



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*

## Preliminary Plan 4-11018

Application	General Data	
<b>Project Name:</b> Parkside Preserve  <b>Location:</b> North side of Springfield Road, at the Springfield Road and Good Luck Road intersection.  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> K & P Springfield Road, LLC 13627 Annapolis Road Bowie, MD 20720  <b>Property Owner:</b> K & P Springfield Road, LLC 13627 Annapolis Road Bowie, MD 20720	Planning Board Hearing Date:	11/10/11
	Staff Report Date:	10/27/11
	Date Accepted:	08/15/11
	Planning Board Action Limit:	11/15/11
	Mandatory Action Timeframe:	70-day
	Plan Acreage:	5.03
	Zone:	R-R
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
	Lots:	8
	Parcels:	0
	Planning Area:	71A
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	04
	Election District	14
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	211NE10

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
To subdivide two parcels into eight residential lots for single-family dwellings.	Informational Mailing	07/01/11
	Acceptance Mailing:	05/09/11
	Sign Posting Deadline:	10/11/11

<b>Staff Recommendation</b>		<b>Staff Reviewer:</b> Quynn Nguyen <b>Phone Number:</b> 301-780-2465 <b>E-mail:</b> Quynn.Nguyen@ppd.mncppc.org	
<b>APPROVAL</b>	<b>APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS</b>	<b>DISAPPROVAL</b>	<b>DISCUSSION</b>
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-11018  
Parkside Preserve, Lots 1-8

OVERVIEW

The subject site is located on Tax Map 28 in Grid D-3 and is known as Parcels 40 and 41. The property consists of 5.03 acres within the Rural-Residential (R-R) Zone and is currently improved with a single-family dwelling and shed, which are to be razed. Parcels 40 and 41 are acreage parcels which have never been the subject of a record plat. The applicant is proposing to subdivide Parcels 40 and 41 into eight residential lots for single-family dwellings.

The site is within the limits of the 2006 *Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B*, which retained the property in the R-R Zone. The eight lots proposed range in lot size from 20,100 square feet to 23,246 square feet and meet the minimum lot size requirement of the R-R Zone of 20,000 square feet. All of the proposed lots are in conformance with the standards for conventional development in the R-R Zone.

The property has frontage on Springfield Road, which is a master plan collector roadway and is designated as a historic road in the site. The site will be subjected to the required buffer along a historic road as stated in Section 4.6 of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. The applicant will be dedicating approximately 54,580 square feet including the frontage along Springfield Road and the proposed internal roadway, Springpark Court. The applicant is proposing to serve the lots via a dedicated public street extending northeast into the site from Springfield Road. Direct access from the lots to Springfield Road is not proposed or recommended.

The property contains no regulated environmental features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The property is subject to the provision of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, which is discussed further in the Environmental section of this report. The property is located adjacent to, but not within, the corporate boundaries of the City of Bowie. The preliminary plan of subdivision was referred to the City of Bowie for review and comments. The City of Bowie found that the proposed preliminary plan has no impact on the city.

SETTING

The property is located on the north side of Springfield Road, at the Springfield Road and Good Luck Road intersection. The neighboring properties to the north and east of the site are zoned Rural Residential (R-R) and are primarily developed with single-family detached dwellings. The neighboring properties to the south are zoned Residential-Estates (R-E) and are also primarily developed with

single-family detached dwellings. The neighboring properties to the west are zoned Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) and are mostly undeveloped, owned by the United States of America.

## 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— Single-Family Dwelling	Residential— Single-Family Dwelling
Acreage	5.03	5.03
Lots	0	8
Outlots	0	0
Parcels	2	0
Dwelling Units	1 (to be razed)	8 (new)
Public Safety Mitigation Fee	No	No
Variance	No	No
Variation	No	No

Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, this case was heard before the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) on September 2, 2011.

2. **Community Planning**—The 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* designates the subject property within the Developing Tier. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable. The preliminary plan is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier by maintaining a pattern of low- to moderate-density development. Approval of this application does not violate the General Plan's growth goals for the year 2025, upon review of Prince George's County's current General Plan Growth Policy Update.

The land use proposed by this preliminary plan conforms with the land use recommendations of the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B* for residential low to moderate development. The master plan retained the property in the R-R Zone.

3. **Environmental**—A Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP1/010/11, and a signed Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-027-06-01, are required and have been reviewed. The site is subject to the environmental regulations contained in Subtitle 24 that came into effect on September 1, 2010. The project is not grandfathered with respect to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, effective September 1, 2010, because there is no previously approved tree conservation plans and this is a new preliminary plan.

