



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.


Specific Design Plan

SDP-1003-05

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Parkside (formerly Smith Home Farm), Sections 1A, 1B, 2, and 3, Parcel U-1 Location: On the eastern side of Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4), approximately 2,000 feet west of its intersection with Suitland Parkway. Applicant/Address: SHF Project Owner, LLC 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 2850 Los Angeles, CA 90067	Planning Board Hearing Date:	09/10/15
	Staff Report Date:	08/27/15
	Date Accepted:	06/18/15
	Planning Board Action Limit:	N/A
	Plan Acreage:	250.85
	Zone:	R-M
	Dwelling Units:	1,109
	Gross Floor Area:	13,389 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	78
	Council District:	06
	Election District	15
	Municipality:	NA
	200-Scale Base Map:	205SE08

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
To revise the previously approved central recreational center within Section 3, including the clubhouse and two bath house floor plans and architecture; to revise the layout and lighting of the recreational area; to add an entry feature; and to revise the tree conservation plan to reflect the revisions.	Informational Mailing:	08/27/13
	Acceptance Mailing:	06/12/15
	Sign Posting Deadline:	08/11/15

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ruth Grover, MUP, AICP Phone Number: 301-952-4317 E-mail: Ruth.Grover@ppd.mncppc.org	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-05
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-011-12-03
Parkside (formerly Smith Home Farm), Sections 1A, 1B, 2, and 3, Parcel U-1

The Urban Design staff has completed its review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the Recommendation section of this report.

EVALUATION

This revision to a specific design plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of Zoning Map Amendment A-9965-C.
- b. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Plans CDP-0501 and CDP-0501-01.
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05080.
- d. The requirements of Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 and its revisions.
- e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, specifically,
 - (1) Sections 27-507, 27-508, and 27-509 governing purposes, uses, and regulations in the Residential Medium Development (R-M) Zone;
 - (2) Section 27-515, Uses Permitted in the R-M Zone;
 - (3) Section 27-274, Design Guidelines; and
 - (4) Section 27-528(a) and (b), Planning Board action.
- f. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- g. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.

- h. The requirements of the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
- i. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the evaluation and analysis of the subject revision to a specific design plan (SDP), the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The request in this case is to revise the previously approved central recreational center with Section 3, including the clubhouse and two bath house floor plans and architecture; to revise the layout and lighting of the recreational area; to add an entry feature; and to revise the tree conservation plan (TCP) to reflect the revisions. All of the revisions to the plan are located within Parcel U-1.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zones	R-M	R-M
Uses	Vacant	Residential
Acreage of Parkside (formerly Smith Home Farm)	757	757
Acreage of SDP	250.85	250.85
Total Number of Units SDP	1,109	1,109
Number of Units in Section 1A	312	312
Number of Units in Section 1B	153	153
Number of Units in Section 2	374	374
Number of Units in Section 3	270	270
 Acreage of Section 3	 27.85	 27.85
Number of Townhouse Units	130	130
Number of Two-Family Units	140	140

CLUBHOUSE	OCCUPANTS	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
Activity Pool (1 per every 7)	80	12	76
Competition Pool (1 per every 7)	76	11	
Rental Area for Parkside residents only (1 per every 7)	15	3	
Exercise/Aerobics (1 per every 7)	22	4	
Gathering Hall (1 per every 3)	69	23	
Sports Lounge/Game Room (1 per every 7)	72	12	
Theater (1 per every 4)	18	5	
Employees/Office	2	2	
Handicap Spaces (1 per every 25)	N/A	3	4
TOTAL		72	80

The applicant has provided sufficient information to enable the Urban Design Section to determine that sufficient parking has been provided for the proposed clubhouse.

3. **Location:** Parkside (formerly Smith Home Farm) is a tract of land consisting of wooded undeveloped land and active farmland, located approximately 3,000 feet east of the intersection of Westphalia Road and Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4), and measuring approximately 757 acres, in Planning Area 78, Council District 6. Sections 1A, 1B, 2, and 3, totaling 265 acres, are located in the western portion of the larger Parkside development. Section 3, measuring approximately 27.85 acres, is a triangular portion of land in the northeastern portion of the SDP formed by the intersection of Central Park Drive to the southeast and Rock Spring Drive to the southwest.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 is bounded to the north by existing subdivisions and undeveloped land in the Rural Residential (R-R) and Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zones and undeveloped land in the Light Industrial (I-1), Miscellaneous Commercial (C-M), Commercial Office (C-O), and Townhouse (R-T) Zones; to the east by other portions of the Parkside development (formerly Smith Home Farm); to the south by existing development, such as the Catholic Charities building/facility and single-family detached houses, and undeveloped land in the R-A Zone; to the west by existing development (Mirant Center) in the I-1 Zone, existing residences in the R-R and R-A Zones, and undeveloped land in the I-1 and Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zones. Section 3 is bounded to the north by vacant land that is proposed to become Phase 4 of the Parkside development, with vacant land that is proposed to become Phase 7 of this development to the east; to the southeast by the proposed Westphalia Central Park; to the southwest by a stream valley with Phases 1B and 2 of this development beyond.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The larger Parkside development (formerly Smith Home Farm) measures 757 gross acres, including 727 acres in the Residential Medium Development (R-M) Zone and 30 acres in the Local Activity Center (L-A-C) Zone, which was rezoned from the R-A Zone through Zoning Map Amendments A-9965-C and A-9966-C for 3,648 dwelling units (a mixture of single-family detached, single-family attached, and multifamily condominiums) and 140,000-square feet of commercial/retail space. Zoning Map Amendments A-9965-C and A-9966-C were approved by the Prince George’s County District Council on February 13, 2006 (Zoning Ordinance Nos. 4-2006 and 5-2006), subject to three conditions. On May 22, 2006, the District Council amended this zoning approval to move the L-A-C line further south about 500 feet, retaining the same acreage in the L-A-C Zone.

