



*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-0407**

| Application  | General Data                        |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Project Name:</b><br>Chaddsford, Section 1 (formerly known as Chaddsford, Section 3)<br><br><b>Location:</b><br>Southwest Corner Of Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Blvd.<br><br><b>Applicant/Address:</b><br>Washington Homes Of Maryland 1, LLC<br>1802 Brightseat Road<br>Landover, MD 20785 | Date Accepted: 11/10/04             |
|  | Planning Board Action Limit: 2/1/05 |
|  | Plan Acreage: 29.86                 |
|  | Zone: R-M                           |
|  | Dwelling Units: 132                 |
|  | Square Footage: NA                  |
|  | Planning Area: 85A                  |
|  | Tier: Developing                    |
|  | Council District: 09                |
|  | Municipality: N/A                   |
|  | 200-Scale Base Map: 219SE06         |

| Purpose of Application                               | Notice Dates   |
|--|--|
| CONSTRUCTION OF 131 SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED DWELLINGS | Adjoining Property Owners<br>Previous Parties of Record<br>Registered Associations: 9/7/2004<br>(CB-12-2003) |
|  | Sign(s) Posted on Site and<br>Notice of Hearing Mailed: 12/28/04   |

| Staff Recommendation |                          | Staff Reviewer: Lareuse |            |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| APPROVAL             | APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS | DISAPPROVAL             | DISCUSSION |
|                      | X                        |                         |            |

January 18, 2004

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Urban Design Section

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-0407  
Chaddsford, Section 1

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the Specific Design Plan for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

**EVALUATION**

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

- a. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Zone Amendment A-9878 as stated in CR-60-1993.
- b. The requirements of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, Section 27-509 for the R-M Zone.
- c. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01.
- d. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03080.
- e. The requirements of Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- f. Referral comments.

**FINDINGS**

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

- 1. **Request:** The request is for 131 single-family detached dwellings. The specific design plan includes a site plan, tree conservation plan, landscape plan and details, and architectural elevations.

2. **Development Data Summary**

|                | <b>EXISTING</b> | <b>PROPOSED</b>        |
|----------------|-----------------|------------------------|
| Zone(s)        | R-M             | R-M                    |
| Use(s)         | Vacant          | Single-family detached |
| Acreage        | 29.86           | 29.86                  |
| Lots           | 0               | 131                    |
| Dwelling Units | 0               | 131                    |

**ARCHITECTURAL MODEL DATA**

The following architectural elevations are proposed by Washington Homes of Maryland 1, LLC:

| <b>Model</b>      | <b>Base Finished Area (Sq. Ft.)</b> |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Cambridge 1 & 2   | 2,565                               |
| James             | 2,405                               |
| Cromwell IV       | 2,005                               |
| Orleans 3 Country | 2,108                               |
| Normandy Country  | 2,035                               |
| Marseilles 3      | 1,650                               |
| York              | 2430                                |
| Ashley III        | 1658                                |
| Ashley IV         | 1739                                |
| Foxhall I         | 1,474                               |

3. **Location:** Generally, the property is located east of US 301 in Prince Georges County, just north of Charles County. The site is in Planning Area 85A, Council District 9, and is located on Tax Map 154 and Grid E-2, at the southwest corner of Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Blvd.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The property has frontage on Chadds Ford Drive and is located directly east of an existing townhouse development known as McKendree Village. To the north of the project is undeveloped R-M-zoned land. To the south is undeveloped R-R-zoned land. To the east is R-M-zoned land in floodplain and woodland.
5. **Previous Approvals:**
- a. Originally, the subject property was rezoned by Basic Plan application (A-8838) in November 1977 for the entire “Mattawoman” development at a total area of 277 acres. Within this 277-acre site, 212 acres were placed in the M-A-C Zone and 64.7 acres were placed in the R-M Zone. This plan is no longer applicable and has been superseded.
  - b. On November 29, 1977, the District Council adopted CR-108-1977 for the entire 277-acre Brandywine Village, placing 213.2 acres in the M-A-C Zone and 64.7 acres in the R-U Zone (A-8898). In 1987, a Basic Plan Amendment was filed to rezone the M-A-C portion but it was unsuccessful. In 1992, another application (A-9878) was filed to rezone the property from the M-A-C to the E-I-A Zone. On September 14, 1993, the District Council adopted the sectional map amendment for Subregion V, rezoning this 212-acre site into 46 acres of E-I-A, 16.4 acres of L-A-C, and 149 acres of R-M (District Council Resolution CR-60-1993).

- c. On February 20, 1997, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-96083 to dedicate Chaddsford Road and General Lafayette Boulevard to public use and place the resultant land bays into four outlots. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/47/96) was approved for the entire area concurrently with this application.
- d. A Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0102, was approved by the Planning Board for the entire 212-acre parcel on October 11, 2001 (PGCPB No. 01-186). This Comprehensive Design Plan included 11 lots on approximately 6 acres, approximately four acres of open space, approximately 4 acres for continuation of Brinton Way, and approximately 13 acres for a community lake. The remaining acres were intended for future development.
- e. On January 22, 2004, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-03080, Chaddsford Section 3, for 132 single-family lots for 29.86 acres and Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01, which revised the entire R-M-zoned property.

#### COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 6. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9878:** CDZ Amendment 2, Brandywine Village Zoning Application A-9878, created the E-I-A, L-A-C and R-M Zones for the 212 acres of the Brandywine Investment Associates. The R-M Zone was designated for 149 acres at 5.8 to 7.9 dwelling units per acre. Specific conditions that warrant discussion regarding conformance of this specific design plan, SDP-0407, with the basic plan are considered below:

- 2. **Conveyance of the stream valley of the tributary of Timothy branch to M-NCPPC as shown on Exhibit "B".**

Comment: The application shows the area of the parkland dedication on the submitted plans.

- 4. **The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

Comment: The application shows one sitting area and one pre-teen lot within the subdivision. The plans appear to include sufficient details and specifications for proper implementation.

- 5. **The applicant shall construct an eight-foot wide hiker/biker trail in the above referenced stream valley park from the northern to the southern end of the subject property. The applicant shall provide whatever structure necessary to insure necessary to insure dry passage along the trail.**

Comment: The applicant has shown the location of the eight-foot trail on the plans and has provided the details and specifications for the construction of the trail.

- 7. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01:** This specific design plan was reviewed against the approved Comprehensive Design Plan and was found to conform to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0102/01. Specific conditions that warrant discussion regarding conformance (besides those previously discussed relative to the basic plan conditions) are considered below:

- 1. **Prior to certificate approval of the Comprehensive Design Plan,**
  - a. **The following revisions shall be made to the plans or information shall be provided:**

- (1) **A minimum lot width of 40 feet (at the street line, unless indicated otherwise) for the proposed lots in the development. No more than 25 percent of the total number of single-family lots in the development may be less than 50 feet in width. The rest of the lots shall be 50 feet or more in width, with no less than 25 percent of the total number of lots at least 60 feet in width. (On cul-de-sacs the lot width may be measured at the building line).**

Comment: The applicant has provided evidence that this application, as well as the previously approved Specific Design Plan and the recently approved Preliminary Plan for Chaddsford, Section 2, 4-4174, have complied with the condition above. The following chart demonstrates conformance:

| <b>Chaddsford Cumulative Lot-Size Table for Single-Family Detached Units</b> |                   |                    |                                 |            |  |
|--|-------------------|--------------------|---------------------------------|------------|--|
| Percent Required<br>Per CDP<br>Condition 1A                                  | Lots<br>Section 1 | Future<br>Sections | Lots<br>SDP-0109<br>Plat 195-91 | Total Lots | Cumulative<br>Percentages of<br>Individual Plans |
| Max. 25%   | 79                | 0                  | 0                               | 79         | 25   |
|  | 40                | 106                | 0                               | 146        | 45   |
| Min. 25%   | 12                | 78                 | 11                              | 101        | 30   |
| 100%   | 131               | 184                | 11                              | 326        | 100  |

- (2) **A minimum side setback of five feet for all lots.**

Comment: This is the minimum side yard setback shown on the Specific Design Plan.

- (3) **Notwithstanding Condition 1 above, no more than twenty 36-foot-wide lots for the total development shall be allowed, but only if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board prior to approval of the first specific design plan that the proposed houses on those lots have a superior architectural design. In the absence of such a finding by the Planning Board, all 36-foot-wide lots shall be increased to at least 40 feet wide and shall be subject to the 25 percent limit in Condition 1.a.(1) above.**

Comment: The applicant and staff met on January 11, 2005 and came to an agreement on the following features to be required on revised architectural elevations for all of the lots 36 feet wide (Lots 17-26 of the site plan). Those requirements are included in the conditions of approval within the Recommendation section of this report.

- 100 percent brick facades on the front and sides of the units
- Keystones shall be used on the front facade
- Rowlock brick will be used below all windows
- A front porch, side lights at the door, or a top transom at the door shall be standard features

- Two-car garage on all units
- Nine-foot ceilings on the first floor

In addition, staff recommends that the Foxhall model, proposed at 1,472 square feet of finished living area, either be deleted or the minimum finished living area increased to 1,650 square feet.

- 3. In conjunction with submission of the second Specific Design Plan, the applicant shall: Develop construction drawings for the trail construction on parkland in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

Comment: This information has been shown on the plans.

- 8. 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 carried over in the approval of this plan

- 11. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 135<sup>th</sup> unit in the development, the applicant shall submit to the Department of Parks and Recreation a performance bond, a letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, for the construction of the of public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland in the amount to be determined by DPR.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan; even though the number of units proposed is only 131, these units contribute to an overall project number of approximately 450 dwelling units in the R-M Zone.

- 12. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall construct the master-planned trail on dedicated parkland in phase with development, and no building permit shall be issued for the lots directly adjacent to the trail until the trail construction is completed.**

Comment: None of the lots within this specific design plan is directly adjacent to the trail.

- 13. Prior to issuance of the building permits for 290th unit in the development, all public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan; even though the number of units proposed is only 131, these units contribute to an overall project number of approximately 450 dwelling units in the R-M Zone.

- 14. The portion of the master planned trail in the General Lafayette Boulevard right-of-way shall be constructed in conjunction with the construction of the roadway.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over in the approval of this plan

- 8. Preliminary Plan for Subdivision 4-03080:** The Chaddsford Plan was reviewed under a

Preliminary Plan reviewed and approved on January 22, 2004, by the Planning Board, which included the following relevant comments:

2. **Prior to approval of the final plats that contain Lots 17-26, the applicant shall demonstrate the approval of the architectural elevations proposed for Lots 17-26, Block C for the reduced lot width at the front street line. If the Planning Board does not approve the architectural elevations the applicant shall delete the lots necessary to maintain the minimum lot width at the front street line.**

Comment: As stated in Condition 1.a.3 of the Comprehensive Design Plan above, the applicant and staff have agreed on the following requirements of these lots and a condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

6. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall construct the master plan stream valley trail per DPR standards at the location agreed to by the applicant and DPR. The applicant shall provide whatever structures necessary to provide dry passage along the trail. Timing for the construction and bonding of the trail shall be in accordance with the recommendations of CDP-0102/01.**

Comment: The conditions of the CDP relating to this subject adequately addresses the condition above and have been reiterated in the Recommendation section of this report.

7. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of the internal public streets unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of issuance of street construction permits.**

Comment: Sidewalks have been provided on both sides of the streets within this subdivision.

8. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and or assignees shall provide six-foot-wide asphalt feeder trails from the southern portion of the stream valley trail to the end of Road B and C.**

Comment: These trails have been shown on the specific design plans.

24. **The DPR staff shall review and approve the location and design of the storm water management facilities and outfalls on dedicated parkland at the time of the Specific Design Plan review if any are proposed within parkland.**

Comment: Since this issue has not been mentioned in the referral from the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Development Review Division recommends that this be addressed prior to signature approval of the plans.

9. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** A Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) was reviewed in conjunction with Preliminary Plan 4-96083. That FSD was resubmitted with CDP-0102 and was found to address the requirements for an FSD in accordance with the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Technical Manual. No further action regarding the Forest Stand Delineation is required with regard to this Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because there are existing woodlands and there are previously approved Type I and

Type II Tree Conservation Plans. The original CDP, Preliminary Plan, and TCPs were approved so that permits could be issued for the construction of sewer and water lines from US 301 to Phase I of “Brandywine Village” along McKendree Road. At that time, TCPI/47/96 was reviewed and was found to satisfy the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. TCPI/47/96-01 was approved in conjunction with Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102 and TCPI/47/96-02 was approved in conjunction with Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0102/01.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98, was approved to allow the installation of water and sewer lines. The Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/126/98, was revised twice, once for the installation of major roads and once for the installation of the lake. The revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan submitted with this application, TCPII/126/98-03, conforms to TCPI/46/97-02; however, there are some technical changes that need to be completed before the TCPII may be signed. The tracking sheet on Sheet 5 of 5 needs to include all of the clearing previously approved.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the Specific Design Plan, the tracking chart on Sheet 5 of 5 of TCPII/126/98-03 shall be revised to include all clearing previously approved.

10. **Referral Responses:**

a. The **Transportation Planning Section** had the following comments:

**A-9878:**

Condition 13: This condition requires that the development participate in a road club to assist in funding the transportation improvements required for adequacy in the area. This lengthy condition sets the amount of payment for each type of land use. The condition also specifies a long list of improvements that are needed for adequacy in the area. The condition states that “the applicant’s sole funding responsibility toward the construction of these off-site transportation improvements shall be the payment” of the appropriate Road Club fee. For single-family detached residences the fee is set at \$1,472, and for townhouses the fee is set at \$1,338 (with the fees to be adjusted for inflation). The applicant has indicated a willingness to pay the appropriate road club fees at the time of building permit, and that is the time at which this condition will be enforced.

Condition 14: This condition sets a trip cap on the site. Between this application, SDP-0109, and pending subdivision 4-04174, a total of 467 residences would be approved within the site, which is well within the residential trip cap.

Conditions 15 and 16: These conditions require that adequate dedication be shown along certain master plan facilities within and adjacent to the site. The current plan shows that adequate dedication exists where needed.

Condition 17: This condition requires that the applicant provide needed signalization at the US 301/MD 5 and Chadds Ford Drive intersection. This condition was addressed by the recommended conditions of approval on the preliminary plan.

Condition 18: This condition provides for the potential future closure of the site’s access to US 301/MD 5 in the event that (a) other street connections are available and (b) SHA



requests removal of the traffic signal at US 301/MD 5 and Chadds Ford Drive. This condition would be enforced at a later time and has no bearing on the current case.

Condition 19: This condition requires that three street connections shown on the Basic Plan be retained. All three street connections were present on the CDP, and none are compromised by the current plan.

Condition 25: This condition requires that street connections to properties north and south of the subject site be shown on the CDP. This is discussed further under Condition 3 of the preliminary plan.

**CDP-0102/01:**

This approval was reviewed concurrently with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03080 and included no unique transportation-related conditions.

**Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03080:**

Condition 3: This condition required that the lack of street connection to properties north and south of the subject site be justified prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan. Such justification was received and the preliminary plan was given final approval. The subject site adjoins the southern boundary of the overall site, and a street connection to the south was not deemed necessary and is not shown on the subject plan.

Condition 17: This condition is identical to Condition 13 of the Basic Plan, and the required pro-rata payments will be made to DPW&T at the time of building permit.

Condition 18: This condition requires physical and signalization improvements at the US 301/MD 5/Chadds Ford Drive intersection. It appears that the physical improvements are in place. The status of possible signalization should be confirmed with the applicant.

Condition 19: This condition repeats Condition 18 of the Basic Plan, which provides for the potential future closure of the site's access to US 301/MD 5 under certain conditions. Once again, this condition has no bearing on the current case.

Access and circulation is acceptable, and it is consistent with the preliminary plan.

The subject property is required to make roadway improvements in the area pursuant to a finding of adequate public facilities made in 2004 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03080 and in consideration of the findings and conditions associated with Basic Plan A-9878. These findings were supported by a traffic study submitted in 2003. Insofar as the basis for the findings is still valid, and in consideration of the scope of this application, the transportation staff can make a finding that the subject property is in general conformance with the approved Preliminary, Comprehensive Design, and Basic Plans. The Transportation Planning Section also finds that the subject application will be served by adequate transportation facilities within a reasonable period of time.

- b. The **Transportation Planning Section** Trails Planner had the following comments:

One master plan trail impacts the subject site. The Subregion V master plan recommends a stream valley trail within DPR parkland along the tributary of the Timothy Branch. This

stream valley trail will ultimately connect to the Timothy Branch Trail to the south and the planned trail along A-55 to the north. In addition to providing recreational opportunities for the residents of the subject site, the trail will also connect to a future library, elementary school, and park & ride within the Brandywine Special Study Area.

Due to the density of the subject application (4,000- and 5,000-square-foot lots), standard sidewalks are recommended along both sides of all internal roads. Condition 10 of CDP-0102/01 requires the provision of these sidewalks, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of issuance of street construction permits. These sidewalks are reflected on the submitted plan.

Basic Plan A-9878 requires the construction of the eight-foot wide hiker-biker stream valley trail from the northern to the southern edge of the subject property by the applicant. Staff supports the alignment of the trail as agreed to by DPR and the applicant. This trail will provide the north-to-south stream valley trail envisioned in the master plan. The provision of the HOA trail on the opposite side of the lake will also provide the opportunity for a loop trail within the community. Conditions 11 and 12 of CDP-0102/01 require the construction of six-foot-wide, asphalt feeder trails from the ends of the two southernmost cul-de-sacs to the stream valley trail. These trail connections are reflected on the submitted SDP from the end of Gilmore Greens and Chadsey Lane and fulfill the intent of these recommendations.

Construction of the trail on M-NCPPC parkland is addressed in CDP-0102/01. Condition 3 states, "In conjunction with submission of the second Specific Design Plan, the applicant shall: Develop construction drawings for the trail construction on parkland in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines." This condition appears to be fulfilled with the provision of a trail cross section in the submitted SDP. This should be adequate, unless additional details are required by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

- c. The **Permit Review Section** had several questions and comments, which have been addressed except for the following:

A timing mechanism must be in place for completion of the proposed recreation facilities.

Comment: The recreational facilities, including the sitting area and the pre-teen lot, should be constructed prior to 75 percent of build-out or the 98<sup>th</sup> building permit.

- d. The **Department of Environmental Resources** stated "Chaddsford Section 1 SDP-0407 is consistent with approved stormwater concept #21274-2003."
- e. The **Environmental Planning Section** stated that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplains, and associated buffers are found throughout this property. The 100-year floodplain is shown on record plats VJ 186-63 and VJ 186-64. Streams, wetlands and associated buffers are correctly shown on the plans submitted with this application.

During the review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-96083, variations to Section 24-129 and Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations were approved for the proposed impacts to streams, stream buffers, 100-year floodplain, wetlands and wetland buffers associated with road crossings for Chadds Ford Drive and General Lafayette Boulevard. However, no variation associated with the proposed lake was requested or

approved with 4-96083. The lake design was studied in detail during the review and approval of SDP-0108, and variation requests for impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers were approved by Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01045 that created the parcel containing the lake. Impacts for the installation of sewer lines, outfalls for stormwater management ponds, and at least one street crossing were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-03080. The impacts shown on SDP-0407 are consistent with those previously approved. No further information regarding sensitive environmental features is required for the review of this Specific Design Plan.

Although McKendree Road is identified as a historic road, this application proposes no impacts within 600 feet of McKendree Road. No further information regarding historic or scenic roads is required for the review of this Specific Design Plan.

Traffic-generated noise may impact portions of the property. US 301 is the eastern boundary of the subject property. The noise model used by the Environmental Planning Section predicts that the 65 dBA noise contour is 531 feet from the centerline of US 301. This noise corridor will impact the L-A-C and E-I-A portions of the site but not the R-M-zoned portion currently under review. General Lafayette Boulevard is designed as a master plan collector roadway and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. Chadds Ford Drive is designed as a 70-foot access road and should not be a significant source of traffic-generated noise. No further action regarding noise is required with regard to this Specific Design Plan review.

- f. **The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section** has reviewed these plans for adequacy of public facilities and concluded the following:

The existing fire engine service at Brandywine Fire Station, Company 40, located at 14201 Brandywine Road has a service travel time of 5.25 minutes, which is within the 5.25-minute travel time guideline for Block A, Lot 1 and Block C, Lots 1-4 and Lots 29-33. All other lots are beyond.

