



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Preliminary Plan 4-03094

Application	General Data
Project Name: BALK HILL VILLAGE Location: North side of MD 202 (Landover Road), approximately 2,500 feet northwest of the intersection of Campus Way North and Lottsford Road. Applicant/Address: D.R. Horton, Inc. 1370 Piccard Drive, Suite #230 Rockville, MD. 20850	Date Accepted: 09/03/03
	Planning Board Action Limit: 03/02/03
	Plan Acreage: 125.4
	Zone: M-X-T
	Lots: 393
	Parcels: 9
	Planning Area: 73
	Council District: 05
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 203NE08&09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
MIXED-USE SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners: (CB-15-1998) N/A
	Previous Parties of Record: (CB-13-1997) N/A
	Sign(s) Posted on Site: 01/14/04
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners: N/A

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Del Balzo	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
		X	

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03094
Balk Hill

OVERVIEW

The subject property consists of approximately 125.4 acres in the M-X-T Zone. It is undeveloped and wooded. The applicant proposes to subdivide the property into 393 lots for single-family residences and nine parcels, two of which are proposed for commercial use.

The property is subject to prior approvals. Zoning Map Amendment A-9956 was approved by the District Council in 2002, and Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03001 was approved by the Planning Board in 2003. The proposed preliminary plan is in general conformance with the requirements of these approvals.

On January 6, 2004, staff received a draft memorandum from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). In it, DPW&T raised the following issues (among others):

- **The referenced property is located at the north side of Landover Road (MD Route 202), approximately 2,500 feet northwest of the intersection of Campus Way North and Lottsford Road. St. Joseph Drive is a County-maintained roadway, classified as a collector roadway. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements, along St. Joseph Drive, in accordance with DPW&T's Specifications and Standards, are required. MD 202 is a State-maintained roadway. Coordination with the State Highway Administration is necessary.**
- **St. Joseph Drive is a Collector Roadway. No parking is permitted on Collector Roadways. Therefore, the developer shall provide adequate parking for the residential and commercial development.**
- **The centerline radius for several roads within the proposed subdivision does not meet the latest DPW&T standards. Therefore, it needs to be approved by the Director of Public Works. Additionally, the proposed roundabout on St. Joseph Drive has to be reviewed and approved by the Director of Public Works.**

Upon receipt of this memorandum, staff forwarded the information to the applicant's engineer and attorney to notify them that the application could not be approved if it did not meet DPW&T roadway standards. While a condition prohibiting parking on St. Joseph's Drive could be imposed, its effect on the lotting pattern is unknown. More importantly, the possible need to redesign the internal streets to increase the centerline radius may prove even more problematic. Staff cannot recommend approval of a subdivision that does not meet that standard. The resulting change in lotting pattern and road configuration leads to too unpredictable an outcome.

The applicant has had meetings with the Department of Public Works and Transportation regarding this issue, but it is yet unresolved. Staff recommended to the applicant that a hearing date not be set until the issue was resolved. However, the applicant insisted on a January 29, 2004, hearing date; in fact, the applicant had at first requested a January 8 hearing date. Staff would have preferred these unresolved DPW&T issues to be addressed prior to posting of public notice on the site and at the latest, prior to the release of this staff report. However, at the applicant's insistence, the case is now scheduled for hearing on January 29, 2004 and the property has been posted. Because the issues are unresolved, staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of this application at this time.

SETTING

The property is located along both sides of the proposed extension of St. Joseph's Drive and on the north side of the proposed extension of Campus Way and is approximately one-half mile north of the existing Campus Way/Lottsford Road intersection. It is bordered on the west by the Town of Glenarden and on the north, east and south by existing subdivisions in the Largo-Lottsford area. The site has road frontage and is accessed via Campus Way North and St. Josephs Drive. To the north are the residential communities of Ladova Heights (R-80 and R-R), Bellehaven Estates (R-S), and Enterprise Forest (R-80). To the southwest is undeveloped land (I-3). To the southeast is Tartan South (R-S). To the east is undeveloped land in the M-X-T Zone (approved Preliminary Plan 4-02016, Balk Hill Phase I).

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

1. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Uses	Vacant	Residential and Commercial
Acreage	125.4	125.4
Lots	0	393
Parcels	2	9
Detached Dwelling Units	0	393
Commercial Square Footage	0	261,360

2. **Transportation**—The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated November 2003 and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. The study was referred to the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA).

Growth Policy - Service Level Standards

The subject property is in the Developing Tier, as defined in the 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) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better is required in the Developing Tier.

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.

At this time, the Development Review Division is in receipt of comments from DPW&T regarding the layout, typical sections of internal public streets, and horizontal alignments of internal public streets. These comments will greatly affect the layout of the subdivision and should be fully addressed prior to Planning Board approval. **Neither the Planning Board nor the planning staff has the authority to grant waivers from the county road standards.** As such, although the traffic study has been reviewed and appears to pose few significant issues from the standpoint of adequacy, the Transportation Planning Section cannot provide a conclusion regarding this development and its approvability under the law; therefore, staff cannot recommend approval of the subject application at this time. Once the deficiencies in the current subdivision plan are corrected or DPW&T grants waivers to allow the current plan to proceed, a more thorough review of the traffic study will be provided.

3. **Other Issues**—Other findings, including environmental impacts, parks and recreation, master plan conformance, schools, fire and rescue, police and stormwater management, can be made for a future public hearing. The final action date for this application is Thursday, February 26, 2004.

RECOMMENDATION

DISAPPROVAL, based on unresolved issues.