On June 12, 2006, Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501 for Smith Home Farm was approved by the District Council, subject to 34 conditions. A single revision, CDP-0501-01, was approved by the District Council on May 21, 2012, subject to five conditions.

On April 6, 2006, the Prince George’s County Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05080 for Smith Home Farm, as formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64. Subsequently, two reconsiderations of 4-05080 were filed and approved as memorialized in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64(A), adopted by the Planning Board on September 7, 2006; and PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64(A/2)(C), adopted by the Planning Board on June 14, 2012 and administratively corrected on February 19, 2013.

Specific Design Plan SDP-0506 for road infrastructure was approved by the Planning Board on July 27, 2006 and PGCPB Resolution No. 06-192 was adopted on September 7, 2006 formalizing that approval. A single revision to that SDP (SDP-0506/01) was approved on December 12, 2007

by the Planning Director as designee of the Planning Board to revise A-67 to a 120-foot right-of-way and to add bus stops and a roundabout. Specific Design Plan SDP-0506-02 was approved by the Planning Board on February 23, 2012 and PGCPB Resolution No. 12-14 was adopted on March 29, 2012 formalizing that approval. Specific Design Plan SDP-0506-03 was approved by the Planning Board on July 17, 2014 and PGCPB Resolution No. 14-70 was adopted on July 31, 2014 formalizing that approval.

Specific Design Plan SDP-1002 for stream restoration was approved by the Planning Board on January 26, 2012 and PGCPB Resolution No. 12-07 was adopted on February 16, 2012 formalizing that approval, subject to seven conditions.

Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 for Sections 1A, 1B, 2, and 3 was approved by the Planning Board on March 12, 2012, as formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 12-21. Subsequently, the District Council reviewed the case on July 24, 2012 and affirmed the Planning Board's decision with two additional conditions. Four revisions, SDP-1003-01, SDP-1003-03, SDP-1003-04, and SDP-1003-06, have since been approved, but do not have any bearing on the subject application. Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-02 was pre-reviewed, but then withdrawn on May 29, 2013 never having been accepted or approved. Applications for Specific Design Plans SDP-1003-07 and SDP-1205-03 have been accepted by the Planning Department and are currently under review.

Lastly, the project is subject to an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 24819-2006-03, dated March 5, 2013 and valid until March 5, 2016.

6. **Details of the Request and Design Features:** The request in this case is to revise the previously approved central recreational center, including the clubhouse and two bath house floor plans and architecture; to revise the layout and lighting of the recreational area; to add an entry feature; and to revise the TCP to reflect the revisions.

Revision of the Recreational Area: The recreational area is proposed to be reconfigured with respect to the location of the clubhouse, bathhouses, parking lot, tot- and pre-teen lots, and the two swimming pools. The pools are proposed to be relocated to opposite ends of the parcel instead of adjacent to each other as they were in the original approval. The type of play equipment to be provided in the tot-lot and pre-teen playground is not proposed to be revised, though both play areas are proposed to be increased in size. The competition pool is proposed to remain the same shape and size (25 meters). A grassed terrace has, however, been added for audience seating for swim meets. The leisure pool deck is proposed to be modified to include some planting beds. The leisure pool is proposed to be modified in shape, but the size of the pool remains the previously approved 4,000 square feet. Proposed multipurpose recreational and event lawns with pergolas have been added to provide open space to be utilized for a variety of activities, and two pool buildings have been added to the plan, one proximate to each pool.

Each separate request is included in **boldface** type, followed by a description of the revisions and staff comment:

- a. **Clubhouse Floor Plan:** The square footage for the clubhouse is 9,760 of finished space. The design program of the clubhouse includes the specified functions, with the square footage allotted to each indicated:

Function	Square Footage
Game Room	359
Theatre	414
Office	165
Men and women's bathrooms	Women's Room: 445 ; Men's Room: 415
An exercise room	594
An aerobics room	481
A multipurpose room	1,025
A rental space for Parkside residents only	1,405
Storage area	48

Comment: The clubhouse will more than adequately provide for a variety of indoor active and passive indoor recreational opportunities for all residents of the Parkside community.

- b. **Clubhouse Architecture:** The clubhouse architecture is visually appealing in its organization of form and massing, its use of quality architectural detail, and its use of architectural detail and variation in the roofline. More particularly, the clubhouse is proposed to be constructed primarily of a brick veneer. The brick color on the watertable and periodic quoins and other vertical uprights of the structure is a deep red color called "Monticello," whereas the remainder of the structure is composed of a lighter red color called "Danish 1776." Black fiberglass shingles are to be utilized on the roof. Staff recommends, and a proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would require, the use of dimensional shingles. The roofline is articulated by the use of dormers, cupolas, and cross transept roofing. A pleasing pattern of fenestration is evident on all four façades, with oval windows utilized on the various pediments. Otherwise, the architectural design utilizes a variety of types of paned windows, some with six-over-six lights, some six-over-one lights, and other two-over-two lights and some horizontal windows, especially on the left and right side elevations, which are smaller and less ornate than the front and rear elevations. Three cupolas are evident on the front and rear elevation, though only one is visible from the right and left side elevations. Covered areas over all of the entranceways and a large multifunctional covered porch is provided along the majority of the rear elevation.

There is a small area of tan-colored fiber cement board utilized in a pediment in the front and rear elevations of the clubhouse, the color of which bears no relation to the color scheme of the remainder of the building. Therefore, staff recommends and a proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would require replacing it with a colored board that is more harmonious with the remainder of the architecture. In general, however, visual interest is created by the successful architectural design and the clubhouse provides a central focal point of the Parkside development, in keeping with the 2007 *Approved Westphalia Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment's* call for exemplary architecture and quality recreational facilities.

