

Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission  
 Prince George's County Planning Department  
 Development Review Division  
 301-952-3530

*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mnccppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mnccppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm)*

## PRELIMINARY PLAN

**4-02019**

Application	General Data
Project Name:  BEALL PROPERTY (a.k.a. Heritage Glen)	Date Accepted 03/11/02
	Planning Board Action Limit 05/19/02
Location:  Northeast side of White House Road, approximately 1,000 feet east of the intersection of Ritchie Marlboro Road and White House Road.	Tax Map & Grid 074/F-04
	Plan Acreage 57.12
	Zone R-80
	Lots 155
Applicant/Address:  Artery Development Company, LLC 7200 Wisconsin Avenue., Suite #1000 Bethesda, MD 20814	Parcels 5
	Planning Area 73
	Council District 06
	Municipality N/A
	200-Scale Base Map 203SE09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners (CB-15-1998) N/A
	Previous Parties of Record (CB-13-1994) N/A
	Sign(s) Posted on Site Yes
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A
Staff Recommendation	
Staff Reviewer: @	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS
DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION

Comment [COMMENT1]: WHEN INSERTING INFORMATION AT THE @ SIGN REMEMBER TO USE INDENT FOR SECOND LINE - NOT TAB. ALSO, IT WILL LOOK LIKE THE TEXT IS GOING WACKO, BUT DON'T WORRY - IT IS FINE.

	X		
--	---	--	--

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02019  
Beall Property (a.k.a. Heritage Glen) , 155 Lots and 5 Parcels

OVERVIEW

The subject site consists of 57.12 $\frac{1}{2}$  acres of land in the R-80 Zone. Identified as Parcel 30, Tax Map 74, Grid F-4, it is currently undeveloped. The applicant proposes to subdivide the property into 155 lots for development with single-family homes and four parcels to be conveyed to a homeowners association and one parcel (Parcel ■E●) to be conveyed to M-NCPPC. Parcel ■A● will be used to continue the existing eight-foot-wide pedestrian trail located to the west of the subject property. Parcels ■B● and ■C● will contain on-site stormwater management facilities. Parcel ■D● is located to the north of the 250-foot-wide transmission line right-of-way that bisects the property and will remain in undisturbed open space.

Access to the development will be provided by a new street connection from White House Road and via an existing street (Birdie Lane) from the adjacent Presidential Heights subdivision that was designed to provide this connection. The proposed road system is similar to the adjacent Presidential Heights subdivision in that a number of the gently curving streets end in cul-de-sacs. The lots range in size from the minimum permitted (9,500 square feet) to some lots exceeding 20,000 square feet.

SETTING

The property is located along the north edge of White House Road approximately 1,100 feet west of its intersection with Harry S Truman Parkway. To the east and north are single-family homes on lots in the R-80 Zone. To the west are M-NCPPC park property and an I-3 zoned tract of land to be developed with a religious facility. To the south, across White House Road, is generally undeveloped residential land.

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Environmental Issues and Variation Request - The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the above referenced revised preliminary plan of subdivision for Beall Property, 4-02019, stamped as revised on April 12, 2002. The revised plans address some of the previous comments, however, the revised Tree Conservation Plan is not in conformance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of 4-02019 and TCPI/11/02 subject to the conditions at the end of this report. Staff also supports the variation request for impacts to existing wetland buffers. This recommendation supercedes a previous recommendation from the Environmental Planning Section dated March 27, 2002.

No previous cases have been reviewed on the subject property by the Environmental Planning Section. The Preliminary Plan proposes the subdivision of one existing parcel totaling 57.12 acres, in the R-80 zone, into 155 individual lots. This site has an approved Conceptual Storm Drain Plan, SCD #645-2002-00, dated February 6, 2002.

