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.*

Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024-05

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: Town Center at Camp Springs Phase 1-B, Lots 333-359	Planning Board Hearing Date:	06/03/10
	Staff Report Date:	05/07/10
	Date Accepted:	10/01/08
Location: Southwest corner of the intersection of Auth Way and Telfair Boulevard	Planning Board Action Limit:	12/10/08
	Plan Acreage:	47.25
	Zone:	M-X-T
Applicant/Address: Auth Way Land, LLC 8521 Leesburg Pike, Suite 601 Vienna, VA 22182	Dwelling Units:	27
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
	Planning Area:	76A
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	09
	Election District	N/A
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	206SE05

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
This case was continued from Planning Board May 13, 2010 to June 3, 2010. Request for approval of site plan, landscape plan, TCPII, and architectural elevations for 27 new townhouse lots.	Informational Mailing:	06/20/08
	Acceptance Mailing:	10/12/08
	Sign Posting Deadline:	04/13/10

Staff Recommendation		**Staff Reviewer:** Susan Lareuse	
APPROVAL	**APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS**	**DISAPPROVAL**	**DISCUSSION**
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024-05
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/059/02-03
Town Center at Camp Springs
Phase 1-B, Lots 333–359

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

a. Conformance to the M-X-T (Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented) Zone, Sections 27-542 through 27-546 and Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance.

b. Conformance to Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015.

c. Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance for conformance to the Site Design Guidelines.

d. Conformance to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07010.

e. Conformance to the requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.*

f. Conformance to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.

g. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the Planning Board adopt the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests the approval of a revision to an approved detailed site plan (DSP) for 27 townhouse lots. In this process, the applicant is deleting lot 275 in order to provide a road access to the new lots proposed and is also providing additional parking spaces throughout the entirety of the DSP. The DSP consists of the site plan, landscape plan, Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII), and architectural elevations.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024

Town Center at Camp Springs, Phase I-B Lots 333-339

Zone	M-X-T
Gross Tract Area	47.25 acres
Area Within 100-Year Floodplain	6.05 acres
Net Tract Area	41.20 acres
Area Within Nontidal Wetlands	5.27 acres
Proposed Use	Single-Family Attached
Number of Units	
Multifamily	86 units
Single-Family Attached (existing) minus Lot 275	328 units
Single-Family Attached (proposed)	**27 units**
Total Single-Family Attached (proposed)	355 units
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	
Minimum FAR Required (per CSP-01015)	TBD
FAR Proposed	TBD
Parking for 27 additional units:	
Parking required	56 spaces
Parking proposed (4 spaces per unit on lot and 6 shared parking spaces)	114 spaces
Required parking for overall DSP:	902 spaces
Parking Proposed	630 garage spaces
	308 tandem spaces
	126 existing surface parking spaces
	35 proposed surface parking
	6 accessibly spaces
Total surface parking proposed	161 spaces

3. **Location:** The subject property is located northwest of the intersection of Auth Way and Telfair Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet north of the intersection of Brittania Way and Auth Way. The site is in Planning Area 76A and Council District 9.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The majority of the lots within this subdivision are developed. The proposed lots are located at the easternmost portion of the development behind the lots located along Talmadge Circle. To the north of the subject lots is open space owned by the homeowner association (HOA), a parcel owned by Potomac Electric and Power Company (PEPCO), and the Suitland Parkway.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject property was previously zoned I-1 (Light Industrial) and was known as Capital Gateway Office Park. The property had a preliminary plan approved in 1990, and subsequently the property received approval for final plats of subdivision. The property was

rough graded and infrastructure was placed on the site including stormwater management, the main loop road (Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive), street trees, and sidewalks. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) acquired a portion of the land for the terminus of the Green Line, which is the Branch Avenue Metro Station.

In October 2000, the District Council rezoned the property from the I-1 and R-R (Rural Residential) Zones to the M-X-T Zone by sectional map amendment. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015 was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on June 28, 2001 (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-120).

The original detailed site plan for this property, DSP-02024, was approved by the Planning Board on June 27, 2002. Since that time, a number of revisions have been approved at the Planning Director level for minor revisions and to add additional architectural elevations to the project. It should be noted that Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024-06 was the most recently approved site plan approved by the Planning Board on January 21, 2010.

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07011 which was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232) on January 3, 2008, for the development of 29 townhouse dwelling units. The townhouse lots are not yet the subject of a record plat. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 31, 2010, pursuant to the adoption of County Council Bill CB-8-2009.

6. Ryan Homes is requesting approval of the following model:

Builder/Models	**Minimum Base Finished Area (square feet)**
Ryan Homes	
Hazelton	2,110

The Hazelton model is a 22-foot-wide, three-story townhouse unit with a front-load, two-car garage built on slab.