- c. **Leisure Pool Building Floor Plan:** The leisure pool building measures 631 square feet and contains two changing rooms, a lifeguard/storage area, a locker room, and pool equipment storage. At the periphery of the building, six outdoor showers are provided. No restrooms are provided in the building.

- d. **Leisure Pool Building Architecture:** The leisure pool building architecture is similar to that of the clubhouse in that two tones of red color split-face block make up the main body of the buildings and the roof is composed of black fiberglass shingles. The similarity, however, ends there. Instead of utilizing brick, as is predominant in the clubhouse, the structure employs entirely split-face block. The leisure pool architecture is much simpler in design than the clubhouse building and should be because these buildings are subordinate to the main building. However, the design of the building is too simplified. The few windows (three on the rear façade and two on the front façade) are all six-over-six lights, offering no variety in design. Architectural ornament is almost entirely absent from this structure and, while the roofline is not entirely flat, that is, there is a single cross gable, it is entirely unornamented. The dormers and cupolas which create visual interest on the clubhouse are entirely absent. The split-face block varies in color, with a deep red color on the water table and a lighter red color on the remainder of the structure. Additionally, tan-colored fiber cement trim boards are utilized in the pediment of the front elevation and bears no relation to the color scheme of the remainder of the building.

Staff recommends and a proposed condition would require the applicant to specify the treatment of the single door shown on the front elevation and the two doors included on the right and left side elevations, respectively, as no design details for the doors have been provided at the time of this writing; that the applicant redesign the roofline to include either a cupola or two dormers to create a more interesting roofline design relationship with the clubhouse; that the tan-colored fiber cement trim board and panels be replaced with one of a color more harmonious with the color scheme of the remainder of the architecture; and that the applicant specify either the use of brick veneer and/or decorative block, instead of painted split-face concrete block. Lastly, staff recommends, and a proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would require, the use of dimensional shingles.

- e. **Competition Pool Building Floor Plan:** The competition pool building measures 1,181 square feet. The floor plan submitted for the building includes bathrooms and showers, changing rooms, a lifeguard storage area, and a locker room. Like the leisure pool building, six outdoor showers are provided.
- f. **Competition Pool Building Architecture:** The architecture of the competition pool building is similar to the leisure pool building, except that a small cupola is provided in the center of the roof. The materials are the same: split-face concrete block, fiber cement trim boards and panels, and fiberglass shingles. There is a small trellis feature with four uprights along the building's front elevation.

Staff recommends and a proposed condition would require the applicant to specify the treatment of the two doors shown on the front elevation, the single door on the right side elevation, and the single door on the left elevation, as no design details for the doors have been provided at the time of this writing, and that the tan-colored fiber cement trim board and panels be replaced with one of a color more harmonious with the color scheme of the remainder of the architecture. Lastly, staff recommends, and a proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would require, the use of dimensional shingles.

- g. **Addition of an Entry Feature:** An entry feature is proposed to the south of the event lawn near the traffic circle. The entry feature for the development is proposed to be a 32-foot-long decorative stone veneer monument sign wall, with an 80-inch by 18-inch or ten-square-foot precast concrete sign panel reading “Spa at Parkside” centered between two-foot by two-foot concrete piers. The sign wall and the piers are capped with concrete. Each pier has a precast concrete insert with a bronze letter “P” pin mounted on it. Landscaping for the monument sign includes eight Dwarf Japanese Barberry shrubs in front of the monument sign and 53 Red Tip Photinia evergreens to its rear.

Staff would suggest and a proposed condition would require the applicant to substitute the invasive Dwarf Japanese Barberry shrubs and non-native Red Tip Photinia specified with native evergreen shrub varieties.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9965-C:** On August 18, 2006, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9965-C to rezone 757 acres of the subject property from the R-A Zone to the R-M Zone.
8. **Comprehensive Design Plans CDP-0501 and CDP-0501-01:** On February 23, 2006, Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501 for Smith Home Farm was approved by the Planning Board subject to 30 conditions. The District Council approved the CDP on May 22, 2006. On December 1, 2011, CDP-0501-01 was approved by the Planning Board subject to four conditions, modifying Conditions 3, 7, and 16 of the original approval. On May 21, 2012, the District Council affirmed the Planning Board’s decision and approved CDP-0501-01. Each relevant condition of the CDP approvals is included in **boldface** type below and is followed by staff comment.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501

In PGCPB Resolution No. 06-56(C), which approved CDP-0501, the Planning Board made the finding below with respect to residential density increments in the R-M-zoned portion of the site. Subsequently, in the final approval of the case, the District Council affirmed the Planning Board’s decision and adopted the Planning Board’s findings of fact and conclusions of law in a District Council Order dated June 12, 2006. The density increment analysis, which resulted in the residential density of the project being increased by 247 dwelling units, stated in Resolution No. 06-56(c) is partly stated herein as it relates to the subject plan, as follows:

Finding 8

- a. **Density Increment Analysis:** The applicant has provided a density increment justification to request density increments pursuant to factors listed in Sections 27-509(b), 509(c), in the R-M Zone for both regular R-M development and Mixed Retirement Development components and Section 27-496(b) in the L-A-C Zone for both residential and commercial components. The following discussions document the staff’s analysis and density increment recommendations.

R-M (Medium 3.6) ZONE RESIDENTIAL UNITS

Base density 3.6 DUs/AC	1,877 units
Maximum density 5.7 DUs /AC	2,973 units
Density requested 4.07 DUs /AC	2,124 units
Density increment requested 13.2%	247 units

Section 27-509(b), Regulations, provides the specific public benefit features and density increment factors that can be considered in granting density increments as follows:

- (4) For recreational development of open space (including minimum improvement of heavy grading, seeding, mulching, utilities, off-street parking, walkways, landscaping, and playground equipment), an increment factor may be granted, not to exceed 10% in dwelling units.

Applicant's request: The applicant requests 10.0 percent (188 units) density increment in dwelling units with the following justification:

“The applicant proposes to develop the neighborhood open spaces into pocket parks. These village green style parks will be graded and will include appropriate landscaping, playgrounds for ages 2–12, walking paths, sitting areas and open play areas. These parks are focal points for their neighborhoods, providing recreation opportunities within walking distance. (See recreation plan for facility locations and sizes.) The recreational development of the neighborhood open space qualifies the applicant for a 10 percent increase in dwelling units.”

Comment: Staff agrees with the applicant and recommends the granting of the full ten percent density increment as requested, *if the conditions of approval are adopted in regard to the size of the community building in the communitywide center (emphasis added)*. The applicant will also provide the following recreation facilities (in addition to the trail components discussed above) throughout the entire development and in the community center (which does not include the facilities provided in the recreation center for the Mixed Retirement Development and the amenities in the L-A-C Center), which exceed the requirements of Subtitle 24 for mandatory dedication:

Eleven open play areas
One community building
One community pool
One bocce/croquet lawn field
One event plaza
Five playgrounds for children age 2–12
Parking compound (with parking spaces per the Zoning Ordinance)

The plan appears to suggest that the community building and pool facilities are one and the same structure. This configuration is acceptable; however, staff believes that *the applicant should commit to a minimum size community building of*

15,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities (emphasis added). The pool has also not been sized; however, staff recommends that the applicant commit to a standard Olympic size pool with at least a 30- by 30-foot training area, and additional areas in order to accommodate uses such as a wading pool for toddlers. The adding of other facilities to the community center, such as tennis courts and basketball courts, should also be considered. If these facilities were added as conditions for approval of the plans, staff would support the full density increment requested.

- (6) For creating activity centers with space provided for quasi-public services (such as churches, day care center for children, community meeting rooms, and the like), a density increment factor may be granted, not to exceed 10 percent in dwelling units.

Applicant's request: The applicant requests 10 percent (188 units) density increment in dwelling units with the following justification:

"The applicant proposes an HOA recreation center for the use of every home in Smith Home Farms. It will include community-meeting rooms in addition to swimming and active recreation facilities. This activity center qualifies the applicant for a 10% increase in dwelling units."

Comment: The applicant proposes only the community meeting rooms be included in the community center building, but does not identify the specific size. Given the size of the proposed development, staff believes that the applicant should commit to a minimum size for the community building as discussed above and only five percent increase in dwelling units (94 units) be granted.

DENSITY INCREMENT SUMMARY: R-M Zone

In summary, the applicant has provided additional improvements and amenities that are above and beyond what is normally required to satisfy the above two density increment criteria. As a result, the applicant has earned the density increments, subject to certain conditions, as follows:

Factor Number	Density Increment (%)	Density Increment (# of units)
4	10	188
6	5	94
	15	282

The applicant requests a density increment of 13.2 percent, an equivalent of 247 dwelling units, which is within the allowable limits of density increment in accordance with the above analysis.

Comment: The applicant received 15 percent in density increments for the provision of recreational development and an activity center, of which they utilized 13.2 percent, or 247 dwelling units, conditional upon providing a 15,000-square-foot community building.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501-01

In PGCPB Resolution No. 11-112, which approved CDP-0501-01, the District Council affirmed the Planning Board's decision and adopted the Planning Board's findings of fact and conclusions of law in a District Council Order dated May 21, 2012, in which the requirements regarding the provision of recreational facilities were somewhat modified.

Pertinent to this review are the findings that the Planning Board made in PGCPB Resolution No. 11-112 regarding Condition 7 of the original approval, which are as follows:

Finding 8

- b. **Condition 7 of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501 requires a community center building and associated swimming pool to be provided at the time of specific design plan:**

7. **Prior to acceptance of the applicable SDPs:**

- a. **The following shall be shown on or submitted with the plans:**

- (1) **The community building shall be shown as a minimum of 15,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.**
- (2) **The swimming pool shall be a 33 1/3 by 50-meter, 8-lane competition pool, and a minimum 2,000 square-foot wading/activity pool.**

Applicant's proposal: The applicant proposes to construct more than one community building to best serve future residents. Specifically, a 10,000-square-foot community building is proposed to be constructed during the first phase of the development to serve approximately 1,650 market rate units, which is approximately sixty-eight percent of all approved market rate dwelling units. The remaining 5,000 square feet are proposed to be constructed in a separate community building to serve the rest of the market-rate units. A third community building will be built to serve the approved age-restricted community consisting of a total of 1,224 dwelling units. In addition, the applicant proposes to relocate the previously approved community center to the north quadrant of the intersection of C-627 and C-631, across C-631 from the proposed central park. The proposed revised Condition 7 is as follows (underlined text is added/changed):

7. **Prior to acceptance of the applicable SDPs:**

- a. **The following shall be shown on or submitted with the plans:**

- (1) **The Community building or buildings shall be shown as a combined minimum of 15,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.**

- (2) The swimming pool shall be a 25-meter, 8-lane competition pool, and minimum of 4,000 square foot wading/activity pool.

The design scheme as approved in Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501 envisioned one community center in a central location where multifamily and single-family attached dwelling units are concentrated. The community center is also adjacent to the proposed L-A-C-(Local Activity Center) zoned town center area with an Olympic-size pool and a wading/activity pool for younger children. The community center has been included as an amenity in the density increment analysis. There is no doubt that an additional community building will provide more amenities to future residents of the Westphalia project. However an additional community center could result in more maintenance costs to be borne by the residents. During the public hearing for this application on December 1, 2011, the applicant expressed the desire to have more flexibility in provision of community buildings and indicated that they would like to have options of providing smaller satellite community buildings in addition to the 10,000 square-foot main community building. The Planning Board acknowledged uncertainty in future real estate market and showed willingness to accommodate the applicant's request. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Board decided and further agreed upon by the applicant that if more than two community buildings will be built, the minimum gross floor area for each subsequent building shall not be less than 2,500 square feet. The Planning Board reserved the right to review and approve additional community buildings at time of appropriate SDPs.