This subject property is located on the north side of White House Road approximately 1,100 feet east of the intersections of Ritchie Marlboro and White House Roads. A review of the information available indicates that the site is wooded and is characterized with terrain sloping to the north and south and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Southwest Branch in the Patuxent River watershed. The predominant soil type found to occur on this property according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey is Collington. This soil series generally exhibit moderate limitations to development due to steep slopes. No Marlboro clay has been identified on this site. There are no streams or floodplains on the site. To the extreme north of the subject property a wetland delineation is shown. There are no rare, threatened, or endangered species located in the vicinity of this property based on information provided by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources-Natural Heritage Program. There are no historic or scenic roads affected by the proposal. The sewer and water service categories are S-4 and W-4 according to the Prince George's County Water and Sewer Categories Map. There are no adverse noise impacts associated with the proposal.

This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in area and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Forest Stand Delineation and a Type I Tree Conservation Plan were submitted as part of the application.

A review of the Forest Stand Delineation as submitted was found not to have addressed all the requirements of the Forest Stand Delineation in accordance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual, because sample plots were not taken in all of the forest stands on the east of the subject property. However, because the stand that was not sampled is being preserved in its entirety and not counted toward any requirements, revisions to the FSD will not be required.

The revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/11/02), stamped as revised April 12, 2002, was reviewed and found not to have addressed all of the requirements of the Ordinance. The minimum woodland requirement for the site is 11.42 acres of the net tract. The revised TCPI still contains areas that do not meet the minimum requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance and the plan shows the use of fee-in-lieu for a site where off-site mitigation is a more appropriate option. In addition, the worksheet will need to be changed to reflect the additional clearing and how the requirements will be met. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, TCPI/11/02 should be revised to address these concerns.

Section 24-113 permits the Planning Board to grant variations from the strict compliance of this Subtitle where it finds that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties may result and that substantial justice may be done and the public interest secured. The variation request submits that the variation requested to permit the disturbance of the nontidal wetlands and the surrounding buffer satisfies these criteria. The variation request has been reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in accordance with the required findings of Section 24-113 of the Subdivision Ordinance.

The plan shows two areas of proposed impacts to existing wetlands, one for the installation of a water line and one for the installation of a sewer line. A variation is required for the

proposed areas of impacts to the wetland buffers. A revised letter of justification was submitted to address the proposed impacts.

**A. The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, or welfare, or injurious to other property.**

Comment: The variation request will not be detrimental to the public safety, health or welfare because the connection is to an existing sanitary sewer line being constructed across an uninhabited electrical utility line. In addition, it is likely that the conditions which created the nontidal wetland area will remain, and that the wetlands will reestablish, so that no permanent disturbance of the wetlands will result.

**B. The conditions on which the variation is based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought and are not applicable generally to other properties.**

Comment: The location of the existing eight-inch sewer line is in an area that requires disturbance to the wetlands specifically located on this property in order to make the connection.

**C. The variation does not constitute a violation of any other applicable law, ordinance, or regulation.**

Comment: The variation request also does not constitute a violation of any other applicable law, ordinance or regulation, but instead allows for an appropriate connection to an existing facility.

**D. Because of the particular physical surroundings, shape, or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations is carried out.**

Comment: The particular topography of the site has resulted in the formation of the nontidal wetlands. Without the approval of this variation, the development of the site could not provide for the safe and efficient transport, via gravity flow, of sewage as well as the efficient design of a waterline system.

2. Community Planning - The 2000 *Interim General Plan* places this property in the Developing Tier. The *Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Master Plan* (1990) was retained in the R-80 Zone through the County Council approval of the SMA. The master plan identifies a suburban land use. The master plan (pages 68 and 69) addresses the following pertinent specific development policies for the Largo community:
  - i. Access points should be limited on White House Road.
  - ii. Individual lots should not front on White House Road.

- iii. Setbacks, vegetation, and berming should be used to protect the residential area from noise and visual impacts of the future Ritchie Marlboro Road/I-95 interchange.
- iv. Development should be compatible with the existing single-family detached development to the north. Lot sizes should not be significantly smaller. (The Rambling Hills subdivision to the north is in the R-80 Zone). Cluster development should not be used and lot sizes should be no smaller than 9,500 square feet.

Only three lots will have frontage on White House Road. These lots are designed to have access via an internal subdivision street and the backs of the lots (along White House Road) will have a 50-foot-wide landscape buffer.

No historic resources were identified as being impacted by the proposed development.

The proposal is in conformance with master plan recommendations and the Zoning Ordinance.

- 3. Parks and Recreation - Staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DRP) reviewed the subject application and recommends that the provision of a combination of land and public recreational facilities be provided. The subject property is adjacent to Greenwood Manor Community Park on the west. The size of the subject property would require the dedication of 2.28 acres for parkland.

DPR staff met with the applicant and developed a mutually acceptable package of land dedication and recreational facilities on adjacent parkland to fulfill the mandatory requirement for dedication of parkland. The Park Planning and Development Division staff recommended appropriate conditions to ensure the proper and timely provision of the land and facilities.

- 4. Trails - In conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan* and consistent with prior approvals for the adjacent subdivision, the applicant was requested to provide a master plan trail along the subject property's entire southern border along White House Road. This trail should be asphalt, a minimum of eight feet wide, and should link to the trail currently being completed in the subdivision to the east. The applicant's revised plan reflects the connection to the existing trail to the east and transitions the trail (after it crosses the entrance road) to the public right-of-way. The entire length of the trail is shown as eight feet wide and is to be constructed as asphalt on the HOA parcel and as concrete in the public right-of-way.

- 5. Transportation - The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the subject application. The subject property consists of approximately 57.12 acres of land in the R-80 zone. The property is located on the north side of White House Road, approximately 1,100 feet east of its intersection with Ritchie Marlboro Road. The applicant proposes a residential subdivision consisting of 155 single-family residences.

The subject application was determined to be sufficient in size to require a traffic study. The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study dated February 2002. The study has been referred to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the

State Highway Administration (SHA). The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by the staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.

#### Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

The traffic study examined the site impact at three intersections in the area:

Ritchie Marlboro Road/Sansbury Road (unsignalized)  
 Ritchie Marlboro Road/White House Road (unsignalized)  
 White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive (unsignalized)

The transportation staff has fully reviewed the traffic study as submitted by the applicant. The existing conditions at the study intersections are summarized below:

EXISTING CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
Ritchie Marlboro Road/Sansbury Road	29.5*	118.9*	--	--
Ritchie Marlboro Road/White House Road	170.3*	25.3*	--	--
White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive	13.0*	13.3*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

Under existing traffic, two of the existing intersections under study operate unacceptably during both peak hours. The *Guidelines* identify signalized intersections operating at LOS E or F during any peak hour as unacceptable. Also, the *Guidelines* identify unsignalized intersections having delays exceeding 50.0 seconds in any movement as unacceptable, and under that criterion both intersections along Ritchie Marlboro Road operate unacceptably as currently configured. Both of these intersections are being widened and signalized under a current capital project.

Staff would note that the traffic study presents critical lane volumes for each intersection. As we have noted in the past, because the intersections are currently unsignalized, all three should be analyzed using the procedures in the *Highway Capacity Manual*, as required by the Planning Board, with only those results reported. The traffic consultant is correct that two of the intersections studied will be signalized as a part of improvements under construction in the area, but the signalized analysis is not indicative of existing conditions.

The traffic study shows approved development in the area. More importantly, there are capital projects in the county and state programs which affect the study area. These projects will include the construction of an interchange at I-95/I-495 and Ritchie Marlboro Road, along with widening and other improvements along the local roadways leading to the new interchange. These projects are currently under construction. The traffic study has adequately accounted for the reassignment of existing traffic and the growth in traffic which would occur as a result of new access to the Capital Beltway. Therefore, background conditions are summarized below:

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
Ritchie Marlboro Road/Sansbury Road	811	749	A	A
Ritchie Marlboro Road/White House Road	884	512	A	A
White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive	34.4*	49.8*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

The site is proposed for development as a residential subdivision. The site is proposed to be developed with 155 single-family detached residences, with access from a new street to White House Road and secondary access via an existing street into the Presidential Heights subdivision to the east. This secondary access point is very important; White House Road is being constructed as an arterial facility with a median, and due to the proximity of the Ritchie Marlboro Road intersection, as it will be realigned, a median break cannot be provided to serve the subject property. To avoid excessive U-turns and weaving along a roadway that will likely become very busy once the current construction is complete, it is very necessary that the subject property have access to Harry S Truman Drive. This connection is necessary for access and to otherwise connect future residents of this subdivision to the greater Largo community and its services. The site trip generation would be 116 AM peak-hour trips (23 in, 93 out) and 139 PM peak-hour trips (91 in, 48 out).

