



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

Preliminary Plan

4-06018

Application	General Data
Project Name: GHOUSE PROPERTY Location: Northeast side of Surratts Road at the intersection with Moores Lane. Applicant/Address: Tristate Development & Construction, Inc. 14100 Sullyfield Circle, Suite 250 Chantilly, VA. 20151	Date Accepted: 03/24/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: 09/11/06
	Plan Acreage: 9.13
	Zone: R-R
	Lots: 14
	Parcel: 1
	Planning Area: 81A
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 09
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 214SE07

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
RESIDENTIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 02/23/06 (CB-58-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 06/27/06

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 4-06018
Ghouse Property Lots 1-14 and Parcel A

OVERVIEW

Located on Tax Map 126, Grid A-2, the subject property consists of approximately 9.13 acres of land that is currently underdeveloped. Two parcels, Parcel 92 and Parcel 35, form the property that is zoned R-R and is shaped like an arrowhead. The proposal is to develop the property into a 14-lot subdivision. All of the lots are proposed for single-family dwelling residences and one parcel for a stormwater management pond, all fronting on, and with access to, a cul-de-sac extending from Surratts Road across from Moores Lane.

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

Located in the developing tier, the subject property is situated along the northeast side of Surratts Road at its intersection with Moores Lane and consists of approximately 9.13 acres of land. Abutting properties north, south and west of the subject property are also zoned R-R. Abutting properties east of the subject property are zoned R-E. Most of the surrounding properties are developed with single-family detached dwelling units.

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
Use(s)	Residential	Residential
Acreage	9.13	9.13
Lots	0	14
Outlots	0	0
Parcels	2	1
Dwelling Units:	0	14
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 24, 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 Clinton, Company 25, 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 February 8, 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.