



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

DETAILED SITE PLAN PLAN

DSP-02029

Application	General Data
Project Name WESTIN CLUSTER (Formerly Bowie Property) Location 2500' South from intersection of MD 202 and 193 on Left side of 202 • 1705 Largo Road, Upper Marlboro, Md 20772 Applicant/Address Ridgely Builders, Inc. 2200 Defense Hwy., Suite 101 Crofton, MD 21114	Date Accepted 05/08/2002
	Planning Board Action Limit 07/17/2002
	Plan Acreage 26.54
	Zone R-R
	Dwelling Units 50
	Square Footage N/A
	Planning Area 79
	Council District 06
	Municipality N/A
	200-Scale Base Map 203SE11

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
CONSTRUCTION OF 49 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED HOMES IN THE R-R ZONE	Adjoining Property Owners 05-01-02 (CB-15-1998)
	Previous Parties of Record 05-31-02 (CB-13-1997)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site 09-13-02
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer: WHITMORE, ELIZABETH
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

July 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Elizabeth Whitmore, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-02029
Westin Cluster

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the Detailed Site Plan for the Westin cluster. Based on that review and the findings in this report, the Development Review Division recommends APPROVAL with conditions, as stated in the Recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

The Detailed Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. Part 3, Division 9, Subdivision 3, of the Zoning Ordinance and Section 27-428, which regulates development in the R-R Zone and the *Landscape Manual*.
- b. Section 27-137 of the Subdivision Regulations, which governs cluster developments.
- c. Conditions of Preliminary Plan 4-01103.
- d. Referrals.

FINDINGS

Based upon evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. The subject application proposes the development of 50 single-family lots, one of which, Lot 43, is improved with an existing single-family residence that is to remain, using the cluster design concept. The site is located on the west side of MD 202 approximately 2,500 feet south of the intersection of MD 202 and MD 193. The ingress/egress for the subject site is located directly across from Waterfowl Way on the east side of MD 202, an entrance into the Perrywood development. No flag lots are proposed.
2. The development criteria for the subject site was set forth in the previously approved Preliminary Plan, 4-01103. The Detailed Site Plan is in compliance with Section 27-428, which regulates development in the R-R Zone, as demonstrated with the following site development data:

	EXISTING
Zone(s)	R-R Zone
Use(s)	Single-family residences
Acreage	26.54 acres
Lots	50 Lots
Parcels	3
Square Footage/GFA	N/A
Dwelling Units:	
Attached	0 Units
Detached	50 Units
Multifamily	0 Units
<u>Other Development Data</u>	
Areas of Slopes Greater than 25%	0.33 acres
Areas Within Existing 100-Year Floodplain	0.00 acres
Cluster Net Tract Area (Gross – F.P. – 25% Slope)	26.21 acres
Number of Lots Permitted at 2.0 du/acre	52 lots
Number of Lots Approved (Total)	50 lots
(Lot 43 is improved with an existing single-family residence)	
Number of Flag Lots Proposed	0 lots
Minimum Lot Size Permitted	10,000 sq. ft.
Minimum Lot Size Proposed	10,125 sq. ft.
Cluster Open Space Required	10.24 acres
2/3 of the Required Cluster Open Space to be outside of the 100-Year Floodplain and Stormwater Management Facilities	7.12 acres
Cluster Open Space Proposed Outside the 100-Year Floodplain and Stormwater Management Facilities	8.92 acres
Total Cluster Open Space Proposed	10.43 acres
Mandatory Dedication Required	0 acres
Open Space to be Conveyed to the Homeowner's Association	10.43 acres
Open Space to be Conveyed to MNCPPC	0 acres
Open Space to be Conveyed to Prince George's County	0 acres

Area of Nontidal Wetlands

6.6 acres

<u>Modification in Dimensional Standards Permitted in Cluster</u>	<u>Standard in Zone</u>	<u>Modification Allowed</u>	<u>Proposed</u>
27-442(c) Net Lot Coverage	25%	30%	30%
27-442(d) Lot width at Building Line	80'	75'	75'
Lot Frontage Along Street Line	70'	50'	50'
Lot Frontage Along Cul-de-sac	60'	50'	50'

