



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

# DETAILED SITE PLAN

## DSP-04067

Application	General Data
<b>Project Name:</b> BALK HILL VILLAGE  <b>Location:</b> 2,500 feet northwest of the intersection of Campus Way North and Lottsford Road  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> D. R. Horton, Inc 1370 Piccard Drive, Suite 230 Rockville, MD 20850	Date Accepted: 3/14/2005
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 125.4
	Zone: M-X-T
	Dwelling Units: 192
	Square Footage: 19,800 Sq. Ft.
	Planning Area: 73
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 05
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 203NE08 & 09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Detailed site plan review for 192 single-family detached and attached homes and 19,800 square feet of commercial retail and office space, on remand from the District Council per notice of final decision dated March 21, 2006.	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 02/25/2006 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 05/09/2006

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ruth E. Grover, A.I.C.P.	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

May 11, 2006

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Ruth Grover, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-04067  
Balk Hill Village Remand

The Planning Board approved a detailed site plan for Balk Hill Village on September 29, 2005 (PGCPB No. 05-202). The District Council reviewed Detailed Site Plan DSP-04067 for Balk Hill Village and in an Order of Remand dated March 13, 2006, returned the case to the Planning Board. Each reason for the remand listed by the District Council is included in boldface type below, followed by staff's comments:

**The Planning Board should state in its revised decision how transportation improvements proposed by (or required of) the applicant, for adequate public facilities purposes, relate to the design of the residential and commercial components shown on the plan.**

**Comment:** In a memorandum dated May 12, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following response to this element of the remand order:

As a part of findings of adequacy, the subject site has been required to do the following:

1. Provide dedication and construction of Campus Way and St. Joseph's Drive within the limits of the subject property. These facilities have been reflected on all plans, and will be constructed as overall construction progresses.
2. Provide an additional eastbound through lane along MD 202 through the I-95 interchange, and additional eastbound and westbound through lanes along MD 202 between the I-95 interchange and Lottsford Road. Additionally, the applicant will provide a second eastbound left-turn lane along MD 202 at the McCormick Drive/St. Josephs Drive intersection.
3. Provide other streets, constructed to County standards, to adequately serve the access needs of this site and allow key vehicular connections to adjacent sites.

The residential components of the plan are well-designed with regard to the transportation facilities. The single-family residences are generally along primary and secondary residential streets, with the streets appropriately sized to foster good access and circulation. Larger single-family residences are placed along St. Josephs Drive. All homes along St. Josephs Drive and

Campus Way are served by alleys, allowing the master plan roadways to be lined with manicured lawns and vegetation.

The commercial components of the plan are placed around the traffic circle along St. Josephs Drive, creating commercial activity at a transportation focal point. Necessary parking facilities are close at hand.

In all cases, exterior elements on the buildings echo the muted tones of new pavement and curbing.

The subject property is required to make roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 2004 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03094. These findings were supported by a traffic study submitted in 2003. Insofar as the basis for the findings is still valid, and in consideration of the scope of this application, the transportation staff can make a finding that the subject property will be served by adequate transportation facilities within a reasonable period of time.

**Urban Design Comment:** Based on the Transportation Planning Section's comments above, it is clear that the required transportation improvements relate harmoniously to the design of the residential and commercial components shown on the plan and therefore fulfill the remand order in this respect.

**Staff and Planning Board shall determine on the record whether the 19,800 square-foot retail component is of sufficient size to serve as a third use type, in the M-X-T Zone on the property.**

**Comment:** In a memorandum dated May 11, 2006, the Research Section stated that, based on their review of the submitted Regent Park Retail Market Study, prepared by the Center for Regional Analysis at George Mason University, they agree with the applicant's conclusion that the supply of retail space in the market area is substantially greater than the demand for retail by the residents in the area. Therefore, the offered 19,800-square-foot retail component of the subject development is more than adequate to meet market demand, and to require a larger retail component to fulfill the requirements of the M-X-T Zone would not be reasonable or advisable.

**The Planning Board should also state in a revised decision how the design of the residential component of the project is consistent with public school facilities existing or programmed for the area including the subject property. The Board shall place in the record an explanation how the residential part of the project will affect neighborhood schools and school capacity.**

**Comment:** In a memorandum dated May 11, 2006, The Public Facilities Planning Section offered the following:

The existing enrollment and capacity of schools in the immediate area are shown on the table below.

School Name	Capacity	Enrollment 2005-2006	Percent Capacity
Lake Arbor E.S.	778	835	107
Ernest E. Just M.S.	990	1,111	112
Flowers H.S.	2,200	2,539	115

Source: Prince George's County Public Schools

The 192 single-family dwelling units will produce 46 elementary school students, 12 middle school students and 23 high school students. The Prince George's County Public Schools make

the final assignment for specific schools. The Lake Arbor Elementary School has 835 students in the 2005-2006 school year and operates at 107% of capacity. If the 46 students generated by Balk Hill were to be assigned to that school it would operate at 113% of capacity. The 12 middle school students would attend Ernest Just Middle School, which has an expected enrollment of 1,111 in 2006, 112% of capacity. The 12 additional students would result in the school operating at 113% of capacity. Flowers High school is operating at 115% of capacity in 2006 and the 23 students generated by the Balk Hill development would change the operating capacity to 121%.

There are no elementary or middle school projects in the current Capital Improvement Program for this area. The FY 06-2001 Capital Improvement Program does contain a project for a new high school which could provide some relief to the system but it is not expected to be completed before 2008.

**Urban Design Comment:** It would appear that the design of the residential component will result in a slight increase in the degree of overcrowding in the neighborhood schools. However, there is no required finding of adequacy of public schools at the time of detailed site plan.

**As to the commercial or industrial area proposed adjacent to the subject property, the tract of approximately 20 acres to be conveyed to the Prince George's County Revenue Authority, the Planning Board shall require review and approval of the use of the 20-acre property, and the design of the use, as follows:**

1. **Regardless of ownership, no part of the 20-acre tract shall be eligible for permits until the Planning Board and District Council approve the use of the property and a detailed site plan for the use.**

**Comment:** Staff has included this requirement as a recommended condition below.

2. **Prior to detailed site plan application, the applicant (whether public or private) shall obtain advice from the Advisory Planning Committee about the proposed use and design of the property. This advice shall be reduced to writing and filed with the site plan application.**

**Comment:** Staff has included this requirement as a recommended condition below.

**The "Manor House" units shall not include rental or condominium units, and each Manor House unit shall contain exactly three attached "buildings," arranged or designed as "one-family dwellings, "in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance definition of a "townhouse."**

**Comment:** Staff has included this requirement as a recommended condition below.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

Based on the foregoing evaluation and analyses of the remand order, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the previous findings of DSP-04067 as expressed in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-202 and the additional findings above, and REAPPROVE Balk Hill Village DSP-04067 and TCP II/82/05 with previous conditions of DSP-04067 as expressed in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-202 and the following additional conditions:

1. **Regardless of ownership, no part of the approximately 20 acres of commercial and industrial land adjacent to the subject site to be conveyed to the Prince George's County Revenue Authority,**

shall be eligible for permits until the Planning Board and the District Council approve the use and a detailed site plan for the property.

2. Prior to submittal of the above-mentioned detailed site plan application, the applicant (whether public or private) shall obtain advice from the Advisory Planning Committee about the proposed use and design of the property and reduce that advice to writing and file it with the site plan application.
3. The “Manor House” units shall not include rental or condominium units, and each Manor House unit shall contain exactly three attached “buildings,” arranged or designed as “one-family dwellings, “ in accordance with the Zoning Ordinance definition of a “townhouse.”