According to the revised comprehensive design plan, the site where the previously approved community center is located will be utilized for another community center serving the age-restricted community of 1,224 dwelling units. The Planning Board believes a separate community center servicing the age-restricted community is a reasonable design decision because the residents in the age-restricted community will have different schedules than the residents in the market-rate community.

The revision also reduces the length of the previously approved eight-lane pool from 50 meters to 25 meters and at the same time doubles the area of the wading/activity pool. This revision is acceptable, given the fact that many families with children will be living in the area. The Planning Board decided that Condition 7 be modified as follows:

7. Prior to acceptance of the applicable SDPs:
 - a. The following shall be shown on or submitted with the plans:
 - (1) The Community building or buildings shall be shown as a combined minimum of 15,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.

- (2) The swimming pool shall be a 25-meter, 8-lane competition pool, and minimum of 4,000-square-foot wading/activity pool.

To ensure timely completion of the first community center and the construction of the second one for the market-rate residential dwelling units, two new conditions have been included in this resolution as follows:

- Prior to the issuance of the 200th residential building permit, the first 10,000-square-foot community building in the R-M Zone shall be bonded, and prior to the issuance of the 400th residential building permit, the community building shall be complete and open to the residents.
- If the applicant decides to build two community buildings only (not including the community building for the seniors), prior to the issuance of the 1,325th residential building permit in the R-M Zone, the second 5,000-square-foot community building shall be bonded, and prior to the issuance of the 1,550th building permit, the community building shall be complete and open to the residents. The exact size, timing of construction and completion of the additional community buildings shall be established by the Planning Board at time of appropriate SDP approvals.

Comment: In addition, it was noted in Finding 9 of Resolution No. 11-112 that the CDP-0501-01 application did not propose any revisions to the previously approved density utilizing density increments for the project. It is also important to note that CDP-0501-01 was approved by the Planning Board revising Condition 7 of the approval of CDP-0501 as follows:

7. Prior to acceptance of the applicable SDPs:

a. The following shall be shown on or submitted with the plans:

- (1) The Community building or buildings shall be shown as a combined minimum of 15,000 square feet, in addition to the space proposed to be occupied by the pool facilities.
- (2) The swimming pool shall be a 25-meter, 8-lane competition pool, and minimum of 4,000 square foot wading/activity pool.

Comment: It is important to note that in the final approval of CDP-0501-01, in the District Council Order dated May 21, 2012, the above revised Condition 7 was included in the decision, but was supplemented by the following Conditions 3, 4, and 5 of the District Council, which included the following additional requirements regarding the bonding and construction of the community building(s):

3. Prior to the issuance of the 200th residential building permit, the first 10,000-square-foot community building in the R-M Zone shall be bonded, and prior to the issuance of the 400th residential building permit, the community building shall be complete and open to the residents.

4. **If the applicant decides to build two community buildings only (not including the community building for the seniors), prior to the issuance of the 1,325th residential building permit in the R-M Zone, the second 5,000-square-foot community building shall be bonded, and prior to the issuance of the 1,550th building permit, the community building shall be complete and open to the residents. The exact size, timing of construction and completion of the additional community buildings shall be established by the Planning Board at time of appropriate SDP approvals.**

Affirmance is also subject to the following additional condition by the District Council, after review of the administrative record and for the reasons stated by the Planning Board in its resolution, which are hereby adopted as the findings of fact and conclusions of law of the District Council.

5. **If the applicant decides to build one 15,000-square-foot community building (not including the community building for the seniors), the community building shall be bonded prior to the issuance of the 1,325th building permit and the community building shall have a validly issued use & occupancy permit and be open to the residents prior to the 1,550th building permit.**

Comment: As Conditions 3 and 4 are germane to the subject SDP, these conditions are provided for informational purposes and for clarification of the record, so as to be better able to track the bonding and construction of the required central recreational facilities on which the density increments were granted in the earlier CDP approvals. The applicant's representative has explained that a revision to the CDP or a reconsideration of the CDP is anticipated to be submitted in the near future. In that case, this issue may be clarified further and the location of the second and third community buildings shall be further refined. It is noted that Condition 5 has been rendered obsolete by the subject project as the applicant has committed to building two or more community buildings and not the originally envisioned single 15,000-square-foot community building through this application.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05080:** On April 6, 2006, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05080 for Smith Home Farm, as formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64. Of those conditions, the following is applicable to the review of this SDP.

16. **The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads. Wide sidewalks may be recommended within the community core or at the L-A-C. A detailed analysis of the internal sidewalk network will be made at the time of each SDP.**

Comment: The revisions proposed in the subject SDP revision retain the sidewalk contained in prior approvals. Therefore, this revision application does not affect previous findings of conformance to this requirement.

10. **Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 and its revisions:** Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 was approved by the Planning Board on March 8, 2012 (PGCPB Resolution No. 12-21), subject to 31 conditions. Subsequently, the District Council reviewed the case on July 24, 2012 and affirmed the Planning Board's resolution with two additional conditions, for a total of 33. The relevant conditions of this approval are included below in **boldface** type, followed by staff comment:

8. The recreational facilities to be included in the subject project shall be bonded and constructed in accordance with the following schedule:

PHASING OF AMENITIES		
FACILITY	BOND	FINISH CONSTRUCTION
Private Recreation center Outdoor recreation facilities	Prior to the issuance of the 200 th building permit overall	Complete by 400 th building permit overall
Pocket Parks (including Playgrounds) within each phase	Prior to the issuance of any building permits for that phase	Complete before 50% of the building permits are issued in that phase
Trail system Within each phase	Prior to the issuance of any building permits for that phase	Complete before 50% of the building permits are issued in that phase
It is occasionally necessary to adjust the precise timing of the construction of recreational facilities as more details concerning grading and construction details become available. Phasing of the recreational facilities may be adjusted by written permission of the Planning Board or its designee under certain circumstances, such as the need to modify construction sequence due to exact location of sediment ponds or utilities, or other engineering necessary. The number of permits allowed to be released prior to construction of any given facility shall not be increased by more than 25 percent, and an adequate number of permits shall be withheld to assure completion of all of the facilities prior to completion of all the dwelling units.		