3. The subject site conforms to the requirement of Section 4.1 and Section 4.6 of the *Landscape Manual*.
4. A Preliminary Plan (4-01103) was approved by the Planning Board (Resolution No. 02-64) on March 28, 2002. The Preliminary Plan contains several condition which warrant discussion:

3. At the time of Detailed Site Plan and Type II Tree Conservation Plan review:

- a. **Disturbance to the PMA shall be limited to disturbances proposed by a Letter of Justification dated February 25, 2002, from the Tech Group to The Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission (Morgan to Del Balzo) justifying disturbance of 0.003 acres of the PMA.**

Comment: The Detailed Site Plan and TCP II have limited PMA disturbances to those requested in the Letter of Justification dated February 25, 2002. The disturbances shown on the DSP are consistent with the approved Preliminary Plan.

- b. **Specimen trees on the site shall be preserved and protected to the maximum extent possible. This may include but not be limited to the following: relocation of lots; adjustment to lot lines; and adjustment to architectural footprints. The TCP II shall demonstrate that disturbance has been minimized in the critical root zone of trees to be retained. The TCP II shall include a Significant/Specimen Tree Management Plan to address best management practices to maintain and promote the viability of the significant trees retained.**

Comment: The Detailed Site Plan proposes the preservation of 29 of the 33 significant trees identified on the TCP II. The road and lot layout has been revised to minimize removal of significant trees to the extent possible. However, the disturbance of critical root zones are addressed further in Finding 11 by the Environmental Planning Section's review of the plans.

- c. **The landscape plan shall be coordinated with the technical stormwater management plan and TCP II to provide attractive landscaping for the stormwater management pond, and the coordination of the residential screening requirement with woodland conservation requirements.**

Comment: No woodland conservation is proposed within the stormwater management pond, so review coordination of the technical stormwater management plan is no longer necessary. However, staff is of the opinion that insufficient landscaping has been provided to fulfill the

concern of providing attractive landscaping. Therefore, a 6-foot-high, sight-tight fence with 9 masonry pillars placed 15 feet on-center should be provided on Lot 25.

- d. **A Phase II Noise Study shall be provided that includes the provision of noise mitigation measures that reduce exterior noise in outdoor activity areas to 65 dBA or less and interior noise to 45 dBA or less. The detailed site plan shall show the necessary site features for mitigation.**

Comment: A Phase I and Phase II Traffic Noise Study was prepared by the Polysonics Corporation (Report 5075, dated July 8, 2002). The Environmental Planning Section reviewed the Noise Study and agrees with the assumptions and findings of the report. However, the noise contours have not been labeled to indicate whether the contours represent mitigated or unmitigated noise. In addition, the report indicates that only a portion of the rear yards will be impacted by noise levels greater than 65 dBA Ldn, therefore, no additional exterior mitigation measures are required. Lots 1 through 7 will be exposed to noise levels higher than 65 dBA Ldn and as high as 67 dBA. Therefore, a minimum STC rating of 39 STC for walls and 28 for windows and doors, with the total window and door surface area not to exceed 20 percent of the overall exterior surface area, should be required at the time of building permit. Condition 2 in the Recommendation section of this report address the above concerns pertaining to noise.

6. **Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan on the subject property, the applicant his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary , DPW&T for the intersection of MD 202 and Water Fowl Way. The applicant shall utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of SHA. If the signal or other needed improvements at that intersection are deemed warranted by SHA at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal or other improvements prior to release of any building permits within the subject property, and install the warranted improvement at a time directed by the appropriate permitting agency. The study may be waived in either of the following situations:**
 - a. **A determination, in writing, by the SHA that sufficient recent studies at that location have been conducted.**
 - b. **A determination, in writing, by SHA that, due to gaps in traffic produced by the signal at the adjacent MD 202/Black Swan Drive/Hancock Drive intersection, the subject intersection would operate acceptably with the development of the subject property without signalization.**

Comment: The Maryland Department of Transportation State Highway Administration, in a memorandum dated March 21, 2002 (McDonald to Foster), offered the following comments:

“Access to the 52 single-family detached dwelling units is proposed from one (1) full movement access driveway on the west side of MD 202 aligning with the existing Water Fowl Way on the east side of MD 202. Specific site access design requirements including an exclusive southbound MD 202 right turn lane and exclusive northbound MD 202 left turn land at the MD 202 access must be coordinated with Michael Bailey.

