

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-REMAND

DSP-04082

Application	General Data
Project Name: BRIGHTON PLACE Location: EAST SIDE OF ROLLINS AVENUE, 1,500 FEET SOUTH OF ITS INTERSECTION WITH MD 332 (OLD CENTRAL AVENUE) Applicant/Address: BEAZER HOMES CORPORATION 8965 GUILFORD ROAD, SUITE 290 COLUMBIA, MD 21046	Date Accepted: 2/7/2005
	Planning Board Action Limit: Waived
	Plan Acreage: 29.0
	Zone: R-55 & R-T (DDOZ)
	Dwelling Units: 128
	Square Footage: NA
	Planning Area: 75A
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 07
	Municipality: NA
	200-Scale Base Map: 201SE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
CONSTRUCTION OF 126 RESIDENCES- 58 TOWNHOUSE UNITS AND 68 SINGLE- FAMILY DETACHED UNITS REMANDED from District Council on February 27, 2006	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 11/19/2004 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 10/31/06

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: LAREUSE	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

July 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Planner Coordinator

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan, DSP-04082
Brighton Place
Addison Road Metro Town Center
TCPH/75/05

The Urban Design Staff has completed its review of the revised detailed site plan submitted by the applicant in an attempt to conform to the Order of Remand from the District Council. The plans have been revised to address the concerns of the District Council as expressed in the public hearing and in the written order. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions as described in the recommendation section below.

FINDINGS

1. The Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for Brighton Place, on July 14, 2005 (PGCPB No. 05-162). The District Council reviewed the Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for Brighton Place on February 27, 2006, and remanded the case to the Planning Board. The Order of Remand dated February 27, 2006, is quoted below and responses are provided.

REMANDED to the Planning Board, for the following reasons:

- A. **The Planning Board shall reevaluate, in consultation with the Department of Environmental Resources (DER), the advisability of the proposed above-ground stormwater management pond and the technical feasibility of underground facilities. If it is determined by DER that underground facilities are technically feasible and approvable in light of applicable county laws and policies, the plan shall be revised to eliminate the above-ground stormwater management pond and substitute underground facilities.**

The applicant provided the following discussion regarding this item in a letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“In response to the March 28, 2006, remand by the District Council for the above-referenced case, the applicant, Beazer Homes, has responded as follows with its revised detailed site plan filed recently with The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC):

“A. The Department of Environmental Resources (“DER”) has given conceptual stormwater approval to the proposed development. Previously, the detailed site plan was requesting an urban development—evidenced by the request to construct townhouses in groups of ten for which an underground pond was believed to be more appropriate. This has been deleted from the plan resulting in a suburban development for which a pond is appropriate and will be used as a recreational feature.

“Additionally, an underground facility would be maintained by the homeowner’s association at the expense of the homeowners who will eventually reside at the property. Conversely, the proposed pond will be maintained by the county and will not be a maintenance and financial burden on the homeowners.

“Further, there are wetlands and ephemeral streams on this site that are to be impacted by this development. As part of the process to acquire permits for these impacts, it was demonstrated that some of the water quality benefits associated with these resources could be replaced by the proposed wet pond facility. An underground facility cannot provide the same benefits.

“The pond as designed for this site has undergone extensive review with the Maryland Department of the Environment, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Prince George’s County DER, and M-NCPPC. This pond is also designated as a publicly maintained facility due to the size of the drainage area and the fact that multiple individual residential property owners are dependent on its function. The design of the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed and is a component of the open space within the planned community. Finally, the pond has been redesigned to provide the homeowners with an aesthetically pleasing recreational area.”

Staff Comment: The stormwater management pond as now proposed is considerably smaller than the original submittal. This has increased the amount of woodland conservation area on-site. A letter dated July 27, 2006 from Rick Thompson of the Department of Environmental Resources to Redis Floyd, Clerk of the Council, indicates that DER has reviewed the advisability of above-ground stormwater management and technical feasibility of underground facilities, and determined that an above-ground facility is the best alternative in light of applicable county laws and policies. This issue has been addressed by the Department of Environmental Resources in a letter dated July 27, 2006, Thompson to Floyd:

“I am writing regarding the order of remand of the Brighton Place project issued by the District Council on March 28, 2006. As I understand it, the council is concerned about the use of the stormwater management (SWM) pond on the site. This letter should address this concern and clarify any issue with the SWM pond on the property.

