



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

Preliminary Plan 4-05119

Application	General Data
Project Name: LYNN'S COVE Location: East side of Bealle Hill Road, just south of its intersection with Accokeek Road. Applicant/Address: Khan, Nazim & Cathy 16045 Accolawn Road Accokeek, MD. 20607	Date Accepted: 02/07/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: 06/27/06
	Plan Acreage: 2.2
	Zone: R-R
	Lots: 4
	Parcels: 0
	Planning Area: 84
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 09
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 221SE01

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 11/17/06 (CB-58-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 05/16/06

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Tom Lockard	
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 4-05119
Lynn's Cove, Lots 1-4

OVERVIEW

The site contains approximately 2.2 acres of land in the R-R Zone. It is Lot 2 of the Cedar Lawn subdivision (Plat Book 04, Plat 81), which was recorded in 1937. The applicant is proposing to subdivide the site into four lots, two of which (Lots 2 and 3) are flag lots. Access to each of the lots will be from the east side of Bealle Hill Road.

At the writing of this staff report, in accordance with Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application, as discussed further in Finding 2 of this report, due to inadequate Fire Department staffing levels. The referral comments received to date are attached for informational purposes.

SETTING

The site is located on the east side of Bealle Hill Road, just south of its intersection with Accokeek Road. The site is undeveloped and predominately wooded. The surrounding properties are zoned R-R and are developed with single-family residences.

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	R-R	R-R
Uses	Vacant	Single-Family Residences
Acreage	2.2	2.2
Lots	1	4
Parcels	0	0
Outlots	0	0
Dwelling Units	0	4
Public Safety Mitigation Fee		No

2. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)-(E) of the Subdivision Ordinance. The subject application was accepted on February 7, 2006.

The Prince George's County Planning Department has determined that this preliminary plan is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station, Accokeek, Company 24, using the Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.

The Fire Chief report for adequate equipment is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states that the "...Department has adequate equipment and has developed an equipment replacement program to meet all the service delivery needs for all areas of the County."

The Fire Chief report for current staffing for the Fire/EMS Department is contained in a memorandum dated March 28, 2006. That memorandum states that the number of "net operational employees" is 672, which equates to 96.97 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel.

As previously noted, the subject application was accepted on February 7, 2006. Section 24-122.01(e)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations states: "If any of the required statements in this Subsection are not provided that meet the criteria specified in this Section on the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three (3) monthly cycles of response time reports, then the Planning Board may not approve the preliminary pla[n] until a mitigation plan between the applicant and the County is entered into and filed with the Planning Board."

One key element to the ordinance language cited above is the creation of a window for the application of the fire and rescue adequacy test that runs from "...the date the application is accepted by the Planning Board or within the following three (3) monthly cycles of response time reports...." This means that an application is afforded the opportunity to pass the test in a time frame that spans approximately 90 days. With regard to data on fire and rescue staffing levels prior to the receipt of the March 28, 2006, letter from the Fire Chief, some clarity needs to be provided.

Since January 1, 2006 (the beginning of the time frame when the standard of 100 percent of the authorized strength of 692 fire and rescue personnel must be met), staff has received four memorandums from the Fire Chief (January 1, February 1, March 5, and March 28, 2006). The data presented in these four memorandums vary in the description of the personnel being counted as applicable to the percentage of the authorized strength standard. Although the number of personnel presented varies only slightly (694, 694, 696 and 693, respectively), the description of the status of these personnel has changed or been clarified from memorandum to memorandum.

It seems clear to staff that since the beginning of 2006, each reporting of personnel has included certain numbers of trainees and/or recruits that were not intended to be considered applicable to the minimum percentage requirement. This becomes apparent when comparing the January 1 and February 1 memorandums. Both reflect a total authorized strength of 694 personnel, but the February 1 memorandum identifies 46 members of that complement in the training academy. The March 5 memorandum does not provide a breakdown of the 696 personnel total, but the March 28 memorandum identifies 21 recruits as part of the "actual total strength" of 693.

Given the totality of the information identified above, staff concludes that since the acceptance of the subject application, the minimum staffing level for fire and rescue personnel, as required by Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)(ii), has not been met. Therefore, pursuant to Section 24-122.01(e)(2), staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application at this point in time.

RECOMMENDATION:

DISAPPROVAL DUE TO INADEQUATE FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICES PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-122.01(e) OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.