

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 May 11, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-95068/01 for Easterly Manor, the Planning Board finds:

1. The Planning Board approved a Detailed Site Plan SP-95068 for the subject residential development consisting of five lots in the R-80 Zone on December 21, 1995 (PGCPB No. 95-407). The Detailed Site Plan was filed in fulfillment of Condition of Approval #1 of the approved Preliminary Plan for the subject subdivision. Four of the five lots are flag lots. Preliminary Plat 4-88252 for the subject subdivision was approved by the Planning Board on January 5, 1989 (PGCPB No. 89-6). Subsequent to the Preliminary Plat approval, a Final Plat was approved on January 10, 1991 and recorded in the County Land Records at VJ 157/24.
2. This subject Revision to a Detailed Site Plan is being submitted to fulfill the requirements of Section 27-287, Validity Period, which states (in part):

■An approved Detailed Site Plan shall remain valid for three (3) years, unless otherwise specified....If, at the end of that time, physical development has not begun, approval of the Plan shall be considered as having lapsed and shall have no effect, unless the Plan is resubmitted and reapproved in accordance with the provisions of this Division.●

The previous approval for SP-95068 lapsed on December 21, 1998. The applicant submitted an application for the subject revision on March 17, 2000.

3. The subdivision is located southeast of the intersection of Temple Hills Road and Kirby Road along Temple Hills Road. The subject Revision to a Detailed Site Plan will not significantly alter the previously approved site/grading and landscape plans for this development. The following new architectural models are being proposed for the subject subdivision:

<u>House Type</u>	<u>Minimum Sq. Ft.</u>
Blair	2,016
Landcaster	2,224

The Blair Model has a no-garage and a garage option.

The following models were previously approved for this subdivision:

<u>House Type</u>	<u>Minimum Sq. Ft.</u>
Aspen	2,300
Poplar II & III	2,350

4. Since the subject revision to the Detailed Site Plan is for architecture and there are no alterations to the previously approved site/grading plans, the subject revision to the Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-88252 and Detailed Site Plan SP-95068 and all applicable conditions of approval.
5. The Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-88252 and Detailed Site Plan SP-95068 found that the proposal was consistent with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the R-80 Zone. Therefore, this revision to the Detailed Site Plan is also in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.
6. This revision proposes house models ranging from 2,016 sq. ft. to 2,224 sq. ft. in size. The previous approval was for house models ranging from 2,300 sq. ft. to 2,350 sq. ft. in size. The floor areas of the proposed houses are less than the floor area of the smallest house in the previous approval. In addition, there is a no-garage option proposed for one of the models.

The size of the proposed models is not substantially smaller than the previously approved models. The smallest house of the proposed Blair model is only 284 sq. ft. smaller than the smallest house of the previously approved Aspen model. Therefore the size, style and design of the proposed models are compatible with the size, style and design of the previously approved models. However, the proposed no-garage option is a new feature in this single-family residential subdivision. All the previously approved models have had either a one-car garage or a two-car garage as standard features. Staff is of the opinion that although the size, style and design of the no-garage model are generally consistent with the overall architecture of the development, it is inferior to the previously approved models because of the absence of a garage. A garage is an important feature of a typical single-family house and elimination of this feature reduces the overall quality of the proposed architecture. Therefore, staff believes that the garage should be proposed as an integral part of the single-family detached residence. A condition of approval has been added to eliminate the Blair model with the no-garage option.

7. Section 27-568, Schedule of parking spaces required, requires two parking spaces for one-family detached dwellings in the residential zones.

Section 27-551 (e), Parking for one-family dwellings states:

■Parking spaces provided solely for, and on the same lot with, one-family dwellings may be located one behind the other. The front space may be used as access to the rear space.●

Since two parking spaces are required for a single-family detached dwelling, a condition of approval has been added to require the provision of one parking space for the proposed houses with the one-car garage option. The proposed parking spaces may be located one behind the other.

8. The revision to the Detailed Site Plan is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1, Residential Requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. The proposal meets the requirements of this section.
9. The subject application was referred to the Historic Preservation Section, the Community Planning Division, the Environmental Planning Section and the Permits Section. The Community Planning Division and the Historic Preservation Section have no comments. The Environmental Planning Section (Finch to Srinivas, meeting, May 1, 2000) has stated that the previously approved TCPII/128/95 is not altered by this proposal and has recommended reapproval of TCPII/128/95. The Permits Section (Windsor to Srinivas, March 9, 2000) has requested information regarding lot coverage. A condition of approval has been added to require the information.
10. With the proposed conditions of approval, the Revision to the Detailed Site Plan SP-95068/01 will represent 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.
11. In order to insure that prospective purchasers in this subdivision are made aware of all exterior elevations of all models approved by the Planning Board, and of the existence of an approved Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan, and plans for recreational facilities, these plans must be displayed in the developer's sales office. A condition of approval has been added to require the display of these approved plans.

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/128/95) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan SP-95068/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the site/grading plans shall be revised to show the following:
  - a. A parking space for the house models with the one-car garage option. The proposed parking spaces may be located one behind the other.

- b. The no-garage option for the Blair model eliminated.
2. Prior to issuance of a building permit, the lot coverage (on each lot or as a table) shall be shown on the site/grading plans.
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, the Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan, and plans for recreational facilities.

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 Boone, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with Commissioners Boone, Brown, McNeill and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 11, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11th day of May 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:LAX:aj