7. The proposed revision to add 27 new townhouse lots will have no substantial impact on the previous findings made for conformance to Section 27-546 of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the M-X-T Zone as were made in Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023. The required findings of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the M-X-T Zone are as follows:

(1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;

Comment: The site is located within close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro Station and the major vehicular interchange of I-95/495 (Capital Beltway) and Branch Avenue (MD 5). The development of this property will promote the effective and optimum use of transit. The proposal will provide for an expanding source of living opportunities for the citizens of the county because the development provides for high density in one of the three required uses in the M-X-T Zone, Residential. The proposed development has the potential to encourage a 24-hour environment with the inclusion of an office component and a community building. The visual character of different parts of the development will be related to one another through the consistent approach to the architectural design of buildings and the use of high-quality materials.

(2) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

Comment: The proposed lots are integrated into the grid pattern of townhouse lots that exist on the adjacent property of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024.

(3) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

Comment: The subject site is bordered by land owned by WMATA and land that is the subject of the companion Detailed Site Plan (DSP-02023). The companion detailed site plan is designed directly in association with the subject site, sharing a central recreational area. Staff believes that the proposed townhouse units are generally compatible with, and complementary to, existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

(4) The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

Comment: The mix of proposed uses and the arrangement of the townhouses, the apartment building, the community building, and recreational facilities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability, if the architectural elevations are enhanced by providing brick endwalls on highly visible side elevations, such as on Lots 274, 276, 333, 346, 347, and 359. In addition, all of the same lots should have a full brick front as well.

(5) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

Comment: The detailed site plan indicates one phase for the development of the townhouses.

(6) The pedestrian system is convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

Comment: A pedestrian system near a Metro station becomes very important in promoting Metro ridership. It must be convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian movement within the development to the Metro. Proposed pedestrian circulation will filter from the development to the loop road and connect to other future uses within the development or the Metro.

(7) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and

Comment: Staff believes that the buildings would benefit from additional brick on highly visible units. Staff recommends that the architectural elevations be revised to add more brick and rooflines should match the slope of the surrounding units. Proposed conditions below would require additional brick on the endwall façades of the highly visible units and would increase the slope on the rooflines from 6:12 to 8:12 pitch.

(8) On a Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant. (CB-1-1989; CB-26-1991)

Comment: Fewer than six years have elapsed since the preliminary plan found adequacy for the road system for the subject site (see attached PGCPB Resolution No. 07-231).

8. Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the required design guidelines for detailed site plans. The proposed revision to add 27 townhouses continues to meet all of the applicable site design guidelines.

9. The detailed site plan is in conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015. The following conditions of that approval (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-120) warrant discussion:

Condition 1 limits the development available under Phase I to 1,700 residences (of which no fewer than 250 shall be senior housing residences), 150,000 square feet of retail space, 968,500 square feet of general office space or different uses, and the application of the approved vehicle trip reductions percentages for pass-by internal trips and Transit (Metro) generating no more than 1,490 inbound AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 1,243 outbound PM peak-hour vehicle trips.

Comment: To this date, the approved developments within the Town Center at Camp Springs are shown in the table below:

Application	Development Amount	Units	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
			IN	Out	Total	IN	Out	Total
DSP-02023	Mid-rise Apartments	398	24	99	123	91	49	140
DSP-02024	Townhouse Mid-rise Apartments	86 329	43	171	214	160	86	246
DSP-05051	Mid-rise Apartments Office Retail	504 67,665 sq. ft. 50,398 sq. ft.	188	236	424	301	287	588
DSP-07074	Mid-rise Apartments Office Retail	801 7,987 sq. ft. 65,359 sq. ft.	131	361	492	416	287	703
4-07010	Townhouses	28	4	16	20	15	8	23
4-07011	Townhouses	29	4	16	20	15	8	23
Total Trips			394	899	1293	998	725	1,723

As shown above, the estimated total AM inbound and PM outbound peak-hour vehicle trips is less than the approved caps. Using these figures, the remaining unallocated AM inbound and PM outbound trips are calculated to be 1,096 and 518 vehicle trips, even though the total number of approved residential units is 2,175, or 475 more units than the number of residential units assumed in the development of the overall approved trip caps.

Condition 3 requires the provision of direct pedestrian connections rather than circuitous ones, and sitting buildings closer to and parking facilities father away from the Metrorail station, as well as provision of at least one direct pedestrian link extending from the northern limits of the property and through the WMATA property to the Metrorail station.

Comment: Pedestrian connections, building entrances, the sitting of both residential buildings, and half of the proposed retail buildings all conform to this condition. The proposed detailed site plan limit does not extend to WMATA's property.

Condition 4 requires that a trail connection provide access to the future extension of the Henson Creek Trail. The exact location of the trail connection shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan, but a connection directly to the portion of the stream valley owned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is preferred. A trail location (within a public use easement) on or in the vicinity of the existing stormwater management pond access road may be appropriate. The width of the trail shall be determined at detailed site plan.

Comment: The submitted DSP reallocates townhouse units within the subject site and results in a relocation of the existing trail on HOA property. This trail parallels the Henson Creek stream valley along the northern edge of the subject site and will ultimately serve as a connection between the Camp Springs Town Center and the extension of the Henson Creek Trail. Previously submitted layouts for these townhouse units reflected the trail running up to and along subdivision roads for a short segment. The layout of the subject application retains the trail entirely on HOA property and does not require any segments along existing or planned roads.

Staff has concerns about two aspects of the proposed layout: 1) the trail will be immediately behind proposed residential lots and 2) the trail appears to be immediately adjacent to the proposed retaining wall. With regards to the adjacent residential lots, staff recommends that the trail be constructed prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 347–359. This will ensure that prospective lot owners will be aware of the presence of the trail prior to construction of the units. It should also be noted that the retaining wall will further separate the trail from the rear of the residential lots, providing an additional measure of buffering.

Regarding the proximity of the trail to the planned retaining wall, it appears that there is little flexibility on the location of the trail in this area. Although it is preferable to have the trail set several feet away from the base of the wall, there does not appear to be an opportunity to provide extra space between the trail and the retaining wall without impacts to the wetland buffer and/or the floodplain buffer. Because of these factors, staff supports the trail location as shown on the submitted plan. It should also be noted that the proposed location is a significant improvement over the previously submitted route taking the trail along a subdivision road. The following condition is recommended:

> The trail on Parcel N shall be constructed prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 347–359.

Condition 20(h) requires determination of an appropriate bus stop, if deemed necessary.

Comment: There are no bus routes along the portions of the existing roadways that the subject property has frontage with.

10. The proposed townhouses are located off of Talmadge Circle, a private street, which provides the main access point for the subject site. The townhouse lots are located within existing Parcel N, which is currently held by Auth Way Land, LLC and will be conveyed to a HOA in the future. The development of fee-simple townhouse lots per Section 27-548(g) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

(g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.

Comment: The townhouse lots are proposed to be served by private streets and an access right-of-way. Subtitle 24 of the County Code allows private streets to serve townhouses per Section 24-128(h) of the Subdivision Regulations, which states the following in regard to the M-X-T Zone:

(7) In Comprehensive Design and Mixed Use Zones:

(A) For land in the V-L, V-M, R-L, R-S, R-M, R-U, M-U-I, L-A-C, M-A-C, M-X-C, M-U-TC, and M-X-T Zones, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision (and all attendant plans of development) with private roads to serve attached single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, and three-family dwellings, but not single-family detached or multifamily dwellings, in accordance with the requirements of Subsections (e) and (f) of Section 27-433 of the Zoning Ordinance, except as hereinafter provided. In all of the above zones, and in the R-R Zone when developed as a cluster subdivision, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision with alleys to serve any permitted use, provided the lot has frontage on and pedestrian access to a public right-of-way. The District Council may disapprove the inclusion of alleys during the consideration of the detailed site plan for a cluster subdivision. For the purposes of this Section, an "alley" shall mean a road providing vehicular access to the rear or side of abutting lots, and which is not intended for general traffic circulation.

(i) The pavement width of private roads may be reduced to not less than a minimum of twenty-two (22) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, hierarchical street system for a development.

Comment: The pavement of the private road, shown as Road A, should be dimensioned to indicate a minimum of 22 feet in width.

Section 27-433(e) and (f) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

(e) Streets.

(1) The following requirements shall apply only to the development of townhouses, one-family semidetached dwellings, two-family dwellings, three-family dwellings, and one-family attached metropolitan dwellings:

(A) The tract of land used for the project involving these dwellings shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street having a right-of-way width of at least sixty (60) feet;

Comment: The plans indicate that Parcel N, the parcel on which the townhouses are located, is connected to proposed Parcel B and/or existing Lot 1, which has frontage on and direct vehicular access to Auth Way and was approved at the time of preliminary plan as such.

(f) Access to individual lots.

(1) The following requirements shall apply only to the development of townhouses, one-family semidetached dwellings, two-family dwellings, three-family dwellings, and one-family attached metropolitan dwellings:

(A) While it is not necessary that each individual lot have frontage on a street, each lot shall be served by a right-of-way for emergency and pedestrian access purposes. The right-of-way shall either be owned by a homes association and approved by the Planning Board, or a dedicated as a public right-of-way.

Comment: The plans propose that the 27 lots will be served by a private street, which will be owned by a homeowners association.

(B) If the individual lot does not have frontage on a street, a right-of-way at least sixteen (16) feet wide shall abut each lot. The right-of-way shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet wide if it contains an easement for sanitary sewerage.

Comment: The plans should be revised to indicate the minimum width of 25 feet where the sewer is proposed within the right-of-way and should be independent of the public utility easement (PUE).

(D) No individual lot shall be more than two hundred (200) feet from a point of approved emergency vehicle access.

Comment: The applicant should provide evidence from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) that the units are adequately served for emergency access prior to signature approval of the plans and prior to final plat. It appears that there is an overly-designed turn around at the end of the street near Lots 346 and 347. This area should be revised prior to signature approval to reduce excess pavement and provide for additional parking, if possible. A landscape treatment that will provide seasonal interest and an attractive view should also be considered.

11. Section 27-548(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.

Comment: The proposal to revise the plans to add 27 townhouses is subject to Section 4.1 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.* The plans demonstrate conformance to Section 4.1 in regard to the number of required trees. However, Lots 347–359 do not contain a single tree due to the narrowness of the front yard and the PUE location. Staff recommends that the plans be

revised to include a narrow habit, flowering tree in at least every other front yard as shown on Lots 333–346, and a shade tree at the ends of each stick of units.

12. **The Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This site is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/25/07 is the most recently approved TCP for this site. A revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/059/02-03, has been submitted and reviewed.

    The subject site has a net tract of 46.99 acres and 8.56 acres of 100-year floodplain. The woodland conservation threshold has been correctly calculated at 5.76 acres, or 15 percent of the net tract. The woodland conservation requirement based on proposed clearing is 8.29 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 3.91 acres of on-site woodland preservation, 0.93 acre of reforestation, 2.60 acres of afforestation, and 0.85 acre of fee-in-lieu.

    Revisions are required. Sheets 2 and 3 of the TCPII show a proposed retaining wall located south of Lot 121 and northeast of Lot 195. Reforestation is also proposed in this area. In order to provide for future maintenance of the wall, the proposed reforestation must be relocated 10 feet from both sides of the proposed wall.

    The existing contour lines in the north section of the site where no development is proposed is not shown on the plan. This information is required to be shown. The expanded buffer in this area also needs to be corrected to be more consistent with the previously approved TCPII. Revise the TCPII to show the existing contour lines for the north section of the site and show the corrected expanded buffer on all plans. These revisions will not affect the proposal for this application.

    Extensive reforestation is proposed in order to fulfill the woodland conservation requirements on this site. In order to protect the reforestation areas after planting, so that they may mature into perpetual woodlands, the planting must be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for the sites and all planting areas must be placed in conservation easements. The plans show the preservation of existing regulated features. Conditions of approval associated with Preliminary Plan 4-07011 provide language that affords reforestation/afforestation areas the same protection as the primary management area (PMA).

    Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to show the existing contour lines for the north section of the site. All plans shall be revised to show the correct expanded buffer, in conformance with the previously approved TCPII.

    Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to show all proposed woodland conservation areas to be located a minimum of 10 feet away from the proposed retaining wall. The worksheet shall be revised as necessary.

13. The proposed 27 lots have no impact on previously approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024 and the associated conditions of approval.

14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies/divisions and is summarized as follows:

    a. **Subdivision Review Section-—**The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-07011, which was approved by the Planning Board for 29 townhouse lots. The resolution of approval (PGCPB No. 07-231) was adopted by the Planning Board on January 3, 2008. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 31, 2010, pursuant to CB-8-2009.

The subject detailed site plan proposes 27 townhouse lots, two lots less than that approved with the preliminary plan of subdivision. In order to access this pod of development, the plan proposes to delete Lot 275 and part of Parcel I (Record Plat REP 200 @ 77) approved pursuant to Preliminary Plan 4-03090 (PGCPB Resolution No. 03-256).

Resolution of approval PGCPB No. 07-231 contains 18 conditions, of which the following warrant discussion:

4. In conformance with the approved Heights Master Plan, and prior approvals for CSP-01015 and DSP-02024 (including the approved sidewalk plan), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:

a. Construct the eight-foot-wide trail from Auth Way to Habersham Avenue, as reflected on the previously approved sidewalk plan. This trail should have six-foot-wide feeder trails linking to Lumpkin Place and Talmadge Avenue (see Condition 4, CSP-01015 and the sidewalk plan for DSP-02024).

b. The sidewalk within Auth Way shall be seven feet wide with brick paver edge details and the planting strip shall be five feet wide, subject to the review and approval by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (Condition 11a, DSP-02024)

c. A six-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along both sides of Telfair Boulevard (sidewalk plan, DSP-02024).

d. Five-foot-wide concrete sidewalks shall be constructed along both sides of Candler Place, Lanier Avenue, and Glynn Place (sidewalk plan, DSP-02024).

e. A six-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed along both sides of Milledge Boulevard from Auth Way to Lanier Avenue in the same design as the sidewalk within Auth Way. A five-foot-wide sidewalk shall be constructed on at least one side, with a four-foot-wide sidewalk on the other side, of all secondary streets. Four-foot-wide sidewalks shall be provided along both sides of tertiary streets (Condition 8, DSP-02024).

Comment: The trail locations have been reviewed by the trails coordinator for conformance. The site plan includes Parcel N in its entirety. The existing record plat does not provide for public access to this master plan trail and should. The new final plat for Parcel N should include a public use easement over the master plan trail to ensure public access.

9. At the time of the detailed site plan, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to show the location of the noise attenuation fence in the rear outdoor activity areas of all proposed lots and provide a detail for its construction, or add the following note to all sheets where fences appear:

> **"All fences shown as noise attenuation fences shall be constructed of solid wood with no gaps or openings."**

Comment: It appears that the applicant is proposing to locate the noise fence over the PUE. If the fencing is removed for repair or maintenance of the utilities, the reconstruction of the fence will be the responsibility of the homeowners. All PUEs should be free of structures; therefore, staff recommends that the plan be revised to relocate the noise fence.

13. At the time of detailed site plan review, it shall be demonstrated that the driveway pads for Lots 333-337 are at least 19 feet in length between the front façade (garage) and the back of the sidewalk. The sidewalk must be 4 feet wide, and set far enough back from the road so that it is free and clear of the driveway apron, with the possible use of mountable curb. The driveway length, for no more than 3 of these lots, can be reduced if the applicant can demonstrate that these lots are reasonably served by off-street parking. The driveways for Lots 338-361 shall be at least 19 feet in length between the front façade (garage) and the back of the sidewalk. Sidewalks located in front of these lots must also be a minimum of 4 feet wide, but may be located directly adjacent to the curb, provided that all curb in front of these lots is mountable.

Comment: The site plan indicates that the driveway length is 19 feet to the edge of the four-foot-wide proposed sidewalk.

14. Total development within the subject property shall be limited by the existing approved site plans CSP-01015, DSP-02023, DSP-02024, and DSP-05051. Any modifications to these plans or succeeding plans shall be determined to be consistent with the overall trip cap for the Capital Gateway site described in Conditions 8 and 10 of PGCPB No. 90-253 approving Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-90037.

Comment: The plan conforms to the development limits established by the preliminary plan and the CSP, which are one in the same.

15. The improvements described in Condition 7 of PGCPB No. 90-253 shall be verified to be complete prior to the issuance of any building permit within the subject property.

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section reported that the improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit.

16. At the time of detailed site plan, a fee-in-lieu shall be considered for any reforestation that cannot be provided in the rear of proposed lots 354-361.

Comment: The TCP proposes to clear woodland in the rear of these proposed lots and provide a series of retaining walls. A fee-in-lieu of 0.85 acre has been proposed to meet

the remaining requirement as a result of the proposed clearing for this area and the remainder of the site. Because this requirement is less than one acre, fee-in-lieu is appropriate.

17. **All residents of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property of this application shall have full access to the clubhouse and other recreational facilities operated by the Town Center at Camp Springs Homeowners Association, located at 4300 Telfair Boulevard. It is acknowledged that the Homeowners Association currently charges an optional initiation fee and annual fee (separate from the annual Homeowners Association dues) specifically for use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court within the clubhouse. The initiation fee for the use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court shall be waived for a period of three (3) months after the date of settlement for the initial residents of each of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property.**

Comment: The condition above is carried over to this approval.

18. **During Detailed Site Plan review for the subject property, a portion of the common area to be owned by the Homeowners Association, consisting of approximately 1,650 square feet on a portion of Parcel N, located at the southwest intersection of what is currently shown on the Preliminary Plan as "Proposed Private Road A" and the turnaround area for larger vehicles (south of Lot 352 and west of Lots 350 and 351), shall be designed as a tot lot, if found to be appropriate for that purpose by the Urban Design Section and the Parks Department, or alternatively, as a sitting/picnic area.**

Comment: The additional recreational area required by the preliminary plan of subdivision for these additional dwelling units (the subject of this DSP) is not shown on the detailed site plan. The approved preliminary plan located a tot lot in the location that the applicant now locates Lots 347 and 348. The plans should be revised to provide a tot lot in accordance with DPR guidelines. Urban Design staff believes that a tot lot would be better located at a point near the entrance into the new townhouse section so that it is in clear view of all residents as they enter and leave the development, in order to provide for visual surveillance of the area. Therefore, staff recommends the removal of Lots 333 and 334 for the location of a tot lot and associated sitting area.

Prior to the approval of the DSP, the plan should be revised to properly site the required recreational area. A recreational facilities agreement (RFA) and proper bonding should also be required.

Site Plan Comments:

(1) The location and extent of the ten-foot PUE should be reviewed and approved by the utility companies including PEPCO, Washington Gas, and Verizon. The locations are not abutting all of the private rights-of-way. The plan indicates that, in some locations, the PUE is located in the rear of units where gas lines are often depicted. The plan does not locate the gas easement and should. Any deviation from the standard easement locations should be approved by the utility companies prior to the approval of the detailed site plan. A condition is included in the recommendation section of this report.

(2) Lots 269–290 are record lots. The lot sizes are not consistent with the record plats. The site plan should provide bearings, distances, and lot sizes consistent with Record Plats REP 200 @ 77 and 79. The revised site plan now shows two different lot sizes in most instances, some lot sizes remain incorrect. A condition is included in the recommendation section of this report.

(3) Dimensions should be provided on the lot width and open space parcels. A condition is included in the recommendation section of this report.

(4) The site plan must include parcels in their entirety. General Note 26 should be revised to correctly indicate the limit of this revision to the DSP.

a. Record Plat REP 200 @ 77, Lot 275, Parcel I, and any lots affected by the re-design (i.e. lot size adjustments).

b. All of Record Plat REP 200 @ 79, Lots 281–290, and Parcel M, as delineated on the coversheet, and specific lots affected by the re-design.

c. Parcel N, Record Plat REP 200 @ 80.

The coversheet delineates "Area Covered by this application," which may not accurately reflect the limit of this DSP revision, and should.

There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

b. **Environmental Planning Section—**The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan and type ii tree conservation plan, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on April 23, 2010. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-02024-05 and TCPII/059/02-03 subject to the conditions noted at the end of this memorandum.

Background
This site has been previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section as Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-89207, 4-90037, and 4-03090; and Detailed Site Plans DSP-92012, DSP-91029, and DSP-02024. This site has a previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/007/90-01) and is subject to a previously approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/59/02-02). The most recent review of this site was with 4-07011 and TCPI/025/07 for the addition of residential townhouse lots to the site. That application has received Planning Board approval. It should be noted that the original Type I tree conservation plan was approved under the 1989 Woodland Conservation Ordinance which has different requirements than the current Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The recently approved TCPI complies with the current Woodland Conservation Ordinance. This area was removed as part of the original TCPI. The revised TCPII (TCPII/059/02-03) has been revised for the proposed development with this application.

Site Description
This 47.25-acre site is located just south of Suitland Parkway at the Branch Avenue Metro Station. A review of the information available indicates that streams, wetlands, wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes are found to occur on the property. According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the soils found to occur are predominantly gravel pit or disturbed soils. Since the exact nature of the soils is not

known, DER may require a soils study prior to the issuance of permits. Suitland Parkway and the Branch Avenue Metro line are considered significant noise generators that may create adverse noise impacts for the proposed residential use. Suitland Parkway is a national register site. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of the site. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. This property is located in the Henson Creek watershed of the Potomac River Basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan.*

Environmental Review

(1) The preliminary plan application has a signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/26/07), dated November 13, 2007 that was included with this application package. The site contains streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes. There are 12 forest stands totaling 10.79 acres. Stands 1, 2, and 6 are dominated by American beech and tulip poplar, Stands 3, 4, 5, and 11 are dominated by red maple, Stand 7 is dominated by sycamore, Stands 8 and 12 are dominated by river birch, Stand 9 is dominated by Eastern white pine, and Stand 10 is dominated by red oak. All stands except Stand 5 have a high priority for preservation because they are associated with regulated areas.

Comment: No further information regarding existing conditions is required.

(4) This property is located in the noise corridor for Suitland Parkway, which is classified as freeway. The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is not shown on the current plan. This property is also in close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro, a potential noise generator for the proposed residential use. A Phase I noise study dated July 5, 2001 and a vibration study dated April 26, 2002 were reviewed with the associated preliminary plan application. The studies and associated plans were found to adequately address noise attenuation for the affected lots.

Comment: Noise will be mitigated for the affected lots through the installation of a solid wood fence for the rear outdoor activity areas. The noise attenuation fences have been correctly shown on the DSP and TCPII. Based on the study, vibration associated with the nearby Metro tracks is not a concern. No additional information regarding noise and vibration is required.