“The issue was raised that this site is urban and should be treated as such with regard to SWM. The use of underground (UG) SWM facilities in urban areas is an acceptable practice when the density and use are such that there is no land available to provide for an acceptable above ground facility. UG facilities are most always privately owned and maintained due to the difficulties associated with access for maintenance and the fact that the contributing drainage areas are typically small and individually owned. UG facilities are common in redevelopment sites within ‘ultra urban’ areas that have previously been developed with near 100 percent impervious coverage and direct outfall to an extensive underground stormdrain system. UG facilities are also used beneath large, commercial parking areas in densely developed areas that, once again, do not have sufficient area for an above ground facility.

“This site, although considered urban, does not have any of the characteristics typically associated with the use of an UG SWM facility. It is not a redevelopment within an ‘ultra urban’ area, and its drainage area is large (33+ acres). In fact, the site has just recently been used for agriculture and has less than one percent of the entire site in impervious coverage. The site does not discharge to an extensive underground stormdrain system. The drainage outfall from this site discharges directly to an open channel stream system on the west side of Rollins Avenue. Further, there are wetlands and ephemeral streams on this site that will be impacted by this development. As part of the process to acquire permits for these impacts, it was demonstrated that some of the water quality benefits associated with these resources could be replaced by the proposed wet pond facility. A UG facility cannot provide the same benefits and could affect the issuance of these permits.

“The pond designed for this site has undergone extensive review by the Maryland Department of the Environment, the Army Corps of Engineers, the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources, and The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission. This pond is also designated as a publicly maintained facility due to the size of the drainage area and the fact that multiple residential property owners are dependent on its function. The design of the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed, and is a component of the open space within the planned community. Finally, this facility is being proposed as a site amenity that will provide the entire community with an aesthetically pleasing recreational area.”

B. Staff, applicant, and Planning Board must explain the basis for the brick front façade requirements in the Planning Board Resolution, PGCPB No. 05-162, approving this site plan.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion regarding this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“As required by the R-T Zone, a minimum of sixty percent of the single-family attached homes will have front facades that are one hundred percent brick.

“Additionally, beyond these zone requirements, the applicant shall:

- (A) Provide full brick side walls on the single-family, attached units on lots 1, 19, 20, 39, 40 and 58 as these lots are highly visible from the street.
- (B) All the single-family attached end walls shall, at a minimum, have brick wrapping the first floor of the side elevations.

“Prior conditions (2) (j) (1) and (2) (l) need to be revised to reflect these changes.”

Staff comment: The basis for the brick front façade requirements are found in both the underlying R-T Zone and the DDOZ overlay zone. The Addison Road Metro Town Center requires at least 60 percent masonry front facades for all single family homes (see PGCPB No. 05-162, page 11, paragraph 8).

C. The Planning Board shall reconsider and review exterior facade materials, utilities relocation, townhouse groups, the Watts-Branch watershed of the Anacostia River, and the tot lot requirement, as follows:

- (1) **In paragraph B.3. I. of the Board's initial decision (page 7): exterior facade materials should be extended down to 12 inches from the finished grade, avoiding exposed unfinished concrete or concrete masonry unit (CMU) basement walls. Alternatively, exposed side and rear basement walls may be clad with standard brick, or brick-formed and painted concrete below the level of the siding.**

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

- “B. As desired, exposed sides of rear basement walls will be clad with standard brick or brick-formed and painted concrete below the level of the siding.”

Staff comment: The majority of the units will not have exposed sides or rears of basement walls because most of the basements are below grade. Less than five percent of the units will have exposed sides and rear basement walls, none of which will be visible from a street.

- (2) **In paragraph P.6. B. of the Board's initial decision (page 8), redevelopment of parcels within the town center should require underground relocation of utilities (except along Rollins Avenue).**

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in letter dated August 18, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

- “(2) As requested, all new utility connections to the houses will be underground.”

Staff comment: The staff continues to support the alternative language approved by the Planning Board:

All utilities within the development will be underground in the 10-foot public utility easement and in connections to individual houses.

- (3) **The Board should explain why the plan as approved allows more than eight townhouse units in an attached group within the project.**

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“The project no longer proposes more than eight townhouse units in an attached group. In fact, the following groupings are proposed.

- “• Six sets of six units in a row.
- “• Four sets of four units in a row.
- “• Two sets of three units in a row.”

Staff comment: The plans have been revised to indicate no more than six units in a row. The original plan proposed ten units in a row.

