The 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.*

Preliminary Plan 4-05125

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: **POPLAR RIDGE**	Date Accepted:	03/3/06
	Planning Board Action Limit:	07/22/06
	Plan Acreage:	23.23
Location: South side of Central Avenue, approximately 3,500 feet east of US 301.	Zone:	R-A
	Lots:	5
	Parcels:	0
Applicant/Address: David-James Builder 3203 Farmington Drive Chevy Chase, MD. 20815	Planning Area:	74B
	Tier:	Rural
	Council District:	04
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	201NE15

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-58-2003)	12/4/2005
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed:	06/13/2006

Staff Recommendation		**Staff Reviewer: Ivy R. Thompson**	
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 4-06125
Poplar Ridge, Lots 1-5

OVERVIEW

Located on Tax Map 70, Grid F-3, the subject property is currently known as Parcel 75. The property is a 23.25-acre irregularly shaped rectangle parcel located in the R-A Zone. There is currently an existing driveway that runs from the main road and continues to the rear off the site crossing the stream via an existing culvert pipe. It is undeveloped and wooded. The applicant proposes to develop the property with a five-lot subdivision. Access to four of the lots will be via a private access drive and access to the remaining lot will be directly on to Central Avenue. All of the lots are proposed for single-family detached units. The subject application was previously reviewed as 4-04207 and 4-04103, which were both withdrawn.

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 for informational purposes.

SETTING

Located in the Rural Tier, the subject property is located along the south edge of Central Avenue (MD 214), approximately 3,500 feet east of US 301.All abutting properties are also zoned R-A. Most are wooded with single-family detached dwelling units on the parcels.

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-A	R-A
Use(s)	Residential	Residential
Acreage	23.23	23.23
Lots	0	5
Outlots	0	0
Parcels	1	0
Dwelling Units:	0	5
Public Safety Mitigation Fee		Yes

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 March 3, 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, Bowie, Company 43, using the Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George's County Fire 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 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 March 3, 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, 2006, February 1, 2006, March 5, 2006, and March 28, 2006). The data presented in these four memorandums varies 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 STAFFING LEVELS PURSUANT TO SECTION 24-122.01(e) OF THE SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS.