



*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

**SDP- 0309**

Application	General Data
<b>Project Name:</b> BALK HILL  <b>Location:</b> One-half mile north of the intersection of Campus Way North and Lottsford Road on Campus Way North  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> D.R. Horton Custom Homes, Inc. 1370 Piccard Drive, Suite 230 Rockville, MD 20850	Date Accepted: 7-29-2003
	Planning Board Action Limit: 11-6-2003
	Plan Acreage: 260
	Zone: R-S
	Dwelling Units: 324
	Square Footage: NA
	Planning Area: 73
	Council District: 5
	Municipality: NA
	200-Scale Base Map: 204NE09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Grading, house location and architecture for 324 single-family dwellings.	CB-13-2002 Notification Sent: 06/27/2003  Sign(s) Posted on Site: 09/03/03

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Laxmi Srivinas	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

September 10, 2003

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Laxmi Srinivas, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-0309  
Balk Hill

The Urban Design Review staff has completed its review of the subject application and of agency referral comments concerning the plan and recommends APPROVAL with conditions as stated in the recommendation section of this report.

**EVALUATION CRITERIA**

1. Conformance with Basic Plans A-9635-C and A-9638-C.
2. Conformance with Sectional Map Amendment CR-71-1990 for the Largo Lottsford Area (Basic Plan A-9637-C was incorporated into this SMA).
3. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the R-S Zone and Comprehensive Design Plans.
4. Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0201.
5. Preliminary Plan 4-02016.
6. Referral responses from concerned agencies and divisions.

**FINDINGS**

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

1. The proposed Specific Design Plan includes site, landscape and architectural plans for 324 dwelling units in the Balk Hill development.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	R-S	R-S
Use(s)	Vacant	Single-family residential
Acreage	180	180
Lots	0	324
Parcels	0	5
Square Footage/GFA	NA	NA

3. The approved Comprehensive Design Plan is for Balk Hill. The project is currently identified as Parcel 53, located on tax map 60, grid F-1 and F-2. The original Basic Plan approvals (A-9635-C and A-9638-C and the SMA CR-71-1990) rezoned the property to R-S.

**Location**—The property is located one-half mile north of the intersection of Lottsford Road and Campus Way North. The subject property is bordered on the west by the Town of Glenarden and on the north, east and south by existing subdivisions in the Largo-Lottsford area. The site has road frontage and is accessed via Campus Way North and St. Joseph’s Drive. The adjacent properties are as follows:

North—Ladova Heights zoned R-80 and R-R  
Bellehaven Estates zoned R-S  
Enterprise Forest zoned R-80

South—southwest: vacant property zoned I-3  
southeast: Tartan South zoned R-S

East— Collington Subdivision zoned R-R

West— Vacant property zoned M-X-T

4. The Balk Hill project, consisting of approximately 180 gross acres, is projected to be developed with 324 single-family lots. Balk Hill is planned to be a high-quality community of single-family houses that will provide executive-level housing, which will prevent some of the outward migration of county residents seeking such housing. The development will preserve natural features of the land to fulfill the environmental goals of the county and provide public and private open space for active and passive recreation to serve the community recreational needs. It will also provide a pleasing setting for the residents of the development.

Balk Hill will be served by two county transportation arteries, Campus Way North and St. Joseph’s Drive. Extension of these roads to serve the proposed Balk Hill development and other developments is underway. Dedications along these streets are included in the Balk Hill development. Two access points to the development are proposed along Campus Way for the western side of the property. Two additional access points originate on St. Joseph’s Drive for the development on the east and west sides of St. Joseph’s Drive. These access points on both of the streets are interconnected to form the circulation system for the development. A portion of the property immediately east of the stream valley is intended to be developed with exclusive large lots. Access to these lots will be from an access road connecting to Dunrobin Drive (a 60-foot right-of-way road) to the south of this property

in the Tartan South development. A portion of the access road will be on land currently owned by M-NCPPC.

The easternmost portion of the property is to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for parkland. This portion is intended to provide a continuous amount of parkland that ties into the parkland along the eastern portion of the Tartan South development to the south of this property.

5. On May 16, 2002, the Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0201 (PGCPB No.02-93) for the Balk Hill development consisting of approximately 180 acres of land and projected to be developed with a maximum of 324 single-family lots.

On September 5, 2002, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-02016 (PGCPB No. 02-155) for 324 lots and five parcels.

6. The applicant is proposing the following architectural models for the subdivision:

<b>Model</b>	<b>Square Footage</b>
Highgrove	3,694
Waverly	3,189
Victoria	2,439
Avalon	2,935
Courtland	2,907
Oberlin	2,640
Zachary	2,449

The proposed models have various options like brick facades, shutters, windows, window trim, bay windows and entrance porches. The proposed design features contribute to the overall superior quality of architecture proposed for this development.

7. **Conformance with Basic Plan**

The proposed specific design plan is in general conformance with Basic Plans A-9635-C and A-9638-C. The Basic Plans show the site designated for residential uses.

8. **Conformance with Comprehensive Design Plans**

The following conditions of the Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0201 are applicable to this Specific Design Plan:

11. *At the time of the Specific Design Plan, the applicant shall submit additional rear elevations for the houses with rear yards facing Campus Way North. The design of these houses shall be as attractive as the front elevations with respect to details, number of design features, and articulation. The proposed architecture shall ensure that a minimum of 75 percent of the total units have brick or stone facing on the front. The minimum size of the proposed houses shall be 2,400 square feet.*

The applicant has submitted additional rear elevations for the houses with rear yards facing Campus Way North. The designs of the houses are as attractive as the front elevations with respect to details, number of design features and articulation. The minimum size of the proposed houses is 2,400 square feet.

13. *Prior to approval of the first Specific Design Plan, detailed construction drawings for recreational facilities on park property including grading plan and trail alignment and details shall be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation for review and approval.*

Compliance with this condition is addressed in detail in Finding 17.

The following conditions of Preliminary Plan 4-02016 are applicable to this Specific Design Plan:

4. *At time of review of the Specific Design Plan, the actual house types and grading schemes shall be shown on the SDP and the TCP, and the PMA impacts shall be limited to those shown on the Type I Tree Conservation Plan submitted with this review, or as revised per the approved conditions.*
6. *As part of the Specific Design Plan submission, a draft technical Stormwater Management Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department. The applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Resources for review and comment on the draft technical plan. The revised technical plan shall be in conformance with the comments received from both agencies and can then be submitted to DER for approval. As necessary, the Detailed Site Plan and TCPI I shall be revised to be in conformance with the technical stormwater management plan. To the extent possible any proposed stormwater management ponds or bioretention areas shall be used for reforestation and afforestation at stocking levels that meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Prior to approval of the Type II TCP, evidence that DER has approved the planting plan shall be submitted.*

Compliance with the above conditions is addressed in Finding 13.

11. *At the time of specific design plan, the transportation staff shall review all lots along St. Joseph's Drive for access. Each lot should direct access away from St. Joseph's Drive or provide driveways with a turnaround capability in order to minimize the need for vehicles accessing these lots to back onto St. Joseph's Drive.*

Compliance with this condition is addressed in Finding 14.

9. **Conformance of the Proposed Specific Design Plan with the findings for approval of a Specific Design Plan (Section 27-528, Planning Board Action)**

*The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual.*

The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.1 (Residential Requirements), Section 4.6 (Buffering Residential Development from Streets) and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses). The proposal complies with these requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. As stated in Finding 8 above, the proposed Specific Design Plan also conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan.

*The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development.*

Findings for adequate public facilities were made in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan for the subject property. The Transportation Planning Section (see Finding 14) has confirmed that the proposal is consistent with the previous transportation adequacy findings.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has recommended that an automatic fire suppression system be provided in all new buildings unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate. A condition of approval has been added to require the same. The section has also stated that the existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Collington Center development. Some of the lots will be beyond the response time guideline for fire and ambulance services. This property will eventually be served by the St. Joseph's Drive Fire/Rescue Station that is currently in the approved Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (2003-2008). Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0201 includes a condition for a fair share contribution toward the construction of the St. Joseph's Drive fire/rescue station. The fee will be collected at the building permit stage of development. Therefore, the property will be adequately served with the construction of this CIP facility pursuant to the provisions of Section 27-528 (a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance.

*Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.*

The Department of Environmental Resources has stated that the subject proposal is consistent with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan #34861-2001.

*The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.*

Compliance with this finding is addressed in detail in Finding 13.

### ***Referral Comments***

10. The Subdivision Section (DelBalzo to Srinivas meeting, September 9, 2003) has stated that conditions of approval regarding adequacy of facilities must be addressed by the Transportation Planning Section and the Environmental Planning Section. As stated in Finding 14 of Preliminary Plan 4-02016, several revisions are required to the Preliminary Plan for consistency with the Comprehensive Design Plan. The Preliminary Plan has not yet been revised. The Specific Design Plan must be consistent with the Comprehensive Design Plan and the Preliminary Plan.
11. The Permit Review Section (Windsor to Srinivas, August 4, 2003) has required minor changes to the site plan. A condition of approval has been added to require the same.
12. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, August 19, 2003) has stated that the proposal is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept #34861-2001.
13. The Environmental Planning Section (Lammers to Srinivas, September 9, 2003) has stated that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and severe slopes and associated buffers for these features are found on the subject property. There are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of the subject property. Campus Way North will be a future noise source. No

Marlboro clay occurs in this area and there are no scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of this property. The applicant has incorporated low-impact development techniques to the degree feasible according to the conditions of approval. The applicant has not provided an unmitigated noise contour and has not provided adequate reforestation or afforestation of the proposed stormwater management ponds according to the conditions of approval of the Preliminary Plan. Conditions of approval have been added to require the same. Conditions of approval have been added for revising the Type II Tree Conservation Plan to show reforestation and stream buffers and to submit information regarding wetland permits etc. The Section has recommended approval of SDP-0309 and TCPII/132/03 with conditions of approval.

The memorandum from the Environmental Planning Section states that:

“The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced Specific Design Plan and Tree Conservation Plan stamped as received by the Countywide Planning Division on July 29, 2003. In addition, revised stormwater management concept plans were received for review on August 27, 2003. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of SDP-0309 and TCPII/132/03 subject to the conditions at the end of this memorandum.

#### **“Background**

“The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site for Basic Plans A-9635, A-9637, A-9738, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02016, TCPI/16/02 and CDP-0201.

#### **“Site Description**

“The 180 acre, R-S-zoned site is located east of the Capital Beltway, south of Ardwick-Ardmore Road, and north of Lottsford Road. There are extensive areas of woodlands, streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes, and severe slopes on the property. The streams and wetlands are associated with tributaries to Bald Hill Branch, which is part of the Patuxent River watershed. According to the Prince George’s County Soil Survey, the soils found on the property include Collington fine sandy loam, Adelphia fine sandy loam, Shrewsbury fine Sandy loam, Ochlockonee sandy loam, and in small areas Mixed alluvial land. The Collington, Adelphia and Ochlockonee soils do not present any problems for development.

“Alluvial land soils have limitations with respect to seasonally high water tables and flood hazard. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication entitled “Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George’s Counties,” December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Campus Way North, a planned arterial highway, will be a future noise source. Marlboro clay does not occur in the area and there are no scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of this property.

#### **“Summary of Related Cases and Conditions**

“The approval of the previous Basic Plans, the Comprehensive Design Plans and the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision included numerous conditions, several of which dealt with environmental issues that were to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The environmental conditions to be addressed during the review of the Specific Design Plan are addressed below. The respective conditions are in **bold type**, the associated comments are in standard type, and additional information or required plan revisions are in *italics*.

**“CDP-0201, PGCPB No. 02-93**

- “1a. Low impact development techniques shall be used to the degree feasible for the design of the stormwater management system by utilizing a combination of rain gardens, stormwater management ponds, and other techniques approved by the Department of Environmental Resources.**

“The Department of Environmental Resources has approved a concept plan for stormwater management that incorporates low impact development techniques to the degree feasible.

- “2a. A plan shall show the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for projected traffic from Campus Way North. Noise mitigation measures as needed shall be shown conceptually on the Preliminary Plan. As part of the Specific Design Plan review, the SDP shall show the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn, and shall provide detailed information regarding how noise levels will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less on the exterior and 45 dBA Ldn or less interior of proposed residential units.**

“The SDP does not contain the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour or any information concerning how the noise from Campus Way North will be mitigated as required by this condition.

*“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan, the SDP shall show the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn, and shall provide detailed information regarding how noise levels will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less in outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA Ldn or less in the interior of proposed residential units.*

*“Recommended Condition: Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of structures within prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45dBA (Ldn) or less.*

- “12. To the extent possible, any proposed stormwater management ponds or bioretention areas shall be used for reforestation and afforestation at stocking levels that meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Prior to certificate approval of the Type II TCP evidence that DER has approved the planting plan shall be submitted to the Urban Design Review Section and the Environmental Planning Section.**

“The TCPH does not show any reforestation or afforestation near the proposed stormwater management ponds that meets the stocking levels of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. It appears that space is available near several of the stormwater management ponds to provide the appropriate afforestation or reforestation that will satisfy this condition.

*“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the SDP, the TCPH shall be revised to show reforestation and afforestation of the areas surrounding stormwater management facilities and provide evidence that the Department of Environmental Resources has approved the planting plan.*



**“Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-02016, PGCPB No. 02-155**

- “4. At time of review of the Specific Design Plan, the actual house types and grading schemes shall be shown on the SDP and the TCP, and the PMA impacts shall be limited to those shown on the Type I Tree Conservation Plan submitted with this review, or as revised per the approved conditions.**

“The TCP II and technical stormwater management plans show several impacts to the PMA from the stormwater outfalls that were not approved on the TCPI. The revised stormwater management plans have reduced the impacts further. Because the Planning Board is the final approval authority on the subject Tree Conservation Plan, the PMA impacts shown can be approved at that time.

“All of the PMA and the 50-foot-wide buffers on the northern and southern property lines are required to be placed in conservation easements. These easements must be shown on the SDP and the TCP II, and platted with the lots.

***“Recommended Condition: At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the Patuxent River Primary Management Area Preservation Area except for areas of approved disturbance, and the 50 foot-wide preservation buffers on the northern and southern property lines except for areas of approved disturbance. The final plat shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certification. The following note shall be placed on the plat:***

*“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”*

- “6. As part of the Specific Design Plan submission, a draft technical Stormwater Management Plan shall be submitted to the Planning Department. The applicant shall coordinate a meeting between the Planning Department and the Department of Environmental Resources for review and comment on the draft technical plan. The revised technical plan shall be in conformance with the comments received from both agencies and can then be submitted to DER for approval. As necessary, the Detailed Site Plan and TCPI I shall be revised to be in conformance with the technical stormwater management plan. To the extent possible any proposed stormwater management ponds or bioretention areas shall be used for reforestation and afforestation at stocking levels that meet the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. Prior to approval of the Type II TCP, evidence that DER has approved the planting plan shall be submitted.**

“The draft technical plan was not submitted until August 14, 2003. A meeting was subsequently held with the Department of Environmental Resources to review the technical plans. The plans as submitted to DER did not result in the preservation of the 50-foot-wide buffer as required by a Basic Plan condition and were not in conformance with the TCPI. Revised plans dated August 27, 2003, were submitted to show a revised design for two of

the stormwater management ponds to reduce the impacts to the required preservation buffer.

#### **“Environmental Review**

“As revisions are made to the plans, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe the changes, the date made, and by whom.

- “1. The Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was previously reviewed and was found to address the criteria for an FSD in accordance with the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual

*Discussion: No additional information is required with respect to the Forest Stand Delineation.*

- “2. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on site, and there is a previously approved Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/16/02, for the site.

“This application was evaluated for compliance with the previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan and was found to require revisions before a recommendation can be made.

*“Recommended Conditions: Prior to certification of SDP-0309, TCPII/132/03 shall be revised as follows:*

- “a. *Correct the amount of floodplain on site based on an approved and submitted floodplain study.*
- “b. *Show and label all conservation easements.*
- “c. *Show the reforestation along Campus Way North in conformance with the approved TCPI.*
- “d. *Revise the reforestation notes to provide seedlings at a rate of 1,000 seedlings per acre.*
- “e. *Revise the plan to show 40-foot-wide cleared areas behind each house to allow for a useable backyard.*
- “f. *Show all streams and associated 50-foot stream buffers clearly on the plan and in the legend. Streams and wetland areas that were previously approved for impacts, that are now to be shown as preserved, shall be clearly delineated with appropriate state-regulated buffers.*
- “g. *Revise the plans to show woodland conservation signs only on lots that contain woodland conservation areas; revise the details to identify which type of sign goes where; and revise the detail to label the conservation signs.*
- “h. *Add a note in large font size to all sheets containing trails that states: ‘PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE STREAM VALLEY TRAIL THE PROPOSED LOCATION SHALL BE FIELD LOCATED AND APPROVED BY M-NCPPC DEPARTMENT OF*

*PARKS AND RECREATION, M-NCPPC COUNTYWIDE PLANNING DIVISION, AND THE DER INSPECTOR.'*

- "i. All reforestation areas abutting and within residential lots shall include permanent fencing along the edge of the reforestation areas. Add a permanent fencing detail to the plans. The type of fence used may include but is not limited to split rail fence, two or three board fence, etc.*
- "j. Revise the house sizes and/or grading on Lots 21 and 22, Block D in order to all space for an outdoor activity area and the drainage swale.*
- "k. Revisions made due to any requirement by federal or state agencies related to the preservation of streams and/or wetlands shall be fully shown on the plans and the revised layout shall be evaluated further.*
- "l. Add the page numbers to the map key.*
- "m. Show Tree Protection Devices (TPDs) at the limit of disturbance throughout the site. The label "TSF" was used on the plans and not in the legend, nor is there a detail for this feature.*
- "n. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.*

*"Recommended Condition: 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."*

- 14. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, September 6, 2003) has stated that the CDP and the Preliminary Plan for the subject development contained several transportation-related conditions. Some of the conditions are applicable at the time of the building permit and Final Plat and record plat. Condition 11 of the Preliminary Plan required that access to lots along St. Joseph's Drive be reviewed at the time of the Specific Design Plan. The applicant has shown sufficient driveways to allow vehicles to turn around and avoid backing onto St. Joseph's Drive. Therefore, this condition has been met. The Section has made a finding that the subject Specific Design Plan is in general conformance with the approved preliminary, Comprehensive Design and Basic Plans. The subject property will be served by adequate transportation facilities within a reasonable period of time.
- 15. The Community Planning Division (Fields to Srinivas, September 5, 2003) has stated that there are no master plan issues raised by this proposal.
- 16. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (Izzo to Srinivas, August 26, 2003) has stated that existing police and paramedic service travel times are within the travel time guidelines. In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings. A condition of approval has been added to require the same. The existing fire engine and ambulance services are inadequate. Conditions of approval for providing a fair share contribution for constructing a fire station will provide the required fire and ambulance services. The Section has determined that the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing and programmed public facilities.