(5) According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey,* the principal soils on this site are in the Bibb, Fallsington, and Sassafras soil series. Prior to development, the site contained sand and gravel pits.

Discussion: This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. A soils report may be required by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources during the permit process review.

(6) A Stormwater Management Concept Plan (CSD 16466-2007-07-01) and approval letter were stamped as received on April 23, 2010. Conditions of approval of this concept include a fee-in-lieu payment, submission of a geotechnical report, and the retrofitting of an existing nearby stormwater management pond. The concept is correctly reflected on the revised TCPI.

Comment: No additional information is required with regard to stormwater management.

c. **Transportation Planning Section—**The Transportation Planning Section is currently reviewing the application as of the writing of this technical staff report.

d. **Historic Preservation Section—**The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) reviewed the subject application at its April 20, 2010 meeting and heard testimony from the applicant, the National Park Service, and the public, and did not vote to make a recommendation to the Planning Board. However, John Peter Thompson, HPC Vice Chairman, did suggest that the applicant's proposed plant list for screening development within the subject property from Suitland Parkway should be revised to eliminate both Leyland Cypress and Colorado Spruce in favor of sturdier and more appropriate native plants. Staff has included this in the recommendation section of this report.

Background

The subject detailed site plan application involves the development of townhouse units, associated roadway, and site improvements adjacent to Suitland Parkway (National Register/Historic Site #76A-022). The application proposes two rows of townhouses with a total of 27 units; of these, the 13 units closest to the parkway (on Lots 347–359) and the two end units to the east (on Lots 333 and 346) will be at least partially visible from the parkway.

Constructed in 1943–1944, Suitland Parkway consists of nine miles of roadway (of which more than six miles runs through Prince George's County) and is a dual-lane parkway with concrete-arch bridges faced with stone. Planned before the outbreak of World War II, the project came to fruition with the entrance of the United States into the war in December 1941, and the establishment of Andrews Air Force Base few months later. The parkway connects Andrews Air Force Base with Bolling Air Force Base and Washington, DC. It has carried many diplomatic processions and official entourages and now provides an efficient line of transportation between Washington and residential suburbs to the east and southeast.

Suitland Parkway was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1995. Because of a longstanding interest in development projects affecting Suitland Parkway, this application has been referred to the National Park Service, National Capital Parks East, for comment.

Findings

(1) The subject property, known as Town Center at Camp Springs, has been developed incrementally to include commercial and residential uses. The most recent phase of development to be reviewed by the Historic Preservation Commission was DSP-0204-06. That application involved 22 townhouses of similar size and design located immediately east of the subject application. That application was reviewed at staff level and comments were provided to the Urban Design Section. With that application, the focus was limited to the rear elevations and roof details of the proposed dwelling units because the façades faced away from the Suitland Parkway and would not be visible from it.

(2) The subject detailed site plan application presents many of the same issues as DSP-0204-06, although the current application provides for townhouses that will largely eclipse the view of the previously reviewed units. The rear elevations of

the townhouses in the subject application will be closer to Suitland Parkway, will be considerably more visible from it, and will not be screened by subsequent development within the subject property.

(3) The application includes architectural elevations and renderings for proposed models that reflect comments from staff and comments from the Planning Board on DSP-02024/06. For that case, the Planning Board's comments focused largely on façade details and streetscape issues, while staff comments addressed the character, details, and materials of the rear elevations potentially visible from Suitland Parkway.

(4) The applicant's proposed architectural treatments and materials for the rear and side elevations of the proposed units include upgraded window and door trim, a limited palette of available siding and trim colors, a single roof material, upgraded materials and treatment for optional rear decks, and the limited use of rear dormers that break up the expanses of roofs potentially visible from Suitland Parkway. These treatments will be used for all buildings within the subject application and will create a uniform character across all rear elevations. For highly-visible end units potentially visible from Suitland Parkway, all brick elevations are specified.

(5) The application includes site and landscape plans that provide for substantial screening of the views of the proposed development from Suitland Parkway. This planting plan includes a combination of native evergreen and deciduous shrubs and trees including Red Oak, Red Maple, American Beech, Hawthorne, Crape Myrtle, Leland Cypress, Colorado Spruce, and Eastern Red Cedar to be planted in a naturalized manner that will serve to both visually deepen the vegetation seen from Suitland Parkway and to screen the manipulated grades, retaining walls, and fences associated with the proposed dwelling units.