### **Master Plan Conformance**

The master plan for this area is the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B*. In the approved master plan and sectional map amendment for Bowie and vicinity, the Environmental Infrastructure section contains goals, policies, and strategies. The following guidelines in **BOLD** have been determined to be applicable to the current project.

#### **Policy 1: Protect, preserve and enhance the identified green infrastructure network within the master plan area.**

The application has been found to be in conformance with the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* as discussed further.

#### **Policy 2: Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded and preserve water quality in areas not degraded.**

The approved stormwater management concept plan shows the use of bioswales on both the northern and southern sides of the proposed public street, which will assist in addressing water quality issues on-site.

The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) has approved the stormwater management design to address surface water runoff issues.

#### **Policy 3: Protect and enhance tree cover within the master plan area.**

The application is subject to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance as discussed further.

### **Conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan**

The site contains evaluation and network gap areas within the designated network of the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. The evaluation area is mapped along the perimeter of the site on the northeastern portion of the property and coincides with the existing treeline. The network gap is located centrally in the open area of the site. Aside from the existing woodland on-site, there are no other sensitive environmental features.

The limit of disturbance (LOD) shown on the TCP1 submitted for the proposed subdivision shows minimal clearing of the existing woodland on-site; however, the remaining woodland cannot be counted toward meeting the woodland conservation requirement for the site because the remaining woodland will not meet the minimum woodland conservation requirements for credits on newly created lots per Section 25-122(b) of the Prince George's County Code.

The proposed development is consistent with a conventional lotting pattern in the R-R Zone and, while the remaining woodland within the evaluation areas cannot be counted for woodland conservation purposes, minimal woodland clearing is proposed for the subdivision. For these reasons, the proposed subdivision is in conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan to the extent practicable.

## **Environmental Review**

The NRI shows no regulated environmental features, streams, wetlands, and floodplain, on or within 100 feet of the subject property. The site has a mapped drainage divide, with the northern portion of the site located within the Upper Beaverdam Creek watershed and the southern portion of the site located within the Horsepen Branch watershed. No steep slopes occur on the property. The forest stand delineation (FSD) indicates the presence of one forest stand totaling 0.64 acre and no specimen trees on-site.

The NRI was approved with a note indicating that rare, threatened, or endangered (RTE) species appear to be on or in the vicinity of the subject site based on the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Natural Heritage Program, sensitive species project review area GIS layer. This information is acceptable on the NRI for approval purposes with the understanding that a DNR RTE letter would be provided for confirmation. The DRN RTE letter was stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on October 6, 2011. The letter confirmed that there are no state or federal records for rare, threatened, or endangered species within the boundaries of the project and no further actions are required.

The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is greater than 40,000 square feet in size, the property contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland, and there are no previously approved tree conservation plans for the property and one is required with a preliminary plan of subdivision. The subject site has a total woodland conservation requirement of 1.39 acres. The plan shows proposed clearing of 0.37 acre and correctly shows the remaining 0.27 acre of woodland as retained but assumed cleared in conformance with Section 25-122(b)(1)(F) and (L). This area must be shown as assumed to be cleared because it does not meet the minimum woodland conservation standards of 50 feet in width and 10,000 square feet in size and cannot be placed on lots one acre or less in size. The plan shows the requirement being met entirely with off-site woodland conservation credits.

Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage on projects that require a grading permit. Properties that are zoned R-R are required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The subject property is 5.03 acres in gross tract area, resulting in a tree canopy coverage requirement of 0.75 acre, or 32,866 square feet. Although a complete evaluation was not conducted during the review of the subject application, at time of grading permit, if the 0.27 acre of existing woodland is not shown to be cleared, it can be counted toward meeting this requirement. In addition, requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) will result in the planting of trees on the lots for landscaping. These trees can also be counted toward meeting the requirement, which will be determined with subsequent plan approvals.

Springfield Road is a designated historic road and has the functional classification of a collector. Since Springfield Road is a collector roadway, it is not regulated for noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn. The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) discusses scenic and historic roads as "...important resources that need to be protected and preserved for enjoyment both today and in the future." The required buffer along a historic road in the Developing Tier, as stated in Section 4.6 of the Landscape Manual, is 20 feet in width along the property's frontage on Springfield Road. A minimum of 80 plant units per 100 linear feet of street frontage are required to be located outside of the ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE). Because the subject application will be retaining the general character of the area, the Landscape Manual buffer is deemed sufficient buffering along this segment of the roadway. Any

improvements within the right-of-way of a historic road are subject to approval by DPW&T under the *Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads*.

