

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.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm)*

## PRELIMINARY PLAN

**4-02028**

Application	General Data
Project Name:  PIETANZA WOODS	Date Accepted 4/09/2002
	Planning Board Action Limit 6/17/2002
Location:  Southeast side of Brooke road, approximately 2000 feet south of the intersection of Central Avenue (MD 214) and Suffolk Avenue.	Tax Map & Grid 73 A-3
	Plan Acreage 7.6
	Zone R-55
	Lots 30
Applicant/Address:  Joseph Pietanza 808 Montrose Road Laurel Md 20707	Parcels 0
	Planning Area 75
	Council District 07
	Municipality N/A
	200-Scale Base Map 202SE5

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 07/10/02
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A
Staff Recommendation	
Staff Reviewer: Whitney Chellis	
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 Subdivision Plan 4-02028  
Pietanza Woods, Lots 1 - 11 Block A, Lots 1 - 17 Block B and Outlots A, B, and C

OVERVIEW

The proposed subdivision consists of approximately 7.62 acres of land in the R-55 Zone. The subject property is located on Tax Map 73 in Grid A-3 and is known as Parcels 173 and 175, never having been the subject of a record plat. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the property into 28 single-family dwelling unit lots for conventional development in the R-55 Zone. All of the proposed lots meet or exceed the 6,500-square-foot minimum lot size required in the R-55 Zone.

On September 28, 1995, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95039 (PGCPB Resolution #95-336) for 30 lots on the subject property, which subsequently expired. Prior to that expiration, the Planning Board, on October 19, 1995, approved a request for the reconsideration of the preliminary plan submitted by the applicant. The request was submitted after a detailed boundary survey of the subject property discovered that a gravel road, once believed to be located on the adjacent property to the south, was in fact located on the subject property. In order to address the location of the private road and the appropriate designation for the land on which it was located, the applicant requested the reconsideration in order to submit a revised layout for the subdivision.

The revised preliminary plan contained the 30 lots originally approved by the Planning Board. The plan also showed the location of the existing 20-foot-wide right-of-way (recorded Liber 54, Folio 5778) along the south portion of the property. The easement which crosses Parcel 175 serves four properties including the subject property. The preliminary plan was revised to contain the right-of-way within three outlots along the south property line. Outlot A is approximately 1,086 square feet, Outlot B is approximately 2,028 square feet, and Outlot C is approximately 5,027 square feet. The applicant intended, and still intends, to convey the outlots to the adjoining owners for which the easement serves. At the time of review of the reconsideration, the adjoining property owners had some concerns that their property tax may increase. Because the properties being conveyed were to be outlots and unbuildable, any tax increase may be minimal. However, if the adjoining property owners refused to accept the outlots, it was determined that the land could be conveyed to the abutting properties within the proposed subdivision.

The layout of the preliminary plan was also revised at that time in that a cul-de-sac, which was originally shown at the end of Street A, was eliminated and the internal road was stubbed at the eastern property line abutting Parcel 176. The only means of access to Parcel 176 is via the 20-foot private right-of-way along the south property line of Parcel 175. Parcel 176 has no public road frontage. The provision of a public road connection was to, and still would, facilitate any future subdivision and development of Parcel 176 if the property owner so decided.

Section 24-104(a)(4) of the Subdivision Regulations encourages the most beneficial relationship between properties for the circulation of traffic, having particular regard for the avoidance of congestion on the streets and highways and to provide for appropriate locations and widths of streets. Even though the

abutting property is not ■landlocked,• because access is provided via the 20-foot- ingress and egress easement, any potential circulation of traffic for future development of Parcel 176 would benefit under this proposal. Parcel 176 is four acres and is improved with a single-family dwelling unit.

On September 28, 1995, at the public hearing for the reconsideration, residents within the immediate area of the proposed subdivision testified regarding their concerns about the views of the development from their properties, buffering/screening, noise, speeding and sight distances on Brooke Road. The Planning Board adopted several conditions to address their concerns. Those conditions include a requirement for the review of a Detailed Site Plan, a board-on-board fence along a portion of the site's boundary, and a site distance study approved by the Department of Public Works and Transportation. All of these conditions of development have been incorporated into this recommendation and are contained in the condition section of this report.

On September 4, 1997, prior to the expiration of the preliminary plan, the Planning Board approved a Detailed Site Plan (DSP-97023) as required by the condition of the preliminary plan of subdivision. Entering into the hearing for the DSP, the applicant had a proposal for 30 lots. At the hearing, concerns regarding the dwellings at the entrance to the subdivision were discussed. The site plan provided no visual, physical or spatial buffering between Brooke Road and the subdivision. Further, the original DSP oriented dwellings with access onto Brooke Road, which is curved at this location. This portion of Brooke Road was noted at that time as having had common occurrences of vehicular accidents. In addition, the applicant had deficiencies in on-site tree conservation. In order to address all of these issues the Planning Board required a revision to the DSP prior to certificate approval that the first two lots at the entrance would be combined with the abutting lots within the subdivision. The preliminary plan submitted with this application incorporates this recommendation and proposes 28 lots in lieu of the 30 originally approved with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95039.

