concept Plan, Concept # 978007170.**

■*Discussion: The stormwater management pond proposed at time of Detailed Site Plan is larger than that proposed at time of preliminary plan. The applicant has submitted a revised Stormwater Management Concept Approval (# 978007170) dated June 28, 2000 because the original pond was undersized. The applicant has also submitted the Stormwater Management Technical Plans for the pond which is in accordance with the new concept approval.*

- b. ■The revised Detailed Site Plan and TCP II shows the location of all residences along the southern property line, and the existing contours for a minimum of 50-feet off the site. The Stormwater Management Concept Approval contains conditions relating to the protection of the adjacent existing residences in the design of the pond, which have been adhered to. The houses adjacent to the stormwater management embankment all have finish floors that are higher than the water surface elevation.

■*Discussion: The applicant still needs to obtain dam breach approval for the proposed pond, and a slope stability study is required at time of grading permit. These requirements will be*

*reviewed by the Department of Environmental Resources prior to the issuance of permits.*

c. ■Condition #5 states:

■**At time of Detailed Site Plan, the plan shall respect the expanded stream buffer as a non-disturbance area, except in areas of approved variation requests.**

■*Discussion: The stream buffer associated with the major tributary on the site was granted a variation at time of preliminary plan for disturbances associated with the construction of the stormwater management facility. The plans originally submitted showed areas of intrusion into the stream buffer, which have been addressed by the applicant as follow:*

1. Behind Lots 9 through 13: A retaining wall has been added to reduce grading into the delineated stream buffer.
2. Adjacent to Lot 1: The outfall located in this area cannot be moved at the request of the Soil Conservation District. The applicant proposes to reforest in this area and restore the stream buffer.
3. From Cooper Lane to the end of Road C: The location of the water line occurs because of a WSSC requirement to provide an inner connect. This essentially loops the water system through the site to ensure a continuous water supply to the site if future maintenance is required to parts of the water line. The impacts on the stream buffer are above the limits of wetlands and wetland buffers, will retain the original drainage pattern in this area, and will not involve the construction of any surface level impervious structures.

*■Discussion: The Environmental Planning Section finds that the impacts proposed to the stream buffer are temporary in nature, and are acceptable.*

d. Condition #7 states that:

**■A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved by the Planning Board at the time of Detailed Site Plan.**

*■Discussion: A revised Tree Conservation Plan TCP II/04/01 dated December 12, 2000 was submitted which satisfies all requirements of the ordinance. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of the TCP in conjunction with Detailed Site Plan DSP-00041.*

*■At time of permit review, the Environmental Planning Section will compare the limits of disturbance shown on the approved Sediment and Erosion Control Plans to determine conformance with the approved Tree Conservation Plan.*

e. **■On Sheet 3 of 6, the area of wetlands delineated is more extensive than that shown at time of preliminary plan. The applicant has submitted a jurisdictional delineation for the property from the Corps of Engineers confirming the extent of the expanded wetlands. The application shows intrusion into the newly delineated wetlands and wetlands buffers, without an approved variation, because these areas were unknown at time of preliminary plan approval.**

*■Discussion: A variation was granted as part of the preliminary plan approval to disturb 110 linear feet of Waters of the U.S., and associated buffers, to allow the location of townhouse lots and a parking lot, which were permanent impacts. The current proposal changes the location of this impact to allow the placement of the through circulation road for the site. The location of the road is inflexible because of the preferred location of the stream crossing to the east in order to minimize impacts. The disturbance proposed to wetlands is a narrow finger, approximately 30 feet in length, with associated buffers. The applicant proposes to restore the buffer areas through landscaping. The revised plans show the preservation of larger areas of contiguous wetlands and wetland buffers, and less permanent impact to wetlands than were approved at time of preliminary plan. •*

f. **■The Type II Tree Conservation Plan (II/04/01) does not show the proposed Tree Protection Devices to be placed at the Limits of Disturbance throughout the site. In**

some cases the devices are shown 10 to 20 feet inside the areas of trees to be preserved.

