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-07054

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: Oaklawn Subdivision	Date Accepted:	10/28/08
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	1.63
Location: 400 feet south of the intersection of Allentown Road and Arundel Drive.	Zone:	R-R
	Dwelling Units:	3
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
Applicant/Address: ACUMEN, TSC 7826 Eastern Avenue, NW Suite 201 Washington, DC 20012	Planning Area:	76B
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	08
	Election District	09
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	211SE03

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
Three single-family homes (one existing, two proposed)	Informational Mailing:	07/25/08
	Acceptance Mailing:	10/27/08
	Sign Posting Deadline:	12/16/08

Staff Recommendation		**Staff Reviewer: Chris Lindsay**	
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-07054
Oaklawn Subdivision

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, as described in the Recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

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

a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the Rural Residential (R-R) Zone.

b. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.

c. The conditions of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06055.

d. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.*

e. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** This application proposes two new single-family detached houses, in addition to the existing single-family house on the site.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	**PROPOSED**
Zone(s)	R-R	R-R
Use(s)	Residential	Residential
Acreage	1.6101	1.6101
Dwelling Units	1	3

Lot	Lot Size	Lot Size Outside of Driveway Stem
Lot 399 (existing house)	20,051 square feet	20,051 square feet
Lot 400 (proposed house)	24,185 square feet	20,266 square feet
Lot 401 (proposed house)	24,637 square feet	20,581 square feet

3. **Location:** The site is located on the east side of Allentown Road, approximately 400 feet south of Ticher Road. The property is part of the larger Oaklawn Subdivision. It is located in Planning Area 76B, within the Developing Tier.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property borders single-family detached residential properties on all three sides.

5. **Previous Approvals:** On March 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06055 to create two new lots on the site. This plan was approved with twelve conditions, including a requirement for detailed site plan approval.

6. **Design Features:** The subject property is currently configured as a deep single-family lot. The applicant proposes two new detached houses on the eastern portion of the property on the new lots created by the preliminary plan of subdivision. The two new lots are flag lots accessed by long, parallel driveways from Allentown Road.

   The existing house on the western portion of the property (Lot 399) faces directly west onto Allentown Road. The proposed houses on Lots 400 and 401 face southwest to avoid a direct front-to-rear relationship with the house on Lot 399 and with each other.

   The applicant proposes a six-foot-tall vinyl fence around the two new houses, and along a portion of the common property line between the new lots. As required by the flag lot design standards of the Subdivision Regulations, landscaping has been proposed to provide buffering of the flag lots from their neighbors.

   The two proposed houses feature standard siding with optional brick or stone fronts. Each house has a two-car garage. The fronts of the houses are well articulated and varied, with numerous windows, standard shutters, and decorative lintels or palladian windows. The side and rear elevations are plainer, with fewer standard windows and a less even distribution of architectural features. The left side elevation does not feature any standard features on the endwall of the house. The optional bay window and loft window should be made standard on this elevation in order to address this deficiency.

   The hand-colored elevations presented with this report represent the clearest images of the architecture that could be obtained.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The site is zoned R-R. The R-R Zone is intended to provide single-family residential development. The proposed arrangement of houses on their lots meets the required setbacks in the zone. The R-R Zone also has a minimum lot size requirement for single-family detached development of 20,000 square feet. All three lots meet this requirement, with the two flag lots each providing at least 20,000 square feet of lot area outside of the stem portion of the lots.

   The R-R Zone also establishes a maximum lot coverage of 25 percent for a single-family detached development. According to the site plan submitted by the applicant, Lots 399 and 401 exceed this maximum. In order to approve the plan without requiring a variance, the lot coverage of each lot must comply with the 25 percent maximum.

   The existing driveway on Lot 399 is extensive and stretches around three sides of the house, and should be reduced in area in order to bring Lot 399 into conformance with the maximum 25 percent lot coverage. The applicant has determined that in this way it will be possible to reduce the coverage of Lot 399 to 23.2 percent. The applicant has further determined that it will be possible to reduce the lot coverage of Lot 401 below 25 percent by a small reduction in the amount of driveway asphalt (104 square feet) and by slightly shifting the lot line between Lots 400 and 401 to transfer 216 square feet of lot area from Lot 400 to Lot 401. Both rearranged lots will still provide the required 20,000 square feet of lot area outside of the flag stem as required. This will result in the lot coverage of Lot 400 being increased to 22.8 percent and the lot coverage of Lot 401 being reduced to 24.9 percent. These proposed changes to the submitted plan, as summarized in the table below, should be made on the plans prior to certificate approval.

Lot	Lot Area (Submitted)	Coverage (Submitted)	Lot Area (Proposed)	Coverage (Proposed)
399	20,151 sq. ft.	28.5%	20,151 sq. ft.	23.2%
400	24,185 sq. ft.	22.2%	23,969 sq. ft.	22.8%
401	24,637 sq. ft.	26.4%	24,853 sq. ft.	24.9%

.

8. **The *Prince George's County Landscape Manual:*** The development is subject to Section 4.1 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. Section 4.1 provides for planting on residential lots. The landscape plans demonstrate that the lots are proposed with adequate numbers of trees to meet this requirement.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06055:** The following conditions of approval warrant discussion at this time.

   11. Prior to Final Plat approval, the applicant shall have a Detailed Site Plan approved by the Planning Board. The Detailed Site Plan shall address architecture (elevation and placement on all the lots, specifically the two flag lots), buffering, screening, fencing, the location of the driveways and parking drives on the flag lot, turnaround capabilities and landscaping.

   The proposed DSP includes the required information to address this condition.

In regards to screening, fencing, and buffering, the applicant proposes to screen the two flag lots from the surrounding lots with a six-foot-tall sight-tight fence around the sides and rear of each flag lot. Additionally, the applicant proposes planting trees in the yards of the two new lots, which will contribute to the screening of the new houses from their surroundings. In Lot 400, the applicant proposes planting five American Holly evergreen trees, two Kousa Dogwood ornamental trees, two red maples, and one red oak. In Lot 401, the applicant proposes planting three American Hollies, two Kousa Dogwoods, two red oaks, and one red maple.

The driveways of both flag lots have been designed with hammerhead turnaround areas.

12. If the applicant is not able to demonstrate to the Planning Board through the Detailed Site Plan that they meet the criteria for Flag Lots, then the applicant shall have a two lot subdivision.

The criteria for flag lots referenced in this condition are in conformance with Section 24-138.01 of the Subdivision Regulations. New flag lots are not allowed by Council Bill CB-4-2006; however, these lots were approved on a preliminary plan accepted prior to November 1, 2006, and were therefore allowed under CB-4-2006.

The proposed flag lots are in conformance with the flag lot design criteria of Section 24-138.01 of the Subdivision Regulations. These criteria are as follows:

(1) A maximum of two (2) tiers of flag lots may be permitted from the street line.

The proposed arrangement features two tiers of flag lots located behind the conventional lot on Allentown Road.

(2) The flag stem shall have a minimum width of twenty-five (25) feet at the street line. This minimum width shall be maintained from the street line to the lot area. Driveways located within flag lot stems serving single lots shall be set back a minimum of five (5) feet from the parallel lot lines, unless modified to address unique site characteristics.

The flag stem of each lot maintains a minimum width of 25 feet and the driveways are set back at least five feet from the parallel lot lines.

(3) The minimum net lot area required in the respective zone shall be provided exclusive of the flag stem connection to the street.

The minimum net lot area in the R-R Zone is 20,000 square feet. The proposed lots provide this minimum area outside of the flag stem area.

(4) Building envelopes shall be established at the time of preliminary plat approval.

(A) Flexibility in determining the front building line should be based on an evaluation of yards and their relationship to adjoining properties. The front building line is not necessarily parallel to the street line.

(B) Building restriction lines shall be determined in the following manner:

(i) The front of the building restriction line shall be a minimum of twenty-five (25) feet from the front street line. The minimum width shall be that which is permitted by Section 27-442(d) of the Zoning Ordinance.

(ii) The minimum side and rear yard shall be that which are permitted by Section 27-442(e) of the Zoning Ordinance.

The front building lines for the flag lots are correctly established on the plan in the locations where the lot width allows them to meet the minimum 100-foot front building line width in the R-R Zone. The required minimum side and rear yards have been provided.

(5) Shared driveways shall not be permitted unless the lot is located within the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area or the M-X-C Zone. When shared driveways are provided, they shall be in accordance with the following:

(A) Shared driveways shall only be permitted for a maximum of two (2) lots when the applicant can demonstrate that their use will minimize disturbance of existing vegetation, will be a benefit to public safety by minimizing the number of access points to the public street, and will enhance the appearance of the subdivision. Where two (2) lots are proposed to be served by a shared driveway, the driveway shall have a width of eighteen (18) feet. Parking spaces shall not be provided within the driveways.

(B) Easement locations for shared driveways must be shown on the preliminary plat and the final plat.

(C) Shared driveways must be designed such that at least some portion of the width of the driveway falls within each flag lot stem for its entire length from the street line to the dwelling.

The site is not located in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area or the M-X-C Zone, and the applicant does not propose shared driveways.

(6) Where a rear yard is oriented towards a driveway that accesses other lots, or towards a front or side of another lot, the rear yard shall be screened by an "A Bufferyard" as defined by the Landscape Manual, unless Alternative Compliance is approved at the time of preliminary plat. The location of the bufferyard shall be shown on the preliminary and final plat.

(7) Where a front yard is oriented towards a rear yard, a "C Bufferyard" as defined by the Landscape Manual shall be provided, unless Alternative Compliance is approved at the time of preliminary plat. The location of the bufferyard shall be shown on the preliminary and final plat.

The rear yard of Lot 399 is oriented towards the side of Lot 400, and the rear yard of Lot 400 is oriented towards the side yards of Lots 358 and 401. Type A bufferyards are therefore required along the eastern side of Lot 399 and along the northern and eastern sides of Lot 400. The landscape plan shows that the appropriate setbacks have been provided, and most of the required plant materials have been provided in the bufferyards. It appears that an additional ornamental or evergreen tree will be required along the northern side of Lot 400 and an additional three ornamental or evergreen trees will be required along the eastern side of Lot 400 to meet the required bufferyard plantings. The landscape plan does not show where the bufferyards will be located, and does not include a landscape schedule to show that the required setbacks and plantings have been provided. The plan should be revised to include this required information and add additional trees to meet the required bufferyard plantings for Lot 400.

REFERRAL COMMENTS

10. **Environmental Planning Section:** In a memorandum dated December 1, 2008 (Stasz to Lindsay), the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of the proposed DSP and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/075/08. The proposed TCPII provides for the woodland conservation requirement to be met through a fee-in-lieu.

11. **Subdivision Section:** In a memorandum dated November 10, 2008 (Chellis to Lindsay), the Subdivision Section offered the following comments:

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06055, Oaklawn Subdivision. The preliminary plan was approved by the Planning Board and the resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-65) was adopted June 7, 2007. The preliminary plan remains valid until June 7, 2009, or until the final plat is recorded in land records.

The technical staff report recommended a two-lot subdivision, and staff did not find that the stacking of lots met the criteria for approval of a three-lot subdivision. The flag lot standards allow for only two tiers of lots. In this case there is a stacking of three lots deep from the public street. However, at the Planning Board hearing, Conditions 11 and 12 were added and included in the approval. Condition 12 requires that at the time of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate conformance with the criteria for the approval of a flag lot. It is clear that the standards were not found with the preliminary plan, and if the criteria cannot be met with the detailed site plan, one of the flag lots should be deleted.