“The traffic consultant determined that side street delays would exceed 45 seconds at the unsignalized MD 202 at Water Fowl Way/Site access drive intersection. However, based

upon an inspection of the projected traffic volumes, not even the Peak Hour Volume Warrant will be met at the intersection with the proposed development.

“The traffic consultant determined that other area intersection could support the proposed development.

“Although the analyses revealed that side street delays from the proposed Site Access Drive approach at the MD 202 at Water Fowl Way/Site Access Drive intersection will exceed 45 seconds, SHA has determined that traffic signalization will not be necessary with the proposed development since not even the Peak Hour Volume Warrant will be met. In addition, gaps in the traffic stream will be created from the signal at the MD 202 at Black Swan Drive/Hancock Drive intersection that will also facilitate traffic at the MD 202 at Water Fowl Way/Site Access Drive intersection.”

Comment: In summary, SHA has determined that signalization of the intersection of MD 202 and Waterfowl Way is not warranted at this time.

5. The cluster regulations require the review of the architectural elevations for the purpose of eliminating monotony of front elevations and to encourage a variety of architectural styling. The applicant is proposing eight architectural models by Ryan Homes; following is the square footage of each of the proposed models:

House Type	Base Square Footage
Sebastian	1,826 sq. ft.
Savoy	1,911 sq. ft.
Belvedere	1,982 sq. ft.
Zachary	2,175 sq. ft.
Victoria	2,334 sq. ft.
Waverly	2,485 sq. ft.
Jefferson	2,680 sq. ft.
Courtland	2,953 sq. ft.

*Finished square footage

Roof pitches on all elevations are a minimum of 8:12, with varying pitches and roof styles on the remaining rooflines and elevations. All of the above houses are two-story units and are enhanced by vinyl or wood siding, reverse gables, shutters and two-car garages. Endwalls provide a minimum of two architectural features. Several of the houses offer front porches and a side entry garage. The Courtland and Victoria models offer a three-car garage. The applicant has agreed to identify Lots 1, 31, 32 and 50 (corner lots) as specialty lots and to provide brick endwalls with a minimum of three endwall features on each lot.

6. A walking trail and a gazebo (which will double as a school bus shelter) with associated landscaping are being proposed in lieu of mandatory dedication. The plans should be revised to show a trail provided from the gazebo to the circuit walking trail.
7. The subject Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with Section 24-137 of the Subdivision Regulations which requires Detailed Site Plan approval for clusters and review and approval of the proposed architecture.

8. Section 24-138.01 of the Subdivision Regulations which addresses flag lots is not applicable since there are no flag lots proposed.
9. The Detailed Site Plan is in conformance with the Conceptual Site Plan and Preliminary Plan 4-01103, specifically in regard to layout, recreational facilities, and all applicable conditions. In addition, the Detailed Site Plan provides for the combination of lots and cluster open space at the entrance to the development that appears to be consistent with development regulations in the R-R Zone.
10. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) had numerous comments which will be addressed at the time of the application of the relevant permit.
11. The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated June 13, 2002 (Shaffer to Whitmore), offered the following comments specifically pertaining to trails:

“The Adopted and Approved Subregion VI Master Plan recommends one master plan trail/bikeway which impacts the subject site. MD 202 (Largo Road) is designated as a Class III bikeway. The existing wide asphalt shoulders in the vicinity of the subject site serve to accommodate bicycle traffic. It is recommended that this existing facility be retained and that bikeway signage be placed along the subject property’s frontage to alert drivers to the possibility of bicycle traffic on the roadway. The delineation of a four-foot wide bicycle facility on the site plan along MD 202 meets the intent of the master plan and retains bicycle accommodations along MD 202.”

Comment: Condition 1.n in the Recommendation section of this report address concerns pertaining to trails.

12. The Environmental Planning Section in a memorandum dated September 9, 2002 (Finch to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

“... The subject property is a 26.54-acre property in the R-R Zone. The site is located on the west side of Largo Road (MD 202), south and east of the Ramblewood Subdivision, and north of the University of Maryland Agricultural Experiment Station. The site is currently a single-family home, surrounded by open, flat agricultural fields, and includes accessory agricultural buildings on the property. Largo Road is a significant noise generator.

“A review of the information available indicates that a stream, with associated nontidal wetlands, is located on the southwest corner of the property. After it leaves the property, it joins a larger tributary, with associated nontidal wetlands and 100-year floodplain, which is offset 150 to 200 feet from the western property line. The on-site stream is located in an incised channel, with pockets of steep and severe slopes adjacent to the stream. The site is located in the Western Branch subwatershed, which is a tributary to the Patuxent River. Trees on the largely cleared site are limited to the area buffering the stream contiguous with a hedgerow effect along the western boundary, and a grove of trees surrounding the existing house.

“The soils found to occur on this property, according to the Prince George’s County Soil Survey, include the Adelphia, Collington, and Shrewsbury series. The Adelphia soils are hydrologic Class B, but may exhibit seasonally high water table, and impeded drainage. The Collington soils pose no special problems for development. The Shrewsbury soils

are hydrologic soils Class D and may exhibit a high water table and poor drainage. None of the soils are considered to be erodible.

“There are no rare, threatened, or endangered species located in the vicinity of this property based on information provided by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources–Natural Heritage Program. No historic or scenic roads are affected by this proposal. The sewer and water service categories are S-4C and W-3.

“... The Preliminary Plan was approved subject to several conditions contained in PGCPB No. 02-64 which were to be addressed at time of Detailed Site Plan Review.

“Condition 3.b reads as follows:

‘Specimen trees on the site shall be preserved and protected to the maximum extent possible. This may include but not limited to the following: relocation of lots; adjustments to lot lines; and adjustment to architectural footprints. The TCPII shall demonstrate that disturbance has been minimized in the critical root zone of trees to be retained. The TCPII shall include a Significant/Specimen Tree Management Plan to address best management practices to maintain and promote the viability of the significant trees retained.’

“Condition 3.d reads as follows:

‘A Phase II Noise Study shall be provided that includes the provision of noise mitigation measures that reduce exterior noise in outdoor activity areas to 65 dBA or less and interior noise to 45 dBA or less. The Detailed Site Plan shall show the necessary site features for mitigation.’

“A Phase I and Phase II Traffic Noise Study was prepared by the Polysonics Corporation (Report 5075, dated July 8, 2002). The Environmental Planning Section agrees with the assumptions and findings of this report, but finds that the noise contours have not been labeled as mitigated or unmitigated on the plans.

“The report indicates that only a portion of the rear yard will be impacted by future noise levels greater than 65 dBA Ldn, therefore, no additional exterior mitigation measures are required. The report further indicates that the traffic noise to the ground level of the proposed houses does not exceed 65 dBA Ldn, a noise level which can be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn with standard construction methods. Therefore, no additional interior mitigation is necessary for the ground level of the proposed dwelling. The residential dwellings proposed on Lots 1 through 7 will be exposed to noise levels higher than 65 dBA Ldn, and as high as 67 dBA. Under these conditions a minimum STC rating of 39 STC for walls and 28 for windows and doors, with total window and door surface area not exceed 20 percent of the overall exterior surface area will satisfy the requirement.

“Condition 3.b of PGCPB 02-64 reads as follows: At time of Detailed Site Plan and Type II Tree Conservation Plan review:

‘... The TCPII shall demonstrate that disturbance has been minimized in the critical root zone of trees to be retained.’