Comment: This condition requires bonding of the subject improvements prior to the 200th building permit and completion by the 400th building permit, and is included in a recreational facilities agreement, which by a proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would be revised to reflect the recreational facilities approved herein and to adjust the bonding amounts if and as necessary. It should be noted that bonding and construction of the second clubhouse is determined by Condition 4 of the approval of CDP-0501-01, as follows:

4. If the applicant decides to build two community buildings only (not including the community building for the seniors), prior to the issuance of the 1,325th residential building permit in the R-M Zone, the second 5,000-square-foot community building shall be bonded, and prior to the issuance of the 1,550th building permit, the community building shall be complete and open to the residents. The exact size, timing of construction and completion of the additional community buildings shall be established by the Planning Board at time of appropriate SDP approvals.

Also, significant from the approval of SDP-1003 is Condition 22, as follows:

22. All future specific design plans for the project shall include a tabulation of all lots that have been approved previously for this project. The tabulation shall include a breakdown of each type of housing units approved, the specific design plan number, and the Planning Board resolution number.

Comment: The specified tabulation is provided on the submitted SDP and need not be updated, as the subject revision does not create any additional lots. Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-01 was approved by a District Council Order dated September 23, 2013. Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-03 was approved by the Planning Board on September 19, 2013 and PGCPB Resolution No. 13-106 was adopted by the Planning Board on October 10, 2013, formalizing that approval. Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-04 was approved by the Planning Board on January 16, 2014 and PGCPB Resolution No. 14-02 was subsequently adopted by the Planning Board on February 6, 2014, formalizing that approval. Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-06 was

approved by District Council order on July 21, 2015. None of the conditions of those approvals impact the subject case.

11. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject SDP is in general compliance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- a. The subject SDP is consistent with Sections 27-274(a)(7), 27-507, 27-508, and 27-509 governing development in the R-M Zone.
- b. Section 27-528 requires the following findings for approval of a SDP:

(a) **Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

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

Comment: The subject SDP has been found to conform to approved Comprehensive Design Plans CDP-0501 and CDP-0501-01 as discussed above in Finding 8. As detailed in Finding 12 below, the subject revision application conforms to the applicable standards of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

(2) **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.**

Comment: Findings for adequate public facilities including fire, rescue, police, and transportation have been made in conjunction with the preliminary plan and subsequent SDPs. The subject revision application will have no effect on the previous findings of adequacy made in conjunction with the preliminary plan and SDPs.

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

Comment: In an e-mail received August 18, 2015, DPIE stated that the subject project is consistent with the requirements of approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 24819-2006-03 dated March 25, 2015. Therefore, it may not be said that adequate provisions have been made for draining surface water and ensuring that there will be no adverse effects on the subject property or adjacent properties.

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

Comment: The subject revision application is being approved together with Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCP-II-011-12-03. Therefore, it may be said that the project conforms to the requirements of the Prince George's County

Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. This is discussed further in Finding 13 below.

(5) The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features are preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible.

Comment: In a memorandum dated July 14, 2015, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the regulated environmental features have been found to have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible. Therefore, this required finding may be made.

12. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed revisions do not affect previous findings of conformance to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
13. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The site is grandfathered from the most recent requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because it has a previously approved TCP. The site is subject to the requirements of the WCO because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. The Environmental Planning Section has proposed conditions that have been included in the Recommendation section of this staff report that bring the application into conformance with the requirements of the WCO. Provided approval in this case is made subject to those conditions, it may be said that the subject project conforms to the applicable requirements of the WCO.
14. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The proposed revisions do not affect previous findings to the affect the application's conformance to the Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
15. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the following agencies or divisions:
 - a. **Historic Preservation Section and Archeological Review:** In a memorandum dated July 2, 2015, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the proposed revisions place the clubhouse at a further distance from the historic site than was originally proposed and that landscaping along Central Park Drive would protect the viewshed from the Blythewood historic site. Further, they noted that archeological investigations were completed on the subject property in 2006 and that all of the archeological conditions of approval have been satisfied. In sum, they stated that the subject proposal will not impact any historic sites or resources, documented properties, or any known archeological resources.
 - b. **Community Planning Division:** In a memorandum dated July 28, 2015, the Community Planning Division stated that there were no general plan or sector plan issues related to the subject SDP application.
 - c. **Transportation Planning Section:** On June 18, 2015, the Transportation Planning Section stated that they had no comments on the subject application.
 - d. **Trails:** In a memorandum dated August 17, 2015, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following regarding trails, sidewalks, and pedestrian accessibility:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the submitted SDP application referenced above for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the 2007 *Approved Westphalia Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (area master plan) in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements.

Review Comments (Master Plan Compliance and Prior Approvals)

The subject application is a proposed amendment to the approved SDP which includes revisions to the clubhouse floor plan and architecture, a revised site layout for the recreational area, and an entry feature. Bicycle, pedestrian, and trail facilities were addressed through the multiple prior approvals, including 4-05080 and SDP-1003. Conditions of approval addressed issues including the location and timing of trail construction, sidewalk construction, and road cross section issues. The revisions proposed in the subject SDP revision do not impact the planned and approved trail network, and the plans retain the sidewalk and trail connections contained in prior approvals. It should also be noted that the master plan trail required along MC-631 (Central Park Drive) by Condition 15c of 4-05080 will be along the south/east side of the road, which does not impact the area covered by the current SDP revision.