The site trip distribution shown in the traffic study is reasonable, and the assignment fully considers that a portion of site traffic—nearly 50 percent—will utilize Birdie Lane to access Harry S Truman Drive. Birdie Lane was platted and is constructed as a primary residential street in consideration of this function. Using the trip distribution and assignment used in the traffic study, we obtain the following results under total traffic:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS		
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)	Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)

Ritchie Marlboro Road/Sansbury Road	843	773	A	A
Ritchie Marlboro Road/White House Road	918	552	A	A
White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive	40.7*	99.8*	--	--

\*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the *Guidelines*, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.

Under the analysis done, no inadequacy has been identified at the two intersections along Ritchie Marlboro Road within the study area. However, the Prince George's County Planning Board, in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, has defined vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds as an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. The White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive intersection, which is unsignalized now and has no current plans for signalization, operates unacceptably during both peak hours with the development of the subject property, with vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds in both peak hours for minor street left-turn movements from Harry S Truman Drive.

In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal if it is deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency. The warrant study is, in itself, a more detailed study of the adequacy of the existing unsignalized intersection. Therefore, a traffic signal warrant study should be prepared by this applicant in response to the inadequacy noted. This should occur prior to the time of building permit (or prior to Detailed Site Plan review, if a site plan is required for other reasons). If such a study is done, and the applicant is responsible for any warranted improvements, this intersection will operate adequately under future traffic.

DPW&T and SHA comments are attached. DPW&T did not raise any objections to the study, but did require that the applicant provide a left-turn lane along White House Road at its approach to Harry S Truman Drive. In the context of improving general safety at this intersection under total traffic, planning staff believes that this request is justified, and that this improvement should be considered at the time the applicant studies future signal warrants at this intersection. SHA concurred with the recommendations of the traffic study.

Staff believes that this left turn would improve safety at this intersection, but the transportation-related findings in Subtitle 24 are very specific. All subdivisions are analyzed for adequacy in accordance with Section 24-124, and at unsignalized intersections the *Guidelines* identify situations where delays exceeding 50.0 seconds in any movement as unacceptable. Staff reexamined the White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive intersection and determined that minor street left-turns would be the critical movement and that the modification suggested by DPW&T would have no effect on minor street left-turn delay and little impact on overall intersection delay. Safety issues are explicitly a concern under Section 24-125, which applies to commercial and industrial subdivisions only.



By their comments on the traffic study, DPW&T has placed the applicant on notice that they will request an eastbound left-turn lane along White House Road at Harry S Truman Drive. But there is no analysis that indicates such an improvement poses an adequacy issue that the Planning Board should address by means of Section 24-124 or the *Guidelines*.

Concerning a potential traffic signal, staff has found that the White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive intersection will operate acceptably if such a study is done, and the applicant should be responsible for any warranted improvements. A payment of a portion of a warranted signal by the applicant is not appropriate for the following reasons:

1. Payment of a portion of the cost of a signal does not ensure that a signal will be installed if warranted. Unless a signal is installed if warranted, the critical intersection will not operate adequately under future traffic.
2. Staff notes that, with existing traffic, approved development in the area, and a consideration of traffic pattern changes due to a new Beltway interchange, the White House Road/Harry S Truman Drive intersection was determined to operate acceptably. With the addition of the subject property, this intersection would experience unacceptable delays. Therefore, the subject property, and not existing or planned traffic, would trigger the need for the condition.
3. Without a signal warrant study in hand, it is not at all clear how the applicant's traffic will affect actual signal warrants. The applicant's traffic may trigger one or two warrants, and a signal may need to be installed to serve the applicant's traffic that would not have been otherwise necessary.