It was the applicant's intent to take into consideration the previous review and approval of this site, as well as to take into consideration the community concerns that were brought forward through the public hearing process on both the preliminary plan and the subsequent detailed site plan. The subject application incorporates those recommendations with the exception of removing the lots which abut Parcel 176. The Planning Board, in the review and approval of DSP-97023, also required that those lots abutting Parcel 176 be incorporated into the abutting lots for the purpose of increasing the on-site tree conservation. The subject application has revised the tree conservation proposal to remove the need for additional on-site preservation as further demonstrated in Finding 1 of this report.

#### SETTING

The subject property is located on the east side of Brooke Road, approximately 800 feet south of its intersection with Highview Place. To the west of the site, across Brooke Road, is Brooke Recreation Center owned by M-NCPPC. To the east of the site are single-family dwelling units and townhomes on the R-55 and R-T zones, respectively. Single-family dwelling units in the R-55 Zone are also located to the south of the site fronting Brooke Road.

#### FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. Environmental●The subject property was originally reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section in 1995 as part of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95039 and subsequently in 1997 as part of the review of Detailed Site Plan SP-97023, both of which were approved. The Preliminary Plan as

proposed is a modification of previously approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-95039. This site has an approved Conceptual Stormdrain Plan #8012030-1995-01.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. Text from a previously approved Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) and the revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/95-01) were submitted as part of this application. The FSD as submitted has been determined to meet the minimum requirements for acceptance. The Environmental Planning Section is recommending approval of TCPI/25/95-01 for the subject site.

The revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/25/95-01 was reviewed and found to require some minor revisions. The worksheet on the revised plan does not reflect the changes made to the originally submitted preliminary plan and it includes preservation and reforestation acreages that are not reflected on the plan drawing.

The minimum woodland requirement for the site is 1.52 acres of the net tract. Additionally, 2.88 acres were shown on the July 1, 2002, version of the TCPI as required due to the removal of woodlands, for a total of 4.40 acres. The plan has been redesigned to preserve more woodland, but the calculations were not changed. In addition, there are areas that could be counted toward the requirements for woodland conservation, mainly on the rear of lot 8, the rears of lots 13, 14, and 17 in Block B, and small portions of the areas on Lot 1, Block A, and Lot 1, Block B. The plan was also not signed by the qualified professional before the changes were made.

Based on aerial photographic observation and site visits, the site is predominantly wooded. The site is characterized with gradually rolling terrain and drains into unnamed tributaries within the Anacostia watershed. There are no streams, nontidal wetlands, floodplain, or Waters of the US associated with the site. According to the sewer service and water service maps produced by DER, the sewer and water service categories are S-3 and W-3.

The predominant soil types on-site are Collington, Adelphia, Marr and Sassafra. These soil types generally exhibit slight-to-moderate limitations to development due to impeded drainage, seasonally high water table, and steep slopes. There are no erodible soils, or rare/threatened/endangered species located on or in the vicinity of this property. There are no noise issues associated with the proposal. There are no Marlboro clay outcrops or scenic or historic roads affected by this proposal.

2. Community Planning - The subject property is within the limits of the 1985 *Approved Master Plan for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity* and is in Planning Area 75B in the Capitol Heights Community. The 2000 *Interim General Plan* locates this property in the Developed Tier. The 1986 *Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity*, Planning Areas 75A and 75B, rezoned this property with other adjoining properties from the R-R to the R-55 Zone.

The 1985 *Approved Master Plan for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity* recommends that the subject property be developed for Medium Suburban residential development. The proposed subdivision is consistent with that recommendation. The living areas chapter of the master plan outlines several guidelines that were evaluated and taken into consideration as appropriate in the review of the proposed subdivision.

3. Parks and Recreation In accordance with Section 24-134(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, the Park Planning and Development Division recommends that the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu of the requirement for the mandatory dedication of parkland because the land available for dedication is unsuitable due to its size and location.
4. Trails There are no master plan trail issues associated with this application. However, a standard sidewalk is recommended along the subject property's frontage of Brooke Road and along both sides of all internal roads.
5. Transportation The subject property consists of approximately 7.62 acres of land in the R-55 Zone. The property is located on the east side of Brooke Road, approximately 3,500 feet north of its intersection with Rollins Avenue. The applicant proposes a residential subdivision consisting of 28 single-family residences.

No traffic study was requested of the applicant. Traffic counts in the area conducted in April 1999 were available for use. These traffic counts were factored upward by one percent per year to approximate current conditions. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these and other relevant 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*.

The subject property is located within the Developed Tier, as defined in the Adopted General Plan for Prince George's County. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better.

Unsignalized intersections: The *Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. 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 (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

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

Brooke Road/Rollins Avenue (four-way unsignalized)  
Walker Mill Road/Rollins Avenue (signalized)

The existing conditions at the study intersections are summarized below:

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

Brooke Road and Rollins Avenue	13.9*	13.0*	--	--
Walker Mill Road and Rollins Avenue	730	656	A	A
*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, the two intersections under study operate acceptably during both peak hours.

Staff has identified eight approved developments in the area. The included developments are: Holy Cross PBS Church, a 38,500-square-foot church; Greater Capitol Heights (east and west), a total of 195 residences; Spaulding Heights (north and south), a total of 70 residences; and Walker Mill Business Park (blocks A, B, and C), a total of 705,740 square feet of light service industrial. Regional traffic growth of 0.3 percent per year over three years is included. Background conditions are summarized below:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
Brooke Road and Rollins Avenue	14.8*	13.8*	--	--
Walker Mill Road and Rollins Avenue	817	741	A	A
*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 28 single-family detached residences. The site trip generation would be 21 AM peak-hour trips (4 in, 17 out) and 25 PM peak-hour trips (17 in, 8 out). The site has been analyzed with the following trip distribution:

North along Brooke Road:	30 percent
North along Rollins Avenue:	5 percent
East along Walker Mill Road:	45 percent
West along Walker Mill Road:	20 percent

Using the trip distribution and assignment described above, we obtain the following results under total traffic:

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

Brooke Road and Rollins Avenue	15.1*	14.2*	--	--
Walker Mill Road and Rollins Avenue	826	752	A	A
*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 the analysis done, no inadequacy has been identified at the two intersections within the study area. This indicates that no off-site transportation conditions would be required for the approval of the subject property.

Transportation staff originally had a concern about the 50-foot right-of-way street crossing the property and stubbing into the property to the east. Without a development plan for that adjacent property, it is difficult to know how much traffic could be using the street within the subject property and if there is a need for a wider right-of-way (and, accordingly, a wider street). Staff has since learned that the adjacent property has environmental features that could limit the development potential of that site. Therefore, staff sees no basis to require the wider right-of-way.

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 Subdivision Regulations if the application is approved.

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) and concluded that the subdivision is exempt from the APF test for schools because it is located in the Developed Tier as identified in the 2000 *Interim General Plan*.
7. Fire and Rescue•The Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of fire and rescue facilities and concluded the following:
  - a. The existing fire engine service at Capitol Heights Fire Station, Company 5, located at 6061 Central Avenue, has a service response time of 2.00 minutes, which is within the 5.25-minute response time guideline.
  - b. The existing ambulance service at Capitol Heights Fire Station, Company 5, located at 6061 Central Avenue, has a service response time of 2.00 minutes, which is within the 6.25-minute response time guideline.
  - c. The existing paramedic service at Silver Hill Fire Station, Company 29, located at 3900 Silver Hill Road has a service response time of 6.74 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

The above 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 proposed subdivision will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance and paramedic services.

8. Police Facilities●The proposed development is within the service area for Police District III-Landover. In accordance with Section 24-122.1(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Pietanza Woods development. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision.
9. Health Department●The Health Department has no issues relating to the proposed subdivision. However, the Health Department notes that if any abandoned wells are found on the property, they will be required to be pumped, backfilled and/or sealed in accordance with COMAR 26.04.04 by a licenced well driller or witnessed by a representative of the Health Department prior to final plat.
10. Stormwater Management●The Department of Environmental Resources (DER), Development Services Division, has determined that on-site stormwater management is not required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, #8012030-1995-01, has been approved with conditions to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan.
11. Detailed Site Plan●As discussed in the overview section of this report, staff is recommending that a Detailed Site Plan be required to address views from other properties, buffering and screening.

#### RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/25/95-01 shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect the changes to the amount of woodland cleared and whether or not credit will be requested for on-site preservation and reforestation.
  - b. Revise the TCPI to show the areas to be counted toward meeting the requirements for preservation and/or reforestation on-site, if any. Shade and label the areas with the appropriate acreage.
  - c. Revise Note 4 to read \$1.50 per square foot for the mitigation fee.
  - d. Have the TCPI signed and dated by a qualified professional after the revisions are made.
2. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved in conjunction with the Detailed Site Plan
3. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/95-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:

■Development is subject to restriction shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/25/95-01), 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 and Subtitle 25.●

3. The Type II TCP shall design those areas closest to Brook Road for the preservation of as much woodland as possible between Brook Road and dwellings on Lot 1, Block A and Lot 1, Block B.
4. Prior to the approval of the final plat of subdivision, a Detailed Site Plan (DSP) shall be approved by the Planning Board.
5. The Detailed Site Plan shall show, if appropriate for buffering, a six-foot-high, board-on-board fence along the site's boundary adjacent to Parcel 174, Parcel 1, Parcel 302 and Parcel 187, as delineated on the approved preliminary plan.
6. The applicant, his heirs, successors and /or assignees shall provide a sight-distance study for the site entrance at Brooke Drive to be approved at the time of review of the Detailed Site Plan, if determined to be necessary by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.
7. Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan #8012030-1995-01.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF TYPE I TREE CONSERVATION PLAN TCPI/25/95-01.