

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 February 24, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-97034/01 for Marwood, Lots 1-70 and 124-129, the Planning Board finds:

1. Location - The subject property is located approximately 3,600 feet west of the intersection of Marlboro Pike and Woodyard Road, on the south side of Marlboro Pike. The proposed development is bounded to the north and east by existing single-family detached dwellings in the R-R Zone, to the south is the Windsor Park Subdivision zoned R-R, and to the west are agricultural parcels, zoned I-4.
2. The Proposed Development - The purpose of this Detailed Site Plan is for the approval of 76 dwelling units on the subject property. The plan includes site, landscape, tree conservation plans, and architecture. The proposed subdivision will have a single vehicular access point from the existing Marlboro Pike, via the proposed North Marwood Boulevard.

The subject application is for the approval of Phase I in the proposed development. The overall development plan for the Planned Retirement Community consists of 306 dwelling units, including 91 single-family detached dwellings, 60 duplexes, and 155 low-rise elderly rental apartments. The proposed development will ultimately provide the following amenities: a community recreational center which will include a community activities building, a putting green, and a swimming pool; a picnic grove, an eight-foot-wide paved hiker-biker trail system, a sitting/garden area, a fenced perimeter, and a gatehouse at the entrance.

3. Background - The 1994 Approved Melwood-Westphalia Master Plan recommends ■low-suburban■ residential density for the subject property. The Melwood-Westphalia Sectional Map Amendment placed the subject property in the R-R Zone. There are no master plan issues associated with the subject development proposal.
4. Conformance with Approved Special Exception - The District Council approved Special Exception No.4233 on November 18, 1996, per Zoning Ordinance No. 20-1996. The approval Special Exception included 15 conditions of approval, one of which required specific action be taken or additional information be supplied at the time

of Detailed Site Plan. Below is the specific condition warranting discussion pertaining to conformance to the approved Special Exception:

- 11. A Detailed Site Plan shall be filed in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of the Zoning Ordinance and shall be finally approved by the District Council and shall include, in addition to other requirements and guidelines, details regarding the interior layout and design of the multifamily facility.**

Comment : The subject application is for Phase I of the proposed development. Phase I consists of Lots 1-70 and 124-129. The interior site layout, architecture, and design details for the subject lots are provided as a part of this application. The layout and design details for the remaining lots, multifamily facility, and the recreational amenities will be provided in a later application for the remaining phase. The proposed Detailed Site Plan will be reviewed by the District Council subsequent to the Planning Board review. The Detailed Site Plan is in general conformance with the approved Special Exception Plan in terms of circulation, lot layout, tree preservation and nondisturbance areas.

5. Conformance with the Approved Preliminary Plat - Preliminary Plat 4-96104 for the subject property was approved by the Planning Board on February 6, 1997, per PGCPB Resolution No. 97-14(C). The overall lotting pattern, circulation and access points shown on the site plan are in general conformance with the approved Preliminary Plat. The approved Preliminary Plat included 17 conditions of approval. Five 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:

- 3. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved for this site plan in conjunction with the Detailed Site Plan.**

Comment : A Type II Tree Conservation Plan has been submitted with the subject Detailed Site Plan application, and has been recommended for approval by the Environmental Planning Section.

6. **With the submittal of the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, the applicant shall provide sufficient documentation to the Natural Resources Division to justify the woodland conservation area within the stormwater management pond. This justification shall include a detailed analysis of the species present within the 100-year water surface elevation, the susceptibility of those species to temporary flooding and anticipated long-term stocking levels for this area. An alternative area for woodland conservation may be required at that time.**

Comment : The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the plan for conformance with environmental conditions of previous approvals and for conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinances. The findings of the Environmental Planning Section, formerly the Natural Resources Division, were reported in a memorandum dated December 10, 1999 (Metzger to Jordan), and the following comments were provided:

■The proposed activity is not exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/64/96) was approved in conjunction with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-96104). A Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/93/97) was also approved in conjunction with a site plan (SP-97034) for street dedication. The site plan as submitted is in compliance with the approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan.●

Furthermore, the subject condition was addressed during the review of the previous Detailed Site Plan for Grading, SP-97034, and in a memorandum dated October 9, 1997 (Markovich to Asan) the following comments were provided:

■It should be noted that the preservation/reforestation area initially proposed to be located in the stormwater management pond has been revised and is now located above the 10-year water surface.●

Given the removal of any woodland preservation/reforestation from the stormwater management pond, the subject condition is moot.