■Discussion: Prior to certification, the Type II TCP shall be revised to show the proposed Tree Protection Devices at the Limits of Disturbance.

- g. ■The Type II TCP shows only one type of Tree Protection Device throughout the site, however, there are two different situations: one where tree protection is needed during construction and one where tree protection is needed for reforestation areas. The types of Tree Protection Devices are not distinguished on the plans.

■Discussion: Prior to certification, the Type II TCP shall be revised to distinguish between the two types of Tree Protection Devices, shall be amended to include details for both types, and shall provide an indication of when each type of protection is to be installed relative to the clearing and grading activities on-site. •

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-00041 and Tree Conservation Plan TCP II/04 /01 subject to conditions, which can be found in the Recommendation Section of this staff report.

- 9. Urban Design - The proposed architecture consists of two base house types, the Fairfield and Fairmont, each of which has six (6) models for each building type. There are three (3) building types, as noted above in Finding No. 6.(3). The architectural units are listed in the chart below, as well as the minimum finished living area of each.

Fairfield	1,250 square feet
Fairmont	1,320 square feet

The builder for the subject lots Ryan Homes. The proposed townhouses can reach a maximum size of 2,433-2,873 square feet with all options. The overall design of the dwelling units is traditional. The units range from two to three stories with gable roofs, window shutters, trim, optional brick accents, siding, bay windows, and garages.

- 1. Several rear yards and exterior facades, specifically Lots 19-21, and 41-44, will be visible from the rights-of-way of the interior streets that will abut them. No provisions for fencing have been provided on any of the subject lots, and the proposed landscaping is minimal. Staff believes that because of the small lot sizes, their proximity to the roadways, and the intended goal of achieving some degree of privacy, the applicant should provide a combination of additional landscaping and fencing. The landscaping will help soften the interface between adjoining lots where a rear yard and side yard are facing each other, with the rear yard visible from the street. The fencing will provide a degree of privacy from the roadway, while helping to define the private space on the subject lots. It is recommended that a combination of additional landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, be provided in proximity to the subject lots to screen the rear exterior facades, and furthermore that a six-foot-high board-on-board fence be provided to screen the view of the rear yard from the roadway. The extent and location of the subject fence and landscaping will be

determined prior to certificate of approval upon the applicant's consultation with the Urban Design Section acting as the Planning Board's designee.

2. An extensive amount of existing woodland is proposed to remain at the eastern entrance to the subdivision from Coopers Lane, and the lots will be set back a significant distance from the entrance. This approach provides for an appropriate transition between the existing development along the east side of Coopers Lane and the subject development, while helping define the main entrance to the subdivision. Although secondary, the entrance from the western side of the development at 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue does not provide an appropriate transition from the existing right-of-way, and conversely proposes homes sited in proximity to the edge of the right-of-way with a minimal amount of landscaping to act as buffering from 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue. If lots are going to be located in proximity to the 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way, then additional landscaping must be provided to help soften the edges of the subdivision which will abut existing rights-of-way. Therefore, it is recommended that a combination of additional landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, be provided in proximity to Lot 30 and the proposed parking lot along the right-of-way frontage at 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The extent and location of the subject landscaping will be determined prior to certificate of approval upon the applicant's consultation with the Urban Design Section acting as the Planning Board's designee.

10. Transportation - The subject application was referred to and reviewed by the Transportation Planning Section. Although a written referral response was not provided, the transportation staff has verbally acknowledged their review of the development proposal and has stated that the proposal is acceptable, and poses no transportation issues.

11. Trails - The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and in a memorandum (Shaffer to Jordan ) dated January 23, 2001, the following comments were provided:

■The Adopted and Approved Bladensburg-New Carrollton & Vicinity Master Plan recommends that Copper Lane be designated as a Class III bikeway with appropriate signage. Because Cooper Lane is a county right-of-way, the applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of this signage. A note shall be placed on the Final Record Plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.