At this time, the applicant has sufficient time if the 70-day review period is waived to prepare a signal warrant study, get it reviewed, and obtain DPW&T concurrence with a means of sharing the cost of the signal. If a signal is deemed to be warranted and DPW&T recommends that the applicant should fund a portion of a signal, this fact can be considered by the Planning Board along with other relevant traffic data. The subject property is proposed to contain 155 residences. The full cost of the study and the signal would be no more than \$600 to \$700 per residence. No other off-site transportation improvements have been recommended by staff.

White House Road is shown on the master plan as an arterial facility, and adequate right-of-way exists to accommodate the master plan recommendations. No further right-of-way dedication is required by this plan. No lot should have direct driveway access to White House Road.

Staff was originally concerned about the adequacy of the 50-foot rights-of-way along particular streets within the subdivision. However, the plan has been modified, and all internal street widths are acceptable.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with the conditions contained in the recommendation section of this report.

6. Schools - The Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of public facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and the *Adequate Public Facilities Regulations for Schools* (CR-23-2001).

Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

Affected School Clusters #	Dwelling Units	Pupil Yield Factor	Subdivision Enrollment	Actual Enrollment	Completion Enrollment	Wait Enrollment	Cumulative Enrollment	Total Enrollment	State-Rated Capacity	Percent Capacity	Funded School
Elementary School Cluster 2	155 sfd	0.24	37.20	7114	224	36	6.96	7418.16	6435	115.28%	Lake Arbor
Middle School Cluster 2	155 sfd	0.06	9.30	4397	201	189	1.74	4798.04	3648	131.53%	East Central
High School Cluster 2	155 sfd	0.12	18.60	12045	412	377	3.48	12856.08	10811	118.92%	Frederick Douglass addn.

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2002

The affected elementary, middle, and high school cluster capacity are greater than 105%. Lake Arbor is the funded school in the affected elementary school cluster. East Central is the funded school in the affected middle school cluster. The Frederick Douglass addition is the funded school in the affected high school cluster. Therefore, this subdivision can be approved with a three-year waiting period.

7. Fire and Rescue - The Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of public fire and rescue facilities.
- The existing fire engine service at Ritchie Fire Station, Company 37, located at 1415 Ritchie Marlboro Road has a service response time of 3.12 minutes, which is within the 5.25-minute response time guideline.
  - The existing ambulance service at Kentland Fire Station, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South has a service response time of 6.25 minutes, which is within the 6.25-minute response time guideline for Block A Lots 1-14; Block B Lots 85-95; Block C Lots 1-11, 15-29; Block D Lots 1-4, 16,17. All other Lots are beyond.
  - The existing paramedic service at Kentland Fire Station, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South has a service response time of 6.86 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

These findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*. The existing ambulance service located at Kentland, Company 46, is beyond the recommended response time guideline for part of the subdivision. The nearest fire station Ritchie, Company 37, is located at 1415 Ritchie Marlboro Road, which is 3.12 minutes from

the development. This facility would be within the recommended response time for ambulance service.

8. Police Facilities - The proposed development is within the service area for District II- Bowie. In accordance with Section 24-122.1 (c) (1) (A) and (B) of the Subdivision Regulations of Prince George's County, the staff concludes that the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Beall Property development. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision.
9. Health Department - The Division of Environmental Health reviewed the subject application and offered comments primarily relating to the existing structure and well on the property that need to be removed. The recommendation section of this report contains conditions addressing those concerns. In a memorandum dated April 11, 2002, the Division of Environmental Health offered no comments on the Geo-tech report and the Conceptual Stormwater Management Approval Letter.
10. Stormwater Management - The Department of Environmental Resources (DER), Development Services Division, approved the Stormwater Management Concept Plan (#645-2002-00) on February 6, 2002. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan.
11. Public Utility Easement - The proposed preliminary plan depicts the required 10-foot-wide public utility easement. This easement will be included on the final plat.