- 10. A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince Georges County Planning Department, which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.**

Comment : The subject application is Phase I of the entire development. The boundaries of the proposed Phase I include the required recreation facilities. The approved recreational facilities per Special Exception, SE-4233, are a community building, tennis courts, and a swimming pool. The applicant has advised staff that a revision will be forthcoming pertaining to the recreation facilities layout, and that a putting green will be substituted for the approved tennis courts. The recreational facilities for the proposed development are required through mandatory dedication. The approved special exception indicated a specific layout for the facilities. Conditions No. 8, 10, and 11 of Zoning Ordinance No. 20-1996 for the approved special exception were written to allow flexibility in the final plan layout and composition, and grants the Planning Board the discretion to approve minor amendments to the plan if density is not affected. Thus, a revision to the special exception will not be required to accommodate these changes. Based on prior staff findings for the approved Special Exception, SE-4233, and the District Council conditions of approval for Zoning Ordinance No. 20-1996 staff find conformance to SE-4233 pertaining to the subject application. As of the time of this application the applicant had not finalized the details of the proposed recreation facilities, and staff could not analyze the facilities for conformance to the standards of the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to certificate approval elevations, details, etc. be provided on the plans for all recreational facilities proposed in Phase I and submitted to the Urban Design Section to be approved by staff as designee of the Planning Board.

- 15. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.**

Comment : See comment above for preliminary plan Condition 10.

- 16. During review of the Detailed Site Plan, the following items shall be addressed, but not limited to:**

- a. Lots 22, 33, 29, 70, 100, 117, 124 and 129 are highly visible small corner lots and screening treatment such as fencing and/or additional landscaping shall be required at DSP.**

Comment : The Phase I site plan includes Lots 22, 29, 33, 70, 124, and 129. The rear yards of all of the lots 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 on the subject lots to screen the rear yards, 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.

Lots 100 and 117 are not included as part of the subject application, Phase I. Staff cannot evaluate the screening of these lots at this time. Evaluation of the proposed screening for Lots 100 and 117 will occur upon their submittal for Detailed Site Plan approval.

b. Rears of Lots 65-70 shall be set back a minimum of 20 feet from the parking lot.

Comment : The parking lot in question was proposed as a part of the parking compound to service the multifamily dwelling units. The location and layout of the subject lots is consistent with the approved preliminary plan. The subject parking lot and the multifamily dwelling units are both located within the boundaries of Phase II. The applicant has indicated that prior to submittal of a final site plan for the multifamily dwelling units, a minor revision to the approved special exception, SE-4233, may be requested to eliminate the parking lot in question to provide an open space passive recreation area for the residents of the multifamily dwelling units. Given that the subject application for Phase I does not include the multifamily dwelling units or its parking, and that the applicant has stated that a revision to eliminate or reduce the parking lot in question is forthcoming, staff does not believe that the subject condition can be addressed at this time. The subject condition shall be addressed upon submittal of Phase II or whichever future submittal in which the multifamily dwelling units and the accompanying parking are included.

c. Lot 22 shall be moved to Lot 21 to provide more space for side and rear screening treatments for corner Lot 22. The proposed six-foot asphalt path shall be moved between Lots 22 and 23.

Comment : The plan has been revised as indicated in the subject condition. The subject condition has been satisfied.

6. The development standards for the proposed community were established by Special Exception No.4233, and are as follows:

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| Zone | R-R |
| Gross Tract Area | 55.97 acres |
| Area Within a 100-Year Floodplain | 0.79 acres |
| Net Tract Area | 55.18 acres |
| Number of Proposed Lots: | |
| Single-family Detached | 91 |
| Duplex Units | 60 |
| Apartment Building Units | 155 |
| Total | 306 |
| Land to be Conveyed to HOA | 24.83 acres |
| Density | 5.5 du/acre |
| Maximum Lot Coverage Required | 75% |
| Minimum Green Area Required (total development) | 60% |

Single-Family Detached (zero lot line)

| | |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|
| Minimum Lot Area | 4,000 sq. ft. |
| Minimum Front Yard | 20 ft. |
| Minimum Side Yard | 0 ft. |
| Minimum Rear Yard | 20 ft. |
| Minimum Lot Width: | |
| @ Front Building Line | 50 ft. |
| @ Front Street Line | 35 ft. (15 ft. at cul-de-sac) |
| Building Height | 35 ft. |

Single-Family Attached (duplex)

| | |
|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Minimum Lot Area | 3,000 sq. ft. |
| Minimum Front Yard | 20 ft. |
| Minimum Side Yard | 0 ft/7.5 ft. |
| If corner lot, side along street | 10 ft. |
| Minimum Rear Yard | 20 ft. |
| Minimum Lot Width: | |
| @ Front Building Line | 40 ft. |
| @ Front Street Line | 35 ft. (15 ft. at cul-de-sac) |
| Building Height | 35 ft. |

Apartment Building

| | |
|-----------------|-----------|
| Building Height | 4 stories |
|-----------------|-----------|

Community Building

Building Height 35 ft.