“The revised TCPII shows the critical root zones of the significant trees on-site, including those impacted by the removal of the driveway.

“In general, the disturbance has been minimized within critical root zone areas in accordance with comments provided in previous memos, but the plans are not complete in the protection of two significant trees.

“Hand clearing was requested by the Environmental Planning Section within the critical root zones of two trees, Trees #4 and #5, where no grading was required, but a 15-foot-wide non-woody buffer was required by DER. How this will be implemented is unclear on the TCPII.

“A Type I Tree Protection Device should be placed on the perimeter of the Critical Root Zone of both trees in the area which extends into the limit of disturbance. The plans should graphically differentiate the area of hand clearing from the preservation area and a note is needed on the plan.

“Condition 3.b. further reads as follows:

‘ . . . The TCPII shall include a Significant/Specimen Tree Management Plan to address best management practices to maintain and promote the viability of the significant trees retained.’

“A complete Significant /Specimen Tree Management Plan has not been submitted. The plans have been revised to include a detail for placing a driveway in the critical root zones of Trees #24 and #25, but no notes indicate where this detail is to be employed. For this site, the management plan should also address the following concerns:

- “a. Root pruning is include in the legend of the TCPII, but no location has been specified or details provided. The plan should address the location, details, and timing for root pruning.
- “b. Appropriate methods for non-mechanical clearing within the critical root zone of Tree #4 and #5 is needed.
- “c. Proposed method for placing a driveway in the critical root zones of Trees #14and #25 is needed.
- “d. Proposed method for removing the existing driveway from the critical root zone of Trees #33, 32, 31, 29, 28, 27, 21, 20, and 19; protection of the affected critical root zone during removal of the driveway; and methodology to allow for vegetation and landscaping restoration.

“Environmental Review

- “1. The TCPII does not include all of the required standard TCPII notes appropriate for this plan and does not include the Woodland Conservation Area Management Notes prepared by the Environmental Planning Section. These standard notes are available from the Environmental Planning Section.

- “2. The legend on the cover sheet identifies three types of TRP devices, but the legend on individual plan sheets does not include any tree protection devices.
- “3. In the southeast corner of the stormwater management pond, the afforestation areas included an area labeled ‘15 foot-wide nonwoody buffer,’ and extends to the right-of-way of Cinnamon Teal Way, covering the probable location of a public utility easement.
- “4. A ‘Tree Protection Detail’ has been placed on Sheet 7 of 7 of the TCPII, but no information has been provided about where it will be used on the plan.”

Comment: Conditions 1.a – 1.l in the Recommendation section of this report address the above concerns.

- 13. The Permit Review Section had several comments, which have been addressed, except for lot coverage. Condition 5 in the Recommendation section of this report addresses this concern.
- 14. The Transportation Planning Section in a memorandum dated June 3, 2002 (Masog to Whitmore) offered the following comments:

“... The site plan is acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation. Appropriate dedication exists along MD 202, and no further dedication is required by this plan.

“The *Subregion VI Master Plan* shows a primary roadway along the southern boundary of the subject property. The text of the plan, however, does not discuss this roadway in any detail, nor is it numbered or identified as are a number of other primary streets within the plan area. It appears that this roadway was shown on the plan as a means of establishing the point where the subject property would gain access to MD 202. A study identifying combined access points along MD 202 was done several years prior to approval of the master plan. Since the access point shown on the subject plan is consistent with the recommendations of that study, staff and the Planning Board determined that the access and circulation plan associated with the underlying subdivision was acceptable. Therefore, the subject plan need not reflect this primary street.”

- 15. The Maryland Department of Transportation, State Highway Administration, in a memorandum dated May 13, 2002 (McDonald to Whitmore), offered the following comments:

“This office completed its evaluation of the submitted plan. The proposed improvements along the property fronting MD 202 are not consistent with State Highway Administration guidelines.”

Comment: The plans have since been revised to address the road improvements along the property fronting on MD 202 in accordance with SHA requirements. Prior to the issuance of the access permit by SHA, additional details and specifications within the right-of-way may be required.