Completion of the subject application will require grading and the use of retaining walls to create finished grades similar to the portion of the community already developed. As a result, a series of retaining walls varying in height from two feet to as much as 22.8 feet will be necessary, and may impact the view from Suitland Parkway. The application proposes the use of a modular block system of concrete masonry units for these walls. In addition, the applicant will be required to construct limited noise attenuation fences to mitigate noise from Suitland Parkway affecting some of the rear yards of the proposed units.

Conclusion

(1) The applicant's proposed architectural treatments and materials are compatible with the character of existing adjacent construction approved for the development. The proposed architecture represents enhancement of typically undesigned and minimally detailed rear elevations of townhouse units. The proposed architectural treatments and materials for the rear of the subject units include upgraded window and door trim, a limited palette of available siding and trim colors, a single roof material and color, upgraded materials and treatment for optional rear decks to provide for a more finished appearance, and the limited use of rear dormers that break up the roofs potentially visible from Suitland Parkway. These treatments will be used for all buildings within the subject application and will create a uniform character across all rear elevations. The applicant's limited

palette of siding eliminates the typical choice of white siding which is highly reflective and often highly visible at great distances. The use of finished rather than unfinished carpentry for optional decks will enhance the overall character of the units if visible from Suitland Parkway.

(2) Because of the substantial system of retaining walls required to level the grades for construction, these walls may be at least seasonally visible from Suitland Parkway until the associated plantings mature. Therefore, the type, arrangement, and caliper of plant material to be used should provide for effective growth and maximum screening in both the short and long term.

Recommendation
Based on the applicant's submitted site plans, landscape plans, architectural elevations, and renderings, Historic Preservation Section staff recommends that the Planning Board approve DSP-02024/05 without conditions.

Comment: The Urban Design Section staff recommends that the rear of the units be enhanced by requiring that the entire rear façade be brick for the units backing to Suitland Parkway. In addition, the retaining walls should be enhanced to be a stone face that should be approved by the Planning board or its designee.

15. In accordance with Section 27-285(b) and Section 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024-05 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/059/02-03, Town Center at Camp Springs, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the detailed site plan shall be revised as follows:

   a. Remove Lots 333 and 334 and provide for a tot lot in accordance with Department of Parks and Recreation guidelines.

   b. The plans shall be reviewed and approved by each of the utility companies and appropriate easements shall be shown free and clear of any structures, including the noise fence.

   c. Provide dimensions on all lot lines and open space parcels, including dimensions between lots.

   d. The site plan and general notes shall be revised to accurately reflect the extent of the original DSP, which shall include parcels in their entirety.

   e. The plant list shall be revised to eliminate both Leland Cypress and Colorado Spruce and substitute with appropriate native plant material.

f. The retaining walls shall be enhanced to be a stone face, to be approved by the Planning Board or its designee.

g. Delineate the public use easement over the master plan trail on Parcel N.

h. An additional recreational area shall be provided to serve the additional dwelling units that are the subject of this DSP, and approved pursuant to Preliminary Plan 4-07011.

i. An ornamental tree shall be located in every other front yard of Lots 333–346 and a shade tree at the ends of each stick of units.

2. Prior to the approval of building permits for Lots 276 through 280, the applicant shall file a record plat in accordance with Section 24-108 of the Subdivision Regulations for which no preliminary plan is required. The record plat shall reflect the adjusted lot sizes in conformance with the approved DSP.

3. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit three original recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) of M-NCPPC for construction of recreational facilities on homeowners land (Parcel N) for approval prior to the submission of final plats. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the County Land Records.

4. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of recreational facilities on homeowners land prior to the issuance of building permits.

5. The record plat for Parcel N shall reflect a public use easement over the master plan trail as reflected on the approved DSP.

6. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to show:

a. The existing contour lines for the north section of the site. All plans shall be revised to show the correct expanded buffer in conformance with the previously approved TCPII.

b. All proposed woodland conservation areas to be located a minimum of ten feet away from the proposed retaining wall. The worksheet shall be revised as necessary.

7. Prior to signature approval, the architectural elevations shall be revised to:

a. Reflect that the front, sides, and rears of the units located on Lots 347–359 shall be entirely brick.

b. Increase roof slopes from 6:12 to 8:12 pitch.

8. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 333 and 346, the front and side elevations shall be shown as entirely brick. All building sticks shall be required to be a minimum of 60 percent brick.

9. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 347–359, the trail on Parcel N shall be constructed and completed.

10. All residents of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property of this application shall have full access to the clubhouse and other recreational facilities operated by the Town Center at Camp Springs Homeowners Association, located at 4300 Telfair Boulevard. It is acknowledged that an optional initiation fee and annual fee (separate from the annual homeowners association dues) specifically for use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court within the clubhouse may be charged. The initiation fee for the use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court shall be waived for a period of three months after the date of settlement for the initial residents of each of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property.