(4) The Board, with staff assistance, should examine more closely and evaluate in its new decision the project's potential and likely impacts on the Watts-Branch watershed of the Anacostia River.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“Rick Thompson (Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources) in his letter on July 27, 2006 states: ‘The design on the pond provides for the most effective means of maintenance, is able to provide water quality and environmental benefits to the receiving watershed, and is a component of the open space within the planned community.’ Clearly then, there is no potential and likely impact on the Watts-Branch Watershed on the Anacostia River as evidenced by the language and the positive findings of Mr. Thompson’s letter.”

Staff comment: All stormwater management facilities are designed to mimic pre-development conditions and are required to reduce post-construction volumes to that of pre-development conditions. The stormwater management facility shown is of sufficient size, according to review by the Department of Environmental Resources, to manage the volumes created by the new development. It should be noted that much of the development within the Anacostia watershed was completed prior to the establishment of stormwater management regulations. This project should result in improved water quality compared to the water quality that is running off sites developed without the benefit of stormwater management.

(5) The Board should reevaluate the need for a tot lot in the project, and should replace the tot lot with other age groups or provide additional funds for development of Rollins Avenue Park.

Comment: The applicant provided the following discussion relating to this item in a letter dated November 13, 2006, LaRocca to Lareuse:

“The District Council, at the February 27, 2006, hearing at which the detailed site plan was remanded to the Planning Board, was clear that it did not want on-site

recreational amenities, including the one previously proposed tot lot. Instead, the District Council wants a fee in lieu paid in the amount of \$145,000 for regional facilities at the Rollins Avenue Park.

“In furtherance of the District Council’s clear and succinct instructions, the tot lot has been removed from the plan and the applicant shall pay \$145,000 to M-NCPPC as a fee-in-lieu.”

Staff comment: The plans have been revised to remove the tot-lot that was previously shown within the open space area of the townhouse section.

D. If additional persons wish to become parties of record, then they should be added, after the case is remanded.

Staff comment: The statement above reflects the current practice of the Planning Board. The property was posted 30 days prior to the scheduled hearing.

2. The Environmental Planning Section provided the following analysis in conjunction with the revised plans as stated in their memo dated October 16, 2006.

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan and TCPII for Brighton Place, stamped as received by the Countywide Planning Division on September 26, 2006. This detailed site plan and TCPI were originally approved by the Planning Board subject to conditions contained in PGCPB No. 05-062 on July 14, 2005. The application was remanded to the Planning Board by order of the District Council on February 27, 2006, for reasons listed in the order of remand. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the reasons for remand, and recommends re-approval of DSP-04082 and TCPII/75/05 subject to the conditions of the original resolution, and as listed at the end of this memorandum.

Environmental Conditions of PGCPB No. 05-162

The Environmental Planning Section has re-reviewed the DSP and TCPII for conformance with environmental conditions of the original Planning Board resolution. These conditions are shown in bold typeface, and the associated comments are shown in standard typeface.

5. **Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

Comment: This condition will be addressed at time of issuance of any permits, and should be retained.

6. **Prior to issuance of the first permit, a copy of the wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted, with all accompanying landscape plans. The mitigation plan shall show extensive plantings of wetland plants and water-tolerant trees and other plants throughout the disturbed area, in conformance with any and all comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Corps of Engineers. The areas**

where the wetlands previously existed shall be landscaped as a natural area and as much of the area around the pond shall be naturalized.

Recommended Additional Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the DSP the TCPII/Landscape Plan shall be revised to show extensive landscaping around the proposed pond.

7. The following notes shall be placed on the TCPII:

“After the site has been cleared the applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the DER Site Inspector, M-NCPPC’s Environmental Planning Section and their certified arborist to evaluate the vegetation on the edges of the preservation area.” The certified arborist hired by the applicant shall prepare a written report regarding how invasive plants will be removed from the preservation area. The report shall be submitted to and reviewed by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section.”

Comment: This condition has been addressed, and does not need to be retained.

8. Prior to certification of the TCPII, it shall be revised as follows:

- a. The plans shall be designed to meet all of the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance, including the provision of tree protection and the required notes.**
- b. Revise the worksheet as necessary to address all conditions of approval.**
- c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.**

Comment: The TCPII and DSP must be revised to add the symbol for forest cleared areas in the legend. Furthermore, the symbol for area cleared on sheet 3 is missing on both the map and legend; existing tree lines must be shown on plan; stormwater management pond inlet and outfalls must be shown on the TCPII; wooded areas 1 and 2 retained as “non-woodlands retained FCA”, should be counted as area cleared because they are within limits of disturbance; and that portion of “woodland retained non FCA” area 3 within the right-of-way must be calculated as cleared.