The proposed revisions to SDP-1003 do not negatively impact the previously approved bicycle, pedestrian, or trail facilities. Trail facilities are not impacted and the necessary sidewalk connections are retained along the roads where the SDP has been amended. Prior conditions of approval remain in effect and one additional condition of approval is recommended at this time.

- (1) Prior to signature approval, the SDP shall be revised to include a bicycle rack(s) accommodating a minimum of ten bicycles at a location convenient to the entrance to the proposed clubhouse.

Comment: The Transportation Planning Section's proposed trail-related condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

- e. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR):** On June 25, 2015, DPR stated that they had no comments on the subject project.
- f. **Special Projects Section:** In a memorandum dated June 25, 2015, the Special Projects Section indicated that they had reviewed the subject SDP in accordance with Section 27-528(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance which states that:

- (2) **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.**

More particularly, the Special Projects Section offered the following comments regarding police facilities, fire and rescue service, the Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (CIP), and water and sewer:

Police Facilities

The proposed development is within the service area of Police District II, Bowie. There is 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George's County

Police Department, and the July 1, 2014 (U.S. Census Bureau) county population estimate is 904,430. Using 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, it calculates to 127,524 square feet of space for police. The current amount of space, 267,660 square feet, is within the guideline.

Fire and Rescue Service

The Special Projects Section has reviewed this SDP for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(B)–(E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(E) states that “A statement by the Fire Chief that the response time for the first due station in the vicinity of the property proposed for subdivision is a maximum of seven (7) minutes travel time. The Fire Chief shall submit monthly reports chronicling actual response times for call for service during the preceding month.”

The proposed project is served by Forestville Fire/EMS, Company 23, a first due response station (a maximum of seven minutes travel time), located at 8321 Old Marlboro Pike.

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

The CIP for Fiscal Years 2015–2020 provides funding for replacing the existing station with a new three-bay fire/EMS station.

The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.”

Water and Sewerage Findings

Section 24-122.01(b)(1) states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed this property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System.

- g. **Environmental Planning Section:** In a memorandum dated July 13, 2015, the Environmental Planning Section provided a thorough discussion of their review of the Parkside project (formerly Smith Home Farm) and none of the previous conditions of approval warrant discussion in regard to this revision. The following text addresses previously approved zoning applications related to the subject application.

District Council Final Decision for A-9965-C

The basic plan for Zoning Map Amendment A-9965-C was approved by the District Council on March 9, 2006 subject to environmental conditions. The conditions of approval were carried forward for implementation with the appropriate step of the development process, and were evaluated during the original review and approval process for SDP-1003. The current revision application does not affect the environmental conditions approved with the basic plan.

District Council Final Decision for CDP-0501

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0501 and TCPI-038-05 were approved by the District Council on June 12, 2006 subject to conditions. Most of the conditions were addressed or will be addressed at the appropriate stage of the development process.

District Council Final Decision for CDP-0501-01

The revised CDP and TCPI-038-05-01 were approved by the District Council on September 13, 2013 subject to conditions. Environmental conditions related to the site were addressed or will be addressed at the appropriate stage of the development process.

Conditions of Preliminary Plan 4-05080 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64(A))

Conditions of approval for Preliminary Plan 4-05080 and TCP1-038-03-01, approved by the Planning Board on June 14, 2012, are contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-64(A). All conditions have been addressed or will be addressed at the appropriate stage of the development process.

Conditions of approval for SDP-0506 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-192)

The Planning Board approved TCPII-057-06 and the SDP-0506 for the subject site on July 27, 2006, subject to conditions, which have been addressed or will be addressed at the appropriate stage of the development process.

Conditions of approval for SDP-1003 (PGCPB Resolution No. 12-21)

The Planning Board approved SDP-1003 and TCPII-008-12, TCPII-009-12, TCPII-010-12, and TCPII-011-12 on March 29, 2013, subject to conditions. The County Council, sitting as the District Council, issued an Order affirming the Planning Board decision on July 24, 2013.

Conditions of approval for SDP-1003-01 (PGCPB Resolution No. 13-62)

The Planning Board approved SDP-1003-01 and four sectional TCPIIs (TCPII-008-12-01, TCPII-009-12-01, TCPII-010-12-01, and TCPII-011-12-01) on May 30, 2013, subject to conditions. The County Council, sitting as the District Council, issued an Order affirming the Planning Board decision on September 23, 2013.

Conditions of approval for SDP-1003-06 (PGCPB Resolution No. 15-36)

The Planning Board approved SDP-1003-06 and TCPII-011-12-02 for Section 3 on April 16, 2015, subject to conditions. The County Council, sitting as the District Council, issued an Order affirming the Planning Board decision on July 24, 2013.

Environmental Review

The environmental review of SDP-1003-05 has been limited to the specific revisions proposed with the current application.

- (1) Natural Resource Inventory NRI-006-05-02 was approved during the review of SDP-1003 which reduced the quantity of wetlands and wetland buffers located on the subject property and reduced the primary management areas (PMA). This was relevant to the calculation of the woodland conservation requirement for the site because of the specific mitigation requirements related to clearing with the PMA.

Comment: No further information regarding the NRI is required at this time. There is no PMA located on the TCPII for Section 3, which is under review with the current application.

- (2) This site is subject to the provisions of the WCO because it is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. Revisions to approved TCPII-011-12-02 are proposed under the current application, which was updated to reflect the revised Section 3 site layout. The limit of disturbance (LOD) did not change, and the amount of clearing and afforestation remains as previously shown on the -02 revision. However, conditions relating to minor revisions to the TCPII are included in the Recommendation section of this staff report.