According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), the predominant soils found to occur on-site include the Downer-Hammonton-Urban land complex, Galestown-Urban land complex, Russett-Christiana complex, Sassafras-Urban land complex, Udorthents, and reclaimed clay pits. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property; however, Christiana complexes are mapped on-site and may pose problems for building foundations or stormwater infiltration. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. The county may require a soils report in conformance with County Council Bill CB-94-2004, regarding sub-surface water conditions for proposed residential construction with a basement, during the building permit process review.

4. **Stormwater Management**—The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), Office of Engineering, has determined that on-site stormwater management is required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 9271-2010-01, was approved on June 2, 2010 and is valid until June 2, 2013. The approved concept plan has conditions to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. The approved concept plan and letter show the use of bioswales for infiltration purposes. Development must be in accordance with that approved concept plan and any subsequent revisions.
5. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In accordance with Section 24-134(3)(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) recommends payment of a fee-in-lieu of mandatory dedication of parkland for the proposed application because the land available for dedication is unsuitable due to the size and location.
6. **Trails**—This proposed preliminary plan was reviewed for conformance with Section 24-123 of the Subdivision Regulations, the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), and the appropriate area master plan in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements.

The MPOT, Complete Streets: Policy 2 recommends that “All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical” (page 10). The MPOT makes several recommendations for on-road bicycle projects in the vicinity of the subject application, but these projects have not been initiated by the county at this time. Springfield Road is recommended for bike lanes between Odell Road and Lanham-Severn Road (MD 564) and along the subject property frontage. The MPOT recommends that continuous sidewalks and designated bike lanes should be provided where a closed section road is utilized, and that designated bike lanes be provided in open section roadway where feasible. Springfield Road has no sidewalks. Because of the rural nature of this location, no sidewalks are recommended along Springfield Road at this time. The MPOT also recommends Springfield Road for an 80-foot-wide ultimate right-of-way, which will be accommodated via the county's rural two-lane collector road specification. The 80-foot right-of-way proposed for Springfield Road will be able to allow bicyclists to use the paved shoulder. Designated bike lanes may be provided by the county in the future if the road is re-stripped by the county as funds become available.

The MPOT, Complete Streets Policy 1, recommends providing “standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers” (page 9). The internal layout of the subdivision does not show sidewalks, but because Springfield Road is a master-planned rural collector without sidewalks, no sidewalks are recommended within the subdivision at this time.

Based on the preceding analysis, adequate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-123 of the Subdivision Regulations.

7. **Transportation**—The application is a preliminary plan of subdivision for a residential subdivision consisting of eight lots for detached residences. Using trip generation rates in the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” it is determined that the proposed development would generate 6 AM (1 inbound and 5 outbound) and 7 PM (5 inbound and 2 outbound) weekday peak-hour vehicle trips. The traffic generated by the proposed preliminary plan would impact the following intersections, interchanges, and links in the transportation system:

- Springfield Road at Good Luck Road/site access (unsignalized)

The proposal is not of sufficient size that it will generate 50 or more vehicle trips, and so a full traffic study was not required. However, weekday traffic counts for the intersection of Springfield Road and Good Luck Road were requested for the purpose of making an adequacy finding. Counts dated September 2011 were submitted by the applicant. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by 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 Developing Tier, as defined in the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*. 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. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations, is permitted at signalized intersections within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the guidelines.
- **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 intersection of Springfield Road and Good Luck Road, when analyzed with existing traffic and existing lane configurations, operates as an unsignalized intersection with a maximum delay of 11.8 seconds during the AM peak hour. Similarly, the maximum delay is 10.4 seconds during the PM peak hour. The Prince George’s County Planning Board has defined a standard of a maximum 50.0 seconds of delay in any movement as the lowest acceptable operating condition

for unsignalized intersections. Therefore, the critical intersection operates acceptably as an unsignalized intersection in both peak hours.

The critical intersection is not programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program or the Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program. Background traffic is based on five previously approved developments in the area and 0.8 percent annual growth rate in through traffic. The critical intersection of Springfield Road and Good Luck Road, when analyzed with background traffic using existing lane configurations, operates as an unsignalized intersection with a maximum delay of 13.1 seconds during the AM peak hour. Similarly, the maximum delay is 11.0 seconds during the PM peak hour.

The critical intersection of Springfield Road and Good Luck Road, when analyzed with total future traffic, including the site trip generation as described above and the assumptions of the distribution of 25 percent north along Springfield Road, 25 percent south along Springfield Road, and 50 percent west along Good Luck Road, operates as an unsignalized intersection with a maximum delay of 13.2 seconds during the AM peak hour. Similarly, the maximum delay is 11.5 seconds during the PM peak hour.

Therefore, it is found that the critical intersection operates acceptably under existing, background, and total traffic during both weekday peak hours.

The site is adjacent to Springfield Road, which is a master plan collector roadway. Adequate right-of-way (ROW) of 40 feet from the master plan centerline is shown for dedication on the preliminary plan of subdivision, which is consistent with master plan roadway recommendations.

Access is proposed by means of a public street from Springfield Road opposite the existing intersection with Good Luck Road. This has been deemed acceptable by DPW&T per that agency's memorandum dated September 26, 2011. However, that same referral notes that there would be a sight distance limitation at the site access due to the horizontal and vertical alignment of Springfield Road. Therefore, DPW&T recommends the construction of an exclusive left-turn lane on the southbound Springfield Road approach to the proposed site access as a means of enhancing safety. This recommendation is carried forward as a recommendation of the Transportation Planning Section pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, which requires that there be "adequate access roads to serve traffic which would be generated by the proposed subdivision."

The lots within the subdivision are served by a single internal street which is proposed as a rural secondary residential roadway. No direct access from lots to Springfield Road is proposed. Direct access from Lot 1 and Lot 8 to Springfield Road should be denied. Dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's Rural Secondary Residential Roadway standard are required for the internal street, as approved by DPW&T.

Based on the preceding findings it is determined that adequate access roads will exist as required by Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations if the application is approved with conditions.

8. **Schools**—The proposed preliminary plan has been reviewed for impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24 122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and County Council Resolution CR-23-2003 and concluded the following:



### Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 2	Middle School Cluster 4	High School Cluster 2
Dwelling Units	8 DU	8 DU	8 DU
Pupil Yield Factor	0.164	0.130	0.144
Subdivision Enrollment	1.3	1.0	1.1
Actual Enrollment	6,385	9,899	12,737
Total Enrollment	6,386.3	9,900	12,738.1
State Rated Capacity	6,335	11,571	13,026
Percent Capacity	100.8%	85.6%	97.8%

*Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2007*

County Council Bill CB-31-2003 established a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA); or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. County Council Bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation and the current amounts are \$8,565 and \$14,682, to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

The school facilities surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

9. **Fire and Rescue**—The proposed preliminary plan has been reviewed for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24 122.01(d) and Section 24 122.01(e)(1)(C) and (E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed development is within the seven-minute required response time for the first due fire station using the *Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map* provided by the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department.

First Due Fire/EMS Company #	Fire/EMS Station	Address
19	Bowie	13008 9th Street

Pursuant to County Council Resolution CR-69-2006, the Prince George's County Council and the County Executive temporarily suspended the provisions of Section 24 122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) regarding sworn fire and rescue personnel staffing levels.

The Fire/EMS Chief has reported that the Fire/EMS Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in County Council Bill CB-56-2005.

### **Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

There are no public facility projects in the Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2011–2016.

The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Mitigation of Adequate Public Facilities: Public Safety Infrastructure.”

10. **Police Facilities**—The subject property is located in Police District II, Bowie. The response time standard is ten minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The times are based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The preliminary plan was accepted for processing by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Prince George’s County Planning Department on August 15, 2011.

Reporting Cycle	Previous 12 Month Cycle	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency Calls
Acceptance Date 8/15/2011	8/2010-7/2011	8 Minutes	8 Minutes
Cycle 1			
Cycle 2			
Cycle 3			

The response time standards of ten minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls were met on September 1, 2011. The Police Chief has reported that the Police Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in County Council Bill CB-56-2005. Pursuant to County Council Resolution CR-69-2006, the Prince George’s County Council and the County Executive temporarily suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) regarding sworn police personnel staffing levels.

11. **Water and Sewer**—Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed existing Parcel 40 in water and sewer Category 3, Community System, and will therefore be served by public systems. Parcel 41 is designated in water and sewer Category 4. Category 3 must be obtained for Parcel 41 for water and sewer through the administrative amendment procedure, prior to recordation of a final plat.

Water and sewer lines in Springfield Road abut the property. A sewer line extension may be required to service the proposed subdivision and must be approved by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC).