Recommended Revised Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:

- a. Revise the legend and the plan to reflect and identify all graphic symbols used;
- b. Revise the plan to show the existing tree line;
- c. Revise the plan to reflect woodland areas 1 and 2 as being cleared;
- d. Revise the plan to reflect “woodland retained non-FCA” area 3 within the right-of-way must be counted as cleared;
- e. Remove labels “existing foundation landscaping (non forest); open crown scrub (non forest)” from sheet 5; and “existing tree row (not forest)” from sheet 3;
- f. Revise the plan to reflect the details of the final stormwater management pond design, including inlets and outfalls;
- g. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan; and

- h. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
9. **Prior to approval of the first permit, a copy of the approved Technical Stormwater Management Plans must be submitted to M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section. The limits of disturbance on the Stormwater Management Plan and those on the TCPII must coincide.**

Comment: This condition has not yet been addressed and should be retained.

3. **Urban Design Review:** The plans have been revised to address the concerns expressed by the District Council in their review. The major changes to the plans are reflected in the reduction of the number of units in a row, being reduced from the original design of ten units in a row to no more than six in a row. The plans were also changed in regard to the design of the stormwater management plan. More attention has been given to detail on incorporation of trails and landscaping around the pond. The third major change to the plans is the elimination of the tot-lot from the plans.

The reduction of the number of units in a row results in an overall reduction in the number of townhouses from 60 to 58 units. This revision is still in keeping with the Addison Road Town center plan and does not create any other non-conformance issues with the underlying zone or the overlay zone. However, the change does impact the general notes of the plan and the number of required parking spaces, so the plan has addressed both issues appropriately.

The revisions to the stormwater management pond are an improvement over the original design. The applicant has provided an exhibit that reflects the proposal, but the actual detailed site plan does not reflect the same grading and details: therefore the plan must be changed prior to signature approval to reflect the proposal shown in the exhibit dated November 13, 2006.

The application has been revised to fulfill the District Council's desire to eliminate the on-site recreational facilities and instead contribute funds toward the planned development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park across Rollins Avenue from the subject site. Therefore, the staff has revised the condition relating to the amount of the contribution to be increased proportionate to the bonding amount of the tot-lot.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based upon the foregoing evaluation of this report, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board APPROVE Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/75/05 and APPROVE the proposed Alternative Development District Standards S3.D, S3.E, S3.F, P1.C, P2.E, B3.I, P5.D and P6.B, and further APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-04082 for the above-described land, subject to the following revised conditions:

1. Prior to the approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide evidence of a contribution to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation in the amount of [\$100,000] \$145,000* for the development of the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.
2. Prior to signature approval, the following conditions shall be fulfilled:

*Denotes Amendment: Underlining indicates new language; [brackets] indicate deleted language.

- a. The maximum lot coverage of 60 percent for the single-family detached dwellings shall be added to the plans.
- b. The plans shall demonstrate that the maximum building coverage for single-family attached dwellings shall be no more than 50 percent of the overall tract area.
- c. The details and specifications of the proposed crosswalks shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section and shall be shown on the plans.
- d. The location of light fixtures, height of pole, details and specifications, and fixture type shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section and shall be shown on the plans.
- e. The architectural elevations for the proposed building sticks shall be prepared for review and approval by the Urban Design Section.
- f. The applicant shall submit the proposed exterior color palette for proposed siding, trim, roof shingles, brick foundation, and front doors for the units, and the colors shall be approved by the Urban Design Section.
- g. A minimum of two end-wall features shall be provided on the single-family detached units and three or more features on the end walls of the townhouse units.
- h. All roadways shall be extended to the property line and constructed so that they terminate at the property line for future extension into the adjacent property.
- i. A crosswalk shall be shown connecting Street A to the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.
- j. The architectural elevations shall be revised as follows:
 - (1) [The townhouse architecture shall include another interior model type and a 24-foot-wide unit to be added to the package to be constructed at the end of each townhouse stick. The elevations shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section.]* The architecture of the townhouse* end walls shall, at a minimum, depict brick wrapping the first floor of the front and side elevations.
 - (2) The Kendall and Ashland models shall be revised to show an attached garage.
 - (3) A side-entry garage shall be provided for the Devon model.
 - (4) The optional stone water table and partial stone front on Elevation 1 of the Ashland model shall be changed to brick.
 - (5) The Devon model shall delete Elevation 1 due to the lack of variation in the roof-line.
 - (6) All porch details shall be shown at least six feet in depth.
- k. The location and the details and specifications of the signage shall be shown on the plans.