The overall development site contains significant natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. Impacts to the PMA for the Smith Home Farm development were approved with Preliminary Plan 4-05080. The PMA impacts approved with SDP-1003 were found to be consistent with those approved at time of preliminary plan.

Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-05 and TCPII-011-12-03 indicate no additional disturbance within the PMA as part of the revision application. The PMA on the subject revised SDP has been preserved to the fullest extent possible, and is consistent with prior approvals.

From an environmental perspective, the revised SDP and TCPII can be found in conformance with Zoning Map Amendments A-9965-C and A-9966-C, CDP-0501 and TCPI-038-05, and 4-05080 and TCPI-038-05.

- h. **The Prince George's County Police Department:** In a memorandum dated June 22, 2015, the Police Department stated that, after reviewing the plans for the subject project, they had no Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) recommendations.
- i. **The Prince George's County Health Department:** In a memorandum dated July 7, 2015, the Health Department stated that they had completed a health impact assessment review of the subject project and made the following comments/recommendations:

During the construction phases of this project, no noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Future plans should indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

The proposed pools, playground, and tot lot comprising the recreational center are viewed to be a very positive and healthful amenity for inclusion in this development project.

Comment: A proposed condition in the Recommendation section of this staff report would require the applicant to add a note to the plans stating that, during the construction phases of the project, noise impacts of the construction activity shall meet the requirements of Subtitle 19 of the County Code.

- j. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC):** At the time of this writing, staff has not received comment from WSSC regarding the subject project.
- k. **Verizon:** In an e-mail dated August 17, 2015, a representative of Verizon requested that a ten-foot-wide public utility easement be included adjacent, parallel, and contiguous to the right-of-way along all roadways dedicated for public street purposes, free, and clear of any surface obstructions.

Comment: Although public utility easements cannot be required at the time of approval of an SDP, the applicant has been provided with this information.

- l. **Potomac Electric and Power Company (PEPCO):** In an e-mail dated August 18, 2015, a representative of PEPCO stated that they had reviewed the plans and that they concur with the 10- and 15-foot-wide public utility easements. Additionally, they noted that additional public utility easements may be required based on service equipment and the location of the service meter.

Comment: Although public utility easements cannot be required at the time of approval of an SDP, the applicant has been provided with this information.

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-1003-05 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-011-12-03 for Parkside development (formerly Smith Home Farm), Sections 1A, 1B, 2, and 3, Parcel U-1, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certification of the specific design plan (SDP), the applicant shall make the following revisions to plans and/or provide the specified additional materials:
 - a. Add a note to the plans stating that the applicant plans to adhere to the requirements of Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code relating to noise associated with construction activities.
 - b. Dimension the competition and leisure pools and indicate their depth. The competition pool should be shown at a depth of a minimum of six feet and the leisure pool shall be shown with a sloped floor at a minimum of three feet deep and a maximum depth of four feet, six inches.
 - c. A note shall be added to the architectural plans stating that the roofing materials shall reflect the use of dimensional shingles on the clubhouse and both pool houses and shall carry a minimum 30-year warranty.
 - d. The tan-colored cement trim board and panels shall be replaced with that of another color harmonious with the color scheme of the remainder of the architecture. The final choice of material shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee.
 - e. Provide native evergreen shrubs for foundation plantings on the Central Park Drive side of the competition pool house.

- f. The specifications for a wood material specified hardscape items such as benches, dumpster enclosures, and pergolas shall be re-designated to utilize a metal or composite material that will be durable and lasting. The specified materials shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee.
- g. Include a bicycle rack(s) accommodating a minimum of ten bicycles at a location convenient to the entrance to the proposed clubhouse and/or the pool entrances.
- h. Redesign the competition and leisure pool buildings as follows:
 - (1) Specify the design details for the doors to be included on the two buildings.
 - (2) Include a cupola or two dormers on the leisure pool building.
 - (3) Replace the tan-colored fiber cement trim board and panels with another color more harmonious with the color scheme of the remainder of the architecture.
 - (4) Specify the use of brick veneer in place of the split-face concrete block.

Final design of the leisure and competition pool buildings, in accordance with the above, shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee.

- i. The applicant shall revise the plans for the clubhouse so that a minimum of 240 square feet of open porch is enclosed as finished floor area to enable the project to meet the requirement that the community building measure a minimum of 10,000 square feet of finished floor area.
- j. The applicant shall revise the recreational facilities agreement to comport with the recreational facilities program included in this SDP, and bonding amounts shall be adjusted if and as necessary.
- k. The Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-011-12-03, shall be revised as follows:
 - (1) The TCPII revision table shall be correctly labeled.
 - (2) Under Standard Type II Tree Conservation Plan Notes, the following revisions shall be made:
 - (a) In Note 1, the second sentence shall be removed.
 - (b) In Note 3, the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) and the contact for the pre-construction meeting shall be identified.
 - (3) The Development Review Division (DRD) approval block shall be consistently labeled to indicate that the associated plan is Specific Design Plan SDP-1003-05.
 - (4) On the overall woodland conservation worksheet, the column for Specific Design Plan SDP-1003 shall be labeled with the correct revision number for the SDP and the TCP, and the approval and certification date shall be changed to "pending."

- (5) On the individual woodland conservation worksheet:
 - (a) The woodland conservation required shall be revised to 10.98 acres.
 - (b) The area of woodland cleared shall be revised to 0.53 acre.
 - (c) An asterisk shall be added to the Afforestation/Reforestation Required, and a note shall be added under the worksheet stating “See Note 3. Under Phased Woodland Conservation Worksheet.”
 - (6) Have the revised plan signed and dated by qualified professional who prepared it.
1. The recreational facilities shall be designed in accordance with the Prince George’s County *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.