The existing ambulance service at Brandywine Fire Station, Company 40, located at 14201 Brandywine Road has a service travel time of 5.71 minutes, which is within the 6.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at Brandywine Fire Station, Company 40, located at 14201 Brandywine Road has a service travel time of 5.71 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service discussed, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

The above findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

The proposed development is within the travel area for Police District V-Clinton. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed

subdivision. The Planning Board's current test for police adequacy is based on a standard for square footage in police stations relative to the number of sworn duty staff assigned. The standard is 115 square feet per officer. As of January 2, 2004, the county had 823 sworn staff and a total of 101,303 square feet of station space. Based on available space, there is capacity for an additional 57 sworn personnel.

- g. The **Community Planning Division** reviewed this application as part of a larger project known as Brandywine Village, which encompasses approximately 277 acres of land that has been classified in the R-M, E-I-A and L-A-C Comprehensive Design Zones with basic plans approved by application A-8838 (1977) and amended by A-9878 (1993). The 2002 General Plan classifies this area as a possible future Center in the Developing Tier.

The property subject to this 29.86-acre SDP application is in the R-M Zone and is proposed for 131 single-family residential dwellings that generally conform to recommendations of the master plan for this area. All development proposed for this site was subject to site plan review in Comprehensive Design Plan application CDP-0102/01, as approved by the District Council on September 13, 2004. Master plan development issues are addressed in the context of the CDP application review process. This application, SDP-0407, should be evaluated for consistency with these previously approved plans. There are no additional master plan or General Plan issues related to this SDP application.

- 11. The plan conforms to the *Landscape Manual*; however, the plans should be revised to remove the notes relating to section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* because Comprehensive Design Plans are exempt from that section of the ordinance.
- 12. As evidenced in Findings Number 10(b) and (f) the development 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.
- 13. Adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties as evidenced with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan # 21274-2003-00.

## 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 Specific Design Plan SDP-0407, Chaddsford Section 1, and TCP II/68/04 subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature approval of the Specific Design Plan, the following revisions shall be made to the plans:
  - a. The tracking chart on Sheet 5 of 5 of TCPII/126/98-03 shall be revised to include all clearing previously approved.
  - b. The applicant shall submit to DPR for review and approval revised and corrected construction drawings for the master plan tail, including a grading plan, limits of disturbance, and complete construction details. Construction drawings for the master plan trail shall be in accordance with the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
  - c. *Landscape Manual* schedules for Section 4.7 shall be removed from the plans.

- d. DPR staff shall review and approve the location and design of the stormwater management facilities and outfalls on dedicated parkland, if any are proposed within parkland.
  - e. The Foxhall model shall either be deleted from the architectural package or the minimum finished living area above grade shall be expanded to 1,650 square feet.
2. Prior to signature approval of the Specific Design Plan the following landscape improvements will be provided on the plans:
- a. Landscaping will be enhanced using either one shade tree or one ornamental tree in the front yard of each lot
  - b. Additional evergreen trees and shade trees (where space is adequate) will be used along the western property boundary to enhance the landscape buffer between the subject property and the townhouses to the west.
  - c. Ornamental trees (minimum groupings of three) and shrubs will be used at intersections, where space and line-of-sight allow, to enhance the housing at all intersections.
  - d. Ornamental shrubs (grouping of four or more) will be used for each lot at the driveways and along all streets, where space and line-of-sight allow, to enhance the appearance of streets to soften the look of driveways.
3. Prior to the issuance of building permits on Lots 17–26, Block C, the following shall be demonstrated on the architectural elevations:
- a. 100 percent brick facades on the front and sides of the units.
  - b. Keystones shall be used on the front façade.
  - c. Rowlock brick will be used below all windows.
  - d. A front porch, side lights at the door, or a top transom at the door shall be standard features.
  - e. Two-car garages on all units.
  - f. Nine-foot ceilings on the first floor.
4. 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.
5. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the 135<sup>th</sup> unit in the overall development as shown on CDP-0102/01, the applicant shall submit to the Department of Parks and Recreation a performance bond, a letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, for the construction of the master plan trail on dedicated parkland in the amount to be determined by DPR.

6. Prior to construction of the master planned trail on dedicated parkland, the location of the trail shall be flagged in the field and reviewed and approved by DPR staff.
7. Prior to issuance of the building permits for 290th unit in the development as shown on CDP-0102/01, all public recreation facilities on dedicated parkland shall be constructed.
8. Prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 98<sup>th</sup> unit in the subject application, the private recreational facilities shall be completed.
9. In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service discussed, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.