Accessory Building

Setbacks:

| | |
|-------------------|--------|
| Front Street Line | 60 ft. |
| Side Street Line | 2 ft. |
| Rear Lot Line | 2 ft. |
| Height | 15 ft. |

7. Conformance with the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-R Zone, including the Requirements of the Prince George's County *Landscape Manual*. The proposed plan is in general conformance with development regulations for development in the R-R Zone.

Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, applies to the subject site. The landscape plans are in full conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

8. Urban Design - The Urban Design staff has reviewed the subject application and provides the following comments:

1. The proposed architecture consists of two types of units, single detached and duplex units. The architectural units are listed in the chart below, as well as the minimum finished living area of each.

Single Detached

| | |
|-----|-------------------|
| *A* | 1,599 square feet |
| *B* | 1,661 square feet |
| *C* | 2,074 square feet |

Duplex

| | |
|-----|-------------------|
| *A* | 1,203 square feet |
| *B* | 1,267 square feet |

The builder for the subject lots is Centex Homes.

The proposed cottages range in size from 1,203 to 2,074 square feet. The overall design of the dwelling units is traditional. Each unit is one story with gable roofs, window shutters, trim, optional brick or stone accents, wood shakes or siding, bay windows, and garages.

2. The approved Special Exception for the subject property, SE-4233, provided for an entrance feature which was comprised of a guardhouse and a decorative fence that ran parallel to Marlboro Pike on either side of the entrance road. Neither the guardhouse nor the decorative fence is shown on the subject plan. Final details are currently being negotiated with the Department of Public Works and Transportation in terms of the guardhouse location, with respect to the public right-of-way. The fence design has not been finalized in terms of materials and composition. Staff cannot find that the subject plan is in conformance with the approved special exception if these entrance feature elements are omitted. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to signature approval the guardhouse and decorative fence elevations/details be provided on the plans and submitted to the Urban Design Section for approval as designee of the Planning Board.
3. The required recreation facilities for the subject development are included as part of Phase I, and staff believes it is important to discuss the timing of construction and completion of the recreational amenities. The overall plan will ultimately be comprised of a total of 306 living units, 91 single detached units, 60 duplex, and 155 multifamily dwelling units. The subject application, Phase I, is for approval of 76 of the total number of units. Staff believes that the recreational facilities are an essential element to the overall success and well-being of this development. The recreational facilities should be completed and in place at the early stages of this development, so as not to deprive initial residents of the community the opportunity to enjoy the on-site recreational activities. Therefore, it is recommended that the required recreational facilities for the subject property be constructed, completed, and in operation prior to the issuance of the 39th building permit.

9. The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (CSD #978004040), which was approved on February 21, 1997.
10. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions; no significant issues were identified. The Permit Review Division provided several comments pertaining to additional information being provided on the plans. Conditions 1a-b of the Recommendation section of this report address the Permit Review concerns. The Department of Public Works and Transportation provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way. The plans should address these comments at the time of the review of permits.
11. 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.
12. 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.

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/93/97) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan SP-97034/01 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:
 1. Provide setback and maximum lot coverage requirements in the general notes.
 2. Provide house templates with building height and all options.
 - c. Provide additional screening landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, and/or a six-foot-high sight-

tight board-on-board wood fence at the rear, and or side of Lots 22, 29, 33, 70, 124 and 129. Final quantities, species, and location to be determined by the Urban Design Section as Planning Board designee.

d. Provide elevations/details of the entrance guardhouse and decorative fencing on the site plan.

e. Provide elevations/details of all applicable recreation facilities, and the community building on the site plan.

2. The required recreational facilities construction shall be commenced by the issuance of the 77th building permit and be completed prior to the issuance of the 125th permit.

3. In order to insure that prospective purchasers in this subdivision are made aware of the existence of a Detailed Site Plan approved by the Planning Board, these plans shall be displayed in the builder's sales office.

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 adoption of this Resolution.

* * * * *

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 McNeill, seconded by Commissioner Brown, with Commissioners McNeill, Brown, Boone and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 24, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 23rd day of March 2000.

PGCPB No. 00-21
File No. SP-97034/01
Page 11

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:aj