12. **Health Department**—The Prince George’s County Health Department has evaluated the proposed preliminary plan of subdivision. Prior to issuance of any future grading permit for the property, the existing abandoned shallow well must be backfilled and sealed in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.04.04.11. A raze permit must be obtained through the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) prior to removal of any existing buildings. Any hazardous materials located in any structures on-site must be removed and properly stored or discarded prior to the structures being razed.

13. **Public Utility Easement (PUE)**—In accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, when utility easements are required by a public utility company, the subdivider should include the following statement in the dedication documents recorded on the final plat:

“Utility easements are granted pursuant to the declaration recorded among the County Land Records in Liber 3703 at Folio 748.”

The preliminary plan of subdivision correctly delineates a ten-foot-wide public utility easement along the public right-of-way as requested by the utility companies.

14. **Historic**—A Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the subject property located at 8505 Springfield Road in Glenn Dale, Maryland. The application proposes eight residential lots. According to tax records, the current house, which is to be razed, was built in 1952. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low.

However, Perkins Methodist Chapel and Cemetery (#64-005) is located to the west across Springfield Road from the subject property. Built circa 1861 on land donated by J.T. Perkins during a period of division in the Methodist Episcopal Church, this is one of the few surviving mid-19th century rural chapels in the county. It is an offshoot of the Pleasant Grove Methodist Church, which was established in 1815. The frame meeting-style building is clad with German siding and is distinguished by its 12-pane fanlight, wood “keystone,” and gable louvre with quatrefoil tracery. Adjoining the building is a cemetery with burials nearly as old as the chapel. A modern church building is located in the vicinity of the developing property and the 1861 chapel is located around a bend in the road and uphill from the subject property. Dense woods are located between the chapel and the developing property. Therefore, the proposed new development will not have a visual impact on the contributing features within the historic site.

15. **Use Conversion**—This preliminary plan was analyzed based on the proposal for residential development. The analysis includes access, noise, mandatory dedication, and views of the property, specifically relating to the single-family dwelling land use proposed with this application. While the subject application is not proposing any nonresidential development, if such a land use were proposed, a new preliminary plan will be required.
16. **City of Bowie**—The property is located adjacent to, but not within, the corporate boundaries of the City of Bowie. The preliminary plan of subdivision was referred to the City of Bowie for review and comments. Based on the memorandum dated August 18, 2011 (Minert to Nguyen), the City of Bowie found that the proposed preliminary plan has no impact on the city.

## RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following technical corrections shall be made:
  - a. Add the stormwater management concept plan approval date to General Note 8.

- b. Add a statement that the proposed preliminary plan does not impact the Perkins Chapel and Cemetery environmental setting to General Note 12.
  - c. Revise the density calculation in General Note 20 to state “5.03 x 2.17 = 10 maximum dwelling units, 8 dwelling units proposed.”
  - d. Revise the lot width at the front building in General Note 20 to be 80 feet.
  - e. Add a note to state “direct access from lots to Springfield Road is not proposed.”
2. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-010-11). The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:
- “This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-010-11 or most recent revision), or as modified by the Type 2 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 and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree Conservation Plans for the subject property are available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George’s County Planning Department.”
- 3. Prior to approval of the final plat of subdivision, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall pay a fee-in-lieu of parkland dedication.
  - 4. At the time of final plat, the applicant shall dedicate public right-of-way of 40 feet from the master plan centerline of Springfield Road and the street, as shown on the approved preliminary plan.
  - 5. Prior to approval of building permits, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program or the Prince George’s County Capital Improvement Program; (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency’s permitting process; and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
- Springfield Road and Good Luck Road/site access**—An exclusive left-turn lane on the southbound Springfield Road approach to the proposed access shall be provided and shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the requirements and standards of the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).
- 6. At the time of final plat, the applicant shall dedicate a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along the public right-of-way (ROW) as delineated on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.
  - 7. Prior to the issuance of grading permits, the applicant shall demonstrate that any abandoned well associated with the existing structure has been backfilled and sealed by a licensed well driller in accordance with Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR) 26.04.04.

8. A raze permit shall be obtained through the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) prior to removal of any existing buildings. Any hazardous materials located in any structures on-site must be removed and properly stored or discarded prior to the structures being razed.
9. The final plat shall label the denial of direct access to Springfield Road from Lots 1 and 8.
10. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to a residential development or equivalent development which generates no more than 6 AM (1 in, 5 out) peak-hour trips and 7 PM (5 in, 2 out) peak-hour trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein-above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
11. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 9271-2010-01 and any subsequent revisions.

STAFF RECOMMENDS APPROVAL OF TYPE 1 TREE CONSERVATION PLAN TCP1/010/11.