- 16. The Detailed Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the Site Design Guidelines of Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance, without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

17. In order to ensure that prospective purchasers are made aware of all exterior elevations of all models approved by the Planning Board, and of the existence of an approved Detailed Site Plan, Landscape Plan, Architectural Elevations and plans for recreational facilities, these plans must be displayed in the sales office.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing analysis, the Urban Design Staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-02029 and TCPII/64/02, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the following revisions and or notes shall be added to the Detailed Site Plan and Tree Conservation Plan, or the indicated issues shall be addressed:
 - a. A Type 1 Tree Protection Device shall be placed on the perimeter of the critical root zone of Trees #4 and #5 which is adjacent to the clearing.
 - b. The TCPII shall be revised to graphically differentiate the area of land clearing from the woodland preservation area adjacent to Trees #4 and 5.
 - c. The following notes shall be added to sheet 4 of 7:

“Note: Clearing in the 15-foot-wide non-woody buffer zone required at the toe of the storm water management embankment, which impacts the critical root zones of significant trees, shall be accomplished by nonmechanical means to reduce impacts and compaction within the critical root zone.”
 - d. All applicable standard TCPII notes and Woodland Conservation Area management notes prepared by the Environmental Planning Section shall be added to the plans.
 - e. Type I, IIA and IIB tree protection devices shall be identified in the legend of all applicable TCPII plan sheets.
 - f. Details and specifications shall be provided to indicate how each type of woodland conservation signage will be mounted.
 - g. Woodland conservation areas shall be removed from public utility easements and non-woody buffer areas.
 - h. The use of the “Tree Protection Detail” shown on sheet 7 of 7 shall be more fully described; or it shall be removed from the plan sheets.
 - i. The TCPII shall more clearly indicate the locations of proposed root pruning.
 - j. Appropriate methods for non-mechanical clearing within the critical root zones of Trees #4 and #5 shall be provided
 - k. The method of placing a driveway in the critical root zones of Trees #24 and #25 shall be provided.

- l. The method for removing the existing driveway from the CRZ of trees from Trees #33, 32, 31, 29, 28, 27, 21, 20 and 19; the protection of significant trees during the removal of the driveway; and methodology for restoration of landscaping shall be provided.
 - j. The applicant shall submit to the State Highway Administration the location of one “Share the Road with a Bike” sign within the right-of-way of MD 202, for their review and approval. The sign shall be purchased from State Highway and a note shall be placed on the plan stating that the sign shall be installed in accordance with the State Highway Administration’s Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.
 - k. All internal trails shall be at least six feet wide, asphalt construction, and shall be ramped at all street crossings.
 - l. The details and specifications for the entrance signage shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section.
 - m. Lots 1, 31, 32, and 50 shall be identified as specialty lots with a large asterisk. The endwalls on these units most visible from the street shall be brick with at least three endwall features.
 - n. The plans shall be revised to include a six-foot-high, sight-tight fence with masonry piers on Lot 25. This privacy fence shall meet required building setbacks.
2. Three original, executed private Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) or other suitable guarantee shall be submitted to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to applying for building permits. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA (or suitable alternative) shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George’s County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland. The RFA shall include 1,570± linear feet of 6-foot-wide asphalt trail and one 16-foot diameter gazebo.
 3. The applicant shall submit to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
 4. Prior to issuance of building permits for Lots 1 through 7, certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be provided on the plans that the buildings have been designed to attenuate interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.
 5. Prior to approval of the Final Plat, a note shall be added to the plats stating that the installation of bicycle signage on MD 202 shall take place prior to release of the first building permit.
 6. Prior to release of building permits for each lot, proposed lot coverage for each lot shall be provided.
 7. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall display in the sales office all the plans approved by the Planning Board for this subdivision, including all exterior elevations of all approved models, the Detailed Site Plan, Landscaping Plan, and plans for recreational facilities.
 8. Units across the street from, and adjacent to, each other shall not have identical front elevations.