*Denotes Amendment: Underlining indicates new language; [brackets] indicate deleted language.

- l. The architecture elevations for the single-family attached development shall indicate brick as the exterior finish material on the entire highly visible side wall for the lots 1, 19, 20, 39, 40, and 58. *
 - m. The amenities to be included around the stormwater management pond shall include appropriate seating elements for the future residents.
3. Prior to the issuance of the first building permit, the street tree and paving plans shall be submitted to MNCPPC to determine conformance to the following:
- a. Street trees shall be planted approximately 35 feet on center.
 - b. Street trees shall be installed at a minimum size of 2½-inch caliper.
 - c. A variety of tree species shall be selected for use as the street trees for the roadways within the town center.
 - d. Plant selections for trees shall consider the following characteristics: shape of canopy, depth of root zone, overhead utility lines, drought tolerance, maintenance requirements, and tolerance of adverse urban conditions. Native plant species are recommended if possible.
 - e. Provide a six- to eight-foot-wide sidewalk along Rollins Avenue.
 - f. Provide six-foot-wide sidewalks along street A and street C.
 - g. Provide standard sidewalks on both sides of all other streets.
 - h. Provide a crosswalk connecting Street A to the Rollins Avenue Neighborhood Park.
- All of the conditions above are subject to the approval of the DPW&T.
4. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the plans shall be revised to demonstrate the following:
- a. Sixty percent of the single-family detached units within the development shall have front porches, except for units along Rollins Avenue, for a minimum of 33 of the units required to have front porches.
 - b. All of the units fronting on Rollins Avenue shall have brick fronts and the overall development shall have 60 percent of the units with brick fronts.
 - c. The Devon and Farrington units shall not be sited along Rollins Avenue.

*Denotes Amendment: Underlining indicates new language; [brackets] indicate deleted language.

5. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit to the M-NCPPC Planning Department copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
6. Prior to issuance of the first permit, a copy of the wetland mitigation plan shall be submitted with all accompanying landscape plans. The mitigation plan shall show extensive plantings of wetland plants and water-tolerant trees and other plants throughout the disturbed area, in conformance with any and all comments from the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Corps of Engineers. The areas where the wetlands previously existed shall be landscaped as a natural area and as much of the area around the pond as possible shall be naturalized.
7. The following notes shall be placed on the TCPII:

After the site has been cleared and prior to issuance of the first building permit, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the DER site inspector, M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section, and their certified arborist to evaluate the vegetation on the edges of the preservation area. The certified arborist hired by the applicant shall prepare a written report regarding how invasive plants will be removed from the preservation area. The report shall be submitted to and reviewed by the M-NCPPC Environmental Planning Section.
- [8. Prior to certification of the TCPII, it shall be revised as follows:
 - a. The plans shall be designed to meet all of the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance including the provision of tree protection and the required notes.
 - b. Revise the worksheet as necessary to address all conditions of approval.
 - c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.] *
8. Prior to certificate approval of the DSP the TCPII/Landscape Plan shall be revised to show extensive landscaping and trails—as shown on the applicant's exhibit dated November 13, 2006—around the proposed pond. *
9. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the Type II tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:
 - i. Revise the legend and the plan to reflect and identify all graphic symbols used;
 - ii. Revise the plan to show the existing tree line;
 - iii. Revise the plan to reflect woodland areas 1 and 2 as being cleared;
 - iv. Revise the plan to reflect "woodland retained non-FCA" area 3 within the right-of-way must be counted as cleared;
 - v. Remove labels "existing foundation landscaping (non forest); open crown scrub (non forest)" from sheet 5; and "existing tree row (not forest)" from sheet 3;
 - vi. Revise the plan to reflect the details of the final stormwater management pond design, including inlets and outfalls; *

*Denotes Amendment: Underlining indicates new language; [brackets] indicate deleted language.

- vii. Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect changes made to the plan; and
- viii. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan. *

[9]10. * Prior to approval of the first permit, a copy of the approved technical stormwater management plans must be submitted to M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section. The limits of disturbance on the stormwater management plan and those on the TCPII must coincide.

[10. Final Plats shall not be accepted until CB-6-2005 is enacted.] *

[11. Prior to signature approval, the architectural elevations for the single-family attached units shall be revised to indicate conformance to Applicant's Exhibit No. 1.] *

*Denotes Amendment: Underlining indicates new language; [brackets] indicate deleted language.