17. The Department of Parks and Recreation (Asan to Srinivas, August 26, 2003) has stated that CDP Condition 13 requires detailed construction drawings for recreational facilities be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation for review and approval. The applicant has submitted information but the information provided on the drawings is insufficient. Therefore, the Department has recommended conditions of approval requiring detailed construction drawings for recreational facilities on parkland.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

The Urban Design Review staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and approve Specific Design Plan SDP-0309 and TCP II/132/03 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Specific Design Plan,
  - a. The site, landscape and architectural drawings shall be revised to show:
    - (1) All design standards on the cover sheet.
    - (2) Location, design and details of any gateway signs or entrance features if any are proposed.
    - (3) A chart to track the 75 percent brick façade requirement for the proposed houses.
  - b. Detailed construction drawings for trail construction on parkland, including a grading plan, limits of disturbance, trail sections and details shall be submitted to the Department of Parks and Recreation for review and approval.
  - c. The SDP shall show the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn and shall provide detailed information regarding how noise levels will be mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn or less in outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA Ldn or less in the interior of proposed residential units.
  - d. The TCPII shall be revised to show reforestation and afforestation of the areas surrounding stormwater management facilities and provide evidence that the Department of Environmental Resources has approved the planting plan.
  - e. The TCPII/132/03 shall be revised as follows:
    - (1) Correct the amount of floodplain on site based on an approved and submitted floodplain study.
    - (2) Show and label all conservation easements.
    - (3) Show the reforestation along Campus Way North in conformance with the approved TCPI.
    - (4) Revise the reforestation notes to provide seedlings at a rate of 1,000 seedlings per acre.
    - (5) Revise the plan to show 40-foot-wide cleared areas behind each house to allow for a

- useable backyard.
- (6) Show all streams and associated 50-foot stream buffers clearly on the plan and in the legend. Streams and wetland areas that were previously approved for impacts, that are now to be shown as preserved, shall be clearly delineated with appropriate state-regulated buffers.
  - (7) Revise the plans to show woodland conservation signs only on lots that contain woodland conservation areas; revise the details to identify which type of sign goes where; and revise the detail to label the conservation signs.
  - (8) Add a note in large font to all sheets containing trails that states: “PRIOR TO CONSTRUCTION OF THE STREAM VALLEY TRAIL THE PROPOSED LOCATION SHALL BE FIELD LOCATED AND APPROVED BY M-NCPPC DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, M-NCPPC COUNTYWIDE PLANNING DIVISION, AND THE DER INSPECTOR.”
  - (9) All reforestation areas abutting and within residential lots shall include permanent fencing along the edge of the reforestation areas. Add a permanent fencing detail to the plans. The type of fence used may include but is not limited to split rail fence, two or three board fence, etc.
  - (10) Revise the house sizes and/or grading on Lots 21 and 22, Block D in order to allow space for an outdoor activity area and the drainage swale.
  - (11) Revisions made due to any requirement by federal or state agencies related to the preservation of streams and/or wetlands shall be fully shown on the plans and the revised layout shall be evaluated further.
  - (12) Add the page numbers to the map key.
  - (13) Show Tree Protection Devices (TPDs) at the limit of disturbance throughout the site. The label “TSF” was used on the plans and not in the legend, nor is there a detail for this feature.
  - (14) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- f. Any changes to the layout of lots, roads, etc. due to changes required by the conditions of approval recommended by the Environmental Planning Section and the conditions of approval of the Preliminary Plan shall be reflected on the site, landscape, and architectural drawings of the Specific Design Plan.
2. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the Patuxent River Primary Management Area Preservation Area except for areas of approved disturbance and the 50-foot-wide preservation buffers on the northern and southern property lines except for areas of approved disturbance. The final plat shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certification. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”

3. Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of structures within prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45dBA (Ldn) or less.
4. Prior to the issuance of any permits that 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.”
5. Prior to issuance of building permits, the trail alignment shall be staked on the field and approved by the Department of Parks and Recreation.
6. All residential buildings shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13D and all applicable Prince George’s County laws.
7. Prior to issuance of building permits, the site plans shall be revised to show building setbacks and building coverage (building coverage to include dwellings, driveways, covered steps, stoops, and options).