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCP I/11/02, shall be revised as follows:
  - A. Eliminate the use of areas less than 35 feet in width from counting toward meeting the requirements.
  - B. Eliminate woodland conservation on lots less than 20,000 square feet in size. If, at time of TCPII review, woodland conservation areas can be preserved on lots of less than 20,000 square feet and meet all of the other requirement and policies of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, then these areas may be counted toward meeting the requirements.
3. Eliminate the use of fee-in-lieu to meet the requirements. Woodland conservation that cannot be met on site shall be met at an off-site location to be determined at time of TCPII review.
4. Revise the worksheet to show how the Woodland Conservation Ordinance requirements will be met.

5. Revise plans to show specimen trees and provide a table listing the size, species, condition and disposition of specimen trees.
2. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP I/11/02). 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 (TCP I/11/02), 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.●
3. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.
4. No lot shall have direct driveway access onto White House Road.
5. Prior to the approval of the initial building permit on the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to DPW&T and, if necessary, SHA for the intersection of White House Road and Harry S Truman Drive. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If the signal at that intersection is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal and/or other improvements prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install the signal at a time when directed by the appropriate permitting agency.
6. No building permits shall be issued for this subdivision until the percent capacity, as adjusted pursuant to the school regulations, at all the affected school clusters are less than or equal to 105 percent or three years have elapsed since the time of the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision; or pursuant to the terms of an executed school facilities agreement where by the subdivision applicant, to avoid a waiting period, agrees with the County Executive and County Council to construct or secure funding for construction of all or part of a school to advance capacity.
7. A stormwater management concept plan shall be approved by the Department of Environmental Resources prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan.
8. Prior to approval of the final plat of subdivision any abandoned well must be backfilled and sealed in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.04.04.

At the time of final plat, Parcel ■E● shall be conveyed to M-NCPPC subject to the following provisions:

- a. An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed, (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), along with the Final Plat.
  - b. The M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed, including but not limited to, sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges prior to and subsequent to Final Plat.
  - c. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.
  - d. The land to be conveyed shall not be disturbed or filled in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). If the land is to be disturbed, the DPR shall require that a performance bond be posted to warrant restoration, repair or improvements made necessary or required by M-NCPPC development approval process. The bond or other suitable financial guarantee (suitability to be judged by the General Counsel's Office, M-NCPPC) shall be submitted to DPR within two weeks prior to applying for grading permits.
  - e. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC, the DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.
  - f. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. The DPR shall inspect the site and verify that it is in an acceptable condition for conveyance, prior to Final Plat approval.
  - g. No stormwater management facilities, or tree conservation or utility easements shall be proposed on lands owned by or to be conveyed to M-NCPPC without the prior written consent of DPR. DPR shall review and approve the location and/or design of these features. If such proposals are approved by the DPR, a performance bond and an easement agreement may be required prior to the issuance of grading permits.
9. The applicant shall construct the recreational facilities on adjacent Greenwood Manor Community Park which including the following:

- a. 22-foot-wide access road to park property
  - b. 10-space parking lot
  - c. Playground for ages 5-12 (a minimum of 5,000 square feet)
  - d. six-foot-wide asphalt accessible path from parking lot to play area and picnic area.
  - e. Picnic table
  - f. Trash receptacle
- 10. The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the applicable standards in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
  - 11. Detailed construction drawings for recreational facilities on park property including grading plan, sections, equipment and landscaping schedules shall be submitted to DPR for review and approval prior to submission of application for grading permit.
  - 12. Submission of three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) to DPR for approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
  - 13. Submission to DPR of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee to secure construction of the recreational facilities on park property, in an amount to be determined by DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
  - 14. Unless otherwise mutually agreed to by the applicant and M-NCPPC, the construction of the recreational facilities shall be completed prior to the 100<sup>th</sup> building permit.
  - 15. The section of the access road to the park property adjoining residential lots shall be constructed and landscaping along the road shall be installed prior to application for the building permit for Lots 73 and 74.
  - 16. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall construct the master plan trail to be handicap-accessible and ADA compatible. The trail shall be assured dry passage. If wet areas must be traversed, suitable structures such as bridging or boardwalk

shall be constructed. The trail shall also be free of all above ground utilities, street trees, and landscaping.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF TYPE I TREE CONSERVATION PLAN I/11/02 and THE VARIATION SECTION 24-130 OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.