

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 November 9, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan SP-97034/02 for Marwood, 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 one hundred fifty-five (155) low-rise elderly rental apartments and seventy-five (75) other dwelling units on the subject property. The 75 dwelling units will be comprised of forty-four (44) single-family detached dwellings and thirty-one (31) duplexes. 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 II in the proposed development. Phase I, SP-97034/01, was approved by the Planning Board on February 24, 2000 and the District Council affirmed the Planning Board decision on May 8, 2000. Phase I consisted of seventy-six (76) dwellings and the following amenities: a community recreational center which will include a community activities building, putting green, swimming pool, fenced perimeter, and a gatehouse at the entrance. Phase II provides for a picnic grove, an eight-foot-wide paved hiker-biker trail system, and a sitting/garden area.

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. See Finding No. 8 for discussion of 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 approved 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.**

Finding: The proposed plan provides for a four-story multifamily apartment building. The exterior finish building materials are a combination of brick and vinyl siding, with brick facades three stories high at the main entrance and two side elevations. Although the upper three floors at the rear elevation are clad in vinyl siding, the above-mentioned brick finish is proposed the full height of the first floor at the rear to provide a unifying architectural element for all facades. All of the living units are provided with exterior balconies, which will provide residents with a constant connection to the surrounding natural environment. The series of recessed/projected balconies, in combination with the roof articulation, provide a rhythm and necessary breaks in the structure that help lessen its overall scale and mass. The main entrance is well defined with a covered driveway and drop-off area. Staff believes that the proposed architecture for the multifamily building is compatible with the single-family/duplex units, and furthermore complements the human scale design approach that will be prevalent through the Marwood development.

The apartment building is easily accessible, with thoughtfully planned interior and exterior spaces that will be appropriate for senior residents. The interior circulation spaces are generous and linear, so as to lessen the possibility of residents becoming disoriented. The community room will be centrally located in the structure at a highly visible location off the main entrance lobby, and nearby the manager's office. Also located off the main entrance lobby will be space for on-site services such as a salon, and a doctor's office. The proposed unit types are one and two bedrooms, which range in size from 701-1,022 square feet. Staff believes that the subject development proposal is appropriate for seniors, and will meet the needs of prospective residents. For further detailed discussion of this facility see the attached narrative provided by the applicant.

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.

Finding: 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 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 Detailed Site Plan (SP-97034) for rough grading. The site plan as submitted is in compliance with the approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and furthermore 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.**

Finding: 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 George's County Planning Department, which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.**

Finding: The recreational facilities for the proposed development are required through mandatory dedication. The subject application is Phase II of the entire development. All required recreation facilities were approved per Special Exception, SE-4233. The mandatory recreation facilities are private and within the boundaries of the approved Phase I, thus the subject condition has been satisfied per the previously approved Detailed Site Plan, SP-97034/01.

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

Finding: See finding above for preliminary plan condition no. 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.**

Finding: The Phase II site plan includes Lots 100 and 117. The rear yards of these lots will be visible from the right-of-way of Timberwood Court, the interior street that will abut them at their side yards. 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/or 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, or 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 landscaping and/or fence 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 122, 29, 33, 70, 124, and 129 are not included as part of the subject application, Phase II. The screening of these lots was evaluated as part of the Detailed Site Plan approval for Phase I.

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

Finding: The subject parking lot and the multifamily dwelling units are both located within the boundaries of Phase II. Lots 65-70 were included in Phase I, and are not part of the subject review. A significant portion of the parking lot in question has been eliminated to provide an open space passive recreation area for the residents of the multifamily dwelling units. The approved Special Exception provided 231 parking spaces for the multifamily units, or approximately 125 percent above the required 103 spaces. The subject plan provides for 157 parking spaces, or approximately 52 percent above that required. The nearest parking space is approximately 40 feet from the subject lots. A small portion of a parking lot driveway is located 20 feet from the rears of lots 68 and 69. Given the additional passive open space provided, staff believes that the reduction in parking is justified. Furthermore, the applicant has still provided far above the minimum required parking to accommodate guests, visitors, etc. The subject condition has been satisfied.

Condition 8b. of the approved Special Exception, SE-4233, states the following:

The Planning Board or its designee may approve the following types of modifications:

Location of dwellings and facilities provided there is no intensification of the development.

Staff believes that the said parking spaces proposed to be deleted can be categorized as facilities noted in the Special Exception condition, and thus the Planning Board may modify the subject plan as proposed by the applicant to reduce the total number of parking spaces at the senior apartments. The uses and development are not intensified, the total area of impervious surfaces is significantly reduced, and additional green space to be used for passive recreation is provided for the residents of the development. Staff believes that the proposed revision meets the intent of Zoning Ordinance No. 20-1996.

- 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.**

Finding: The subject condition was satisfied as part of Phase I.

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.

Sections 4.1, Residential Requirements, and 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements are applicable to the subject application. The development proposal is in full conformance with all requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

8. Community Planning - The subject application was referred to the Community Planning Division and in a memorandum (Irminger to Jordan) dated October 10, 2000 the following comments were provided:

■Prospective residents should be aware of the noise generated by aircraft at this location. The Maryland standard for exterior noise is a maximum of 65 Ldn, however, the proposed development is located within the 65 - 70 DNL moderate noise contour of Andrews Air Force Base (AAFB), based on the most recent (1998) Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) study, page 4-4. In its discussion of ■Noise Exposure for Existing Aircraft Operations, the study states: ■The DNL 65 DB contour extends about one mile east of the eastern boundary of the AFB. In its section called, ■Comparison with Previous AICUZ Study, it states: ■The differences in extent of the 65 dB DNL contour to the east are due to an increased number of closed pattern operations, page 4-5. In the Melwood-Westphalia Master Plan the noise analysis is based on the 1989 AICUZ study that placed the DNL 65 DB noise contour within the Base property west of this proposal. While the 1994 Melwood-Westphalia Plan identified 228 acres of land outside the Base within the 65 - 70 DNL noise

contour in Planning Area 77, the same contour in the 1998 AICUZ study covers more than half of Planning Area 77, a substantial increase. Based on this information, noise would not have been a planning consideration in evaluating Special Exception 4233 in 1996 although it is currently an issue.

■In addressing aircraft noise, the Melwood-Westphalia Master Plan recommends (page 105) that: deeds of sale include language informing the prospective buyer that the property has been identified with noise levels that exceed 65 Ldn due to military overflights; that residential development in the moderate noise contour be acoustically buffered; and that a certification be obtained that the residential structure will attenuate noise.●

As noted in the memorandum the Environmental Planning staff concurs with this analysis, and furthermore, conditions of approval can be found in the Recommendation Section of this staff report.

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

9. 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-family detached and duplex units. The architectural units are listed in the chart below, as well as the minimum finished living area of each.

Single-Family Detached	
A	1996 square feet
B	2052 square feet
C	2495 square feet
Duplex	
A	1426 square feet
B	1470 square feet

The builder for the subject lots is Centex Homes. The proposed cottages range in size from 1426 to 2495 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. The architecture proposed for Phase II is identical to that of Phase I. It is recommended that the architecture approved for Phase I be approved for Phase II also.
 10. The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (CSD # 978004040), which was approved on February 21, 1997. Upon initial referral of the subject application to the Department of Environmental Resources it was found, as

reported in a referral response received August 8, 2000, 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.

11. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions; no significant issues were identified. The Permit Review Division provided comments pertaining to additional information being provided on the plans. Condition 1a of the Recommendation Section of this report address the Permit Review concerns. The subject plan was referred to the Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW & T) and written comments had not been received as of the writing of this staff report. The DPW & T has stated that designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way will be required. Any written comments from the DPW & T pertaining to the subject development proposal received prior to the planning board hearing will be provided at the hearing. The plans will be required to address any right-of-way improvements at the time of the review of permits.
12. 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.
13. 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-97034/02 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:
 - a. Provide all development standards per Special Exception, SE-4233.
 - b. Provide additional screening landscaping, shade and evergreen trees, and/or a six-foot-high sight-tight board-on-board wood fence at the rear or side of Lots 100 and 117. Final quantities, species, and location to be determined by the Urban Design Section as Planning Board designee.
3. Delineate the area of the subdivision which is located within the 65-70 DNL moderate noise contour, as specified in the 1998 AICUZ noise study.

4. The acoustical certification letter required in Condition No. 2 shall be reproduced and displayed on the Detailed Site Plan.
2. Prior to certification of approval, there shall be a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis that building shells located within the 65-70 DNL boundary in the subdivision will, if the building methods described below (or equal or better alternative) are employed, attenuate ultimate exterior noise levels to an interior level not to exceed 45 dBA(Ldn):
 5. Multifamily units shall include minimum twenty four (24) inch roof overhang, minimum R-30 blown in attic insulation, two (2) layers of gypsum wallboard on the top floor ceiling, double-pane windows, 5/8-inch OSB exterior wall sheathing, and a maximum 30% glass to wall ratio;
 6. Single-family/duplex units, Phases I and II, shall include minimum R-30 blown in attic insulation, double-pane windows and a wall assembly which achieves a minimum 37 STC wall rating.
3. A disclosure clause shall be included in all home-purchase contract agreements and deeds of sale, for residential properties located within the subdivision that includes language, which references the acoustical certification letter and informs any prospective buyer that a property has been identified as possibly having noise levels that exceed 65 Ldn due to military aircraft overflights.
2. 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 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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Brown, Eley, Lowe and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 9, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of December 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:rmk