12. The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (CSD # 978007170), which was approved on June 28, 2000. Upon initial referral of the subject application to the Department of Environmental Resources it was found, as reported in a referral response received January 4, 2001, that the plan was not consistent with the approved stormwater management concept. Subsequent to the referral, the applicant revised the proposed plan and it was found that the revised plan was in conformance with the approved stormwater management concept plan.
13. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions. Significant environmental issues identified by the Environmental Planning Section have been resolved through subsequent revisions to the proposed site plan. The Permit Review Section provided several comments pertaining to additional information being provided on the plans. Thus, conditions 1.a.-b. reflect the Permit Review concerns. The Department of Public Works & Transportation provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way. The plans should address the right-of-way improvement comments at the time of the review of permits.
14. The subject application was referred to the municipalities of Cheverly and Landover Hills. No response has been received as of the writing of this staff report.
15. In order to insure that prospective purchasers in this subdivision are made aware of the existence of an approved Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations, and plans for recreational facilities, these plans must be displayed in the developer's office.
16. The Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use. Furthermore, the Detailed Site Plan fulfills the site design guidelines for Townhouses as listed in Section 27-274(a)(11) as noted in Finding No. 6 above.

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/04/01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan SP-00041 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval, the following modifications or revisions shall be made to the Detailed Site Plan and Tree Conservation Plan, or the following information shall be provided:
  - a. Provide the typical house types as shown on the cover sheet at a larger scale, and identify all architectural options, including dimensions.
  - b. Revise the parking schedule to include parking ratios.

1. Provide the location of all proposed recreational equipment with the required fall-zones for each on the site plans.

2. Provide specifications, model numbers, manufacturer, and details for all proposed recreational equipment.
- e. Provide horizontal dimension on the architectural elevations of each individual unit type.
6. Provide a note on the plans that states that the minimum width of all proposed house types is twenty (20) feet.
7. Provide architecture for buildings on lots where endwalls are prominent that will consist of four (4) endwall architectural features in a balanced composition, or two (2) endwall architectural features with the exterior endwall finished in brick, stone, or stucco. Specifically, Lots 5, 16, 17, 22, 23, 40, 41, 52, 88, 89, 129, 130, 140, 141, 145, 146, 162, 163, and 168 shall employ the said architecture.
8. Provide a note on the plans and architectural elevations that states above-ground foundation walls shall either be clad with finish materials compatible with the primary facade design, or shall be textured or formed to simulate a clad finish material such as brick, decorative block, or stucco.
- i. A minimum of 60 percent of all townhouse units (minimum 101 units) in the development shall have a full front facade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim and doors) of brick, stone or stucco.
- j. Provide additional screening landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, at the rear of Lots 37-40. Final quantities, species, and location to be determined by the Urban Design Section as Planning Board designee.
- k. Provide additional screening landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, and a six-foot-high sight-tight board-on-board wood fence at the rear, and side of Lots 19-21, and 41-44. Final quantities, species, and location to be determined by the Urban Design Section as Planning Board designee.



- l. Provide additional screening landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, in proximity to Lot 30, and the proposed parking lot along the right-of-way frontage at 65<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Final quantities, species, and location to be determined by the Urban Design Section as Planning Board designee.
  - m. Provide proposed Tree Protection Devices at the Limits of Disturbance.
  - n. Provide details for both types of proposed Tree Protection Devices. Furthermore, provide a schedule/indication of when each type of protection is to be installed relative to clearing and grading activities on-site.
2. Prior to the issuance of any permits, the applicant shall submit to the Environmental Planning Section:
  - a. The approved Sediment and Erosion Control Plans to determine conformance with TCP II/04/01.
  - b. All Federal and State wetland permits, evidence that permit approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans related to impacts to wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S.
3. The developer, his heirs, successors and/or assigns shall display in the sales office all of the plans approved by the Planning Board for this subdivision, including all exterior elevations of all approved models, site plan and landscape plan.
4. Prior to Final Plat approval a note shall be placed on the plat which states that the applicant, his heirs, successors, or assigns shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of Class III bikeway signage.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Eley, seconded by Commissioner Lowe, with Commissioners Eley, Lowe, Brown and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 8, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 22nd day of March 2001.

PGCPB No. 01-50  
File No. SP-00041  
Page 18

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk