



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

## SPECIFIC DESIGN PLAN (ARCHITECTURE) SDP-0202/01

Application	General Data
Project Name  The Preserve (Greens At Piscataway)	Date Accepted 05/22/2003
	Planning Board Action Limit N/A
Location  Adjacent to and south of Floral Park and Danville Roads	Plan Acreage 861.8
	Zone R-L & L-A-C
Applicant/Address  Bailey's Associates L.P. c/o Greenvest L.C. 8614 Westwood Center Drive, Suite 900 Vienna, Va. 22182	Dwelling Units N/A
	Square Footage N/A
	Planning Area 84
	Council District 09
	Municipality NA
	200-Scale Base Map 217 SE 03

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Change to Planning Board condition regarding roof pitch.	Adjoining Property Owners 5/09/03 (CB-15-1998)
	Previous Parties of Record 5//03 (CB-13-1997)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site 5/23/03
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer: LAREUSE, SUSAN
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITION	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

June 5, 2003

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Planner Coordinator

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-0202/01  
The Preserve (previously known as the Greens of Piscataway)  
Architectural Elevations Only

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the proposed revision to the Planning Board condition and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of approval with one substitute condition.

## EVALUATION

The Specific Design Plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. Conformance to Basic Plans A-9869 and A-9870.
- b. Conformance to Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9306.
- c. Conformance to the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- d. Conformance to the *Landscape Manual*.

## FINDINGS

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

1. This Specific Design Plan includes architectural elevations only for single-family detached units for the overall development known as The Preserve (formerly known as the Greens at Piscataway). This is for the purpose of revising a Planning Board condition regarding the required roof pitch of proposed architectural elevations.

2. The applicant, Caruso Homes, is proposing to change the following condition that was adopted by the Planning Board (PBCPB No. 02-253) per the staff recommendation at the January 16, 2003, public hearing:

**2. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan:**

- f. Each of the builders shall indicate on the architectural elevations a minimum roof pitch of 8:12 on the main gable and 12:12 pitch on the front reverse gables, and all rooflines shall overhang the structure a minimum of eight inches.**

The applicant has requested to modify the condition above as follows:

- f. Each of the builders shall indicate on the architectural elevations a minimum roof pitch of 8:12 on the main gable and 5:12 pitch on the front reverse gables, and all rooflines shall overhang the structure a minimum of eight inches.**

The original condition was generated as a staff recommendation and was not a requirement of the Comprehensive Design Plan. At the time of the Planning Board review of SDP-0202, the applicant in the case did not raise the issue and the staff and applicant appeared to be in agreement with the recommended conditions of approval. When the applicant submitted the plans for signature approval, it was discovered that the 12:12 pitch requirement was not being met on a number of the elevations. The applicant asserts that revising the plans to meet this requirement would require additional costs.

Staff agrees that a revision to the roof pitch condition relating only to the reverse gables is appropriate. However, the gable pitches within each building should be generally consistent. The staff suggests that minor deviations in the pitches of the reverse gables are acceptable as long as the overall appearance of the units is consistent and architecturally logical. The mixing of diverse roof pitches in the same unit, without regard to the overall composition, does not appear logical. For example, a reverse gable pitch of 12:12, combined with another reverse gable of 7:12, will not appear consistent within an overall design characterized by neo-traditional detailing. However, a reverse gable pitch of 12:12, combined with another reverse gable pitch of 10:12, may not appear inconsistent to the eye. The staff suggests the condition be revised so that the roof pitch of reverse gables not vary significantly in the slope ratio within the individual unit.

Based on the discussion above, the staff recommends that the condition above be modified as follows:

- f. Each of the builders shall indicate on the architectural elevations a minimum roof pitch of 8:12 on the main gable and 5:12 pitch on the front reverse gables. Combining more than one reverse gable pitch is allowed as long as the reverse gable pitches vary significantly in the slope ratio. All rooflines shall overhang the structure a minimum of eight inches.**

3. If the recommended substitute condition is adopted, this Specific Design Plan for architecture and the companion Specific Design Plan for site improvements, SDP-9804/01, conform to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and the applicable standards of the *Landscape Manual*.
4. This Specific Design Plan for architecture and the companion Specific Design Plan for site improvements, SDP-9804/01, will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with

existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development. The proposed revision to the condition of approval will have no impact on the finding.

5. This Specific Design Plan for architecture and the companion Specific Design Plan for site improvements, SDP-9804/01, has made adequate provision for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.
6. This Specific Design Plan for architecture and the companion Specific Design Plan for site improvements, SDP-9804/01, is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Urban Design Review staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Specific Design Plan SDP-0202/01 for architectural elevations only, with the following substitute condition of approval for condition 2.4. in PGCPB Resolution 02-253:

2. f. **Each of the builders shall indicate on the architectural elevations a minimum roof pitch of 8:12 on the main gable and 5:12 pitch on the front reverse gables. Combining more than one reverse gable is allowed as long as the reverse gable pitches do not vary significantly in the slope ratio. All rooflines shall overhang the structure a minimum of eight inches.**