Site Plan Comments:

a. The site plan should clearly establish that the net lot area is exclusive of the flag stem.

b. The Subdivision Regulations provides for specific bufferyards when utilizing flag lots. The landscape plan does not indicate if bufferyards are required.

c. The preliminary plan does not have signature approval and should prior to the approval of the detailed site plan.

d. Condition 5 requires that the driveways on Lots 400 and 401 be designed with turnaround capabilities.

12. **Community Planning:** In a memorandum dated November 14, 2008 (Umeozulu to Lindsay), the Community Planning Division determined that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier, and that it conforms to the residential low-density land use recommended by the April 2006 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Henson Creek-South Potomac Planning Area.*

13. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T):** In a memorandum dated November 24, 2008 (Abraham to Lindsay), the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) offered comments outlining the roadway and stormwater standards that will apply to this project. It should be noted that DPW&T enforces its requirements through its own permitting process.

14. **Permit Review:** In a memorandum dated November 26, 2008 (Butler to Lindsay), the Permit Review Section raised a number of questions which have been addressed by subsequent plan revisions or by the conditions of approval.

15. **Trails Planner:** In a memorandum dated October 30, 2008 (Janousek to Lindsay), the trails planner stated the following:

The adopted and approved Henson Creek-South Potomac master plan recommends continuous sidewalks and designated bike lanes along Allentown Road. Allentown Road, at the subject site, is a master-planned two to four lane collector road between Old Fort Road North to Tucker Road.

There is an existing sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Allentown Road. The road contains a designated bikeway and bikeway signage is located at various points along Allentown Road. Tayac Elementary School and Isaac Gourdine Middle School are approximately a quarter mile south of the subject site along Allentown Road. There is a gap in the sidewalk along Allentown Road between the subject site and the schools.

The proposal indicates that there will be two new curb cuts to serve the proposed lots. Staff is puzzled as to why there are two curb cuts located so closely together in this residential subdivision. In terms of pedestrian safety, this creates the potential for more turn movements in and out of the subject property. The applicant could construct one shared driveway.

In either case, the curb cuts should be ramped. The sidewalk along the entire frontage should be maintained.

16. **Urban Design Comment:** The trails planner's recommendation for a shared driveway for the two flag lots is not feasible, as the flag lot regulations specifically prohibit shared driveways except in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area and the M-X-C Zone. The other recommendations have been included in the conditions of approval.

17. 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-07054 and Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/075/08, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval, the applicant shall revise the detailed site plan as follows:

    a. Show a portion of the existing driveway on Lot 399 to be removed in order to reduce the lot coverage of Lot 399 to 23.2 percent.

    b. Adjust the lot line between Lots 400 and 401 to transfer 216 square feet from Lot 400 to Lot 401.

    c. Reduce the driveway area on Lot 401 by 104 square feet in order to reduce the lot coverage of Lot 401 to 24.9 percent.

    d. Reflect the revised lot sizes and lot coverage information on the table.

    e. Revise the fence detail to note that the fence shall be constructed of composite material in a natural, non-white color.

2. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07054, the applicant shall revise the landscape plan as follows:

    a. Show the required Type A bufferyard along the northern side of Lot 400.

    b. Show the required Type A bufferyard along the eastern side of Lot 400.

    c. Show the required Type A bufferyard along the eastern side of Lot 399.

    d. Add landscape schedules to demonstrate the required Type A bufferyards along the eastern edge of Lot 399 and the northern and eastern edges of Lot 400. Add additional trees to the bufferyards as needed to meet the planting requirements.

3. Prior to certificate approval of the DSP, the applicant shall obtain certificate approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

4. Prior to certificate approval, the left side architectural elevation of the proposed houses shall be revised to include the optional bay window and loft window as standard elements of the endwall.

5. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees should provide a financial contribution of $210 to DPW&T for the placement of bike signage along Allentown Road. A note shall be placed on the final record plat that indicates that this payment is to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.