



*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-9411/13 and SDP-9406/08**

Application	General Data
Project Name  Perrywood, Section 5 and Perrywood, Section 7  Location  Located on the east side of MD 202 near the intersection of MD 193  Applicant/Address  Dee Corporation 2200 Defense Hwy, Suite 101 Crofton, MD 21114	Date Accepted 05/21/2002
	Planning Board Action Limit N/A
	Plan Acreage 51.6
	Zone R-S
	Dwelling Units NA
	Square Footage NA
	Planning Area 79
	Council District 06
	Municipality NA
	200-Scale Base Map 202SE12

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Revision to recreational facilities.	Adjoining Property Owners 05/21/02 (CB-15-1998)
	Previous Parties of Record 06/27/02 (CB-13-1997)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site 06/21/02
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners N/A

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer: LAREUSE
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
X			

July 30, 2009

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Susan Lareuse, Principal Urban Designer

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan Revision  
SDP-9411\13 and SDP-9806/08  
Perrywood, Section Five and Section Seven

The Urban Design Section has reviewed the proposed revision to the recreational facilities for Perrywood, Sections Five and Seven, and recommends APPROVAL, as stated in the Recommendation section of this report.

FINDINGS

1. The original Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-8708, set the requirements for the construction of recreational facilities for the Perrywood Development (Sections 1-7), and a Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA) dated December 20, 1990, was recorded in Liber 7872 folio 81. Numerous amendments to the RFA, for the purpose of revising the phasing schedule for the development of recreational facilities within Perrywood (as anticipated by Dee Corporation), were reviewed and subsequently recorded in the land records. The following is a list of the amended RFAs:

<b>Liber &amp; folio</b>	<b>Date</b>
L.8873, f.86	June 24, 1993
L.10115, f.115	April 10, 1995
L.10866, f.422	June 11, 1996
L.11388, f.661	April 14, 1997
L.12017, f.570	February 25, 1998
L.12399, f.216	August 13, 1998

2. The applicant is requesting this revision in order to substitute and delete recreational facilities listed in the current RFA (L.12399, f.216). This request is being made by the applicant, Dee Corporation, on behalf of the Homeowners Association, the Perrywood Community Association, Inc.
3. In a letter dated April 16, 2002, Michele LaRocca, Meyers, Rodbell & Rosenbaum, P.A., to Susan Lareuse, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, the applicant requested the following changes:

■The purpose of this letter is first, to substitute recreational facilities within Section Five (5) of Perrywood at the request of the Perrywood Homeowners Association (HOA). Specifically:

■(1) In Section Five, substitute

■(a) one (1) tot/pre-teen combo lot  
■and

■(b) one (1) gazebo  
■for

■(a) one (1) multi-purpose court  
■and

■(b) one (1) picnic area

■(2) In Section Five, the trail behind lots 30-44, Block I is also sought to be deleted. The trail is duplicative and is of a security and maintenance concern to the HOA.

■Secondly, the asphalt trail in Section Seven connecting the development to the Board of Education property is requested to be deleted. The HOA wishes this trail to be deleted since the Board of Education decided to locate the Perrywood school on another property. The original intent of this trail was to connect Perrywood to this school when it was believed that a school would be located on this adjacent parcel. This is no longer the case and the HOA does not want a trail to a vacant property. If a school is ever built on the property, the easement will still be in place and a trail could be built at that time. For the foreseeable future though, the trail is not needed and would be a nuisance. The sdg for Section 7 will also be revised to delete this trail as well.

■An amended recreational facilities agreement reflecting these changes is enclosed.●

Comment: The applicant appropriately proposes to revise the recreational facilities agreement as stated above.

4. The proposal for Section Five to substitute a combination tot-lot and preteen lot for a previously approved multipurpose court and picnic area is supported by the staff. The deletion of the multipurpose court is appropriate because each facility is nearly equivalent in

regard to value and there are two multipurpose courts within walking distance directly across Water Fowl Way. The playground will serve the recreational needs for a greater variety of ages than the multipurpose court. The proposed substitution of a gazebo for a picnic area is also supported by the staff because each facility is nearly equivalent in regard to value and the location of the picnic area may not be an appropriate facility in that it is adjacent to single-family dwellings, where most people will tend to picnic in their own yards. The applicant also proposes to reduce the amount of four-foot-wide trail from 4,600 linear feet to approximately 2,200 linear feet of 5-foot-wide trail within Section Five. The deletion of the trail is in an area that is located along an intermittent stream behind single-family detached homes within a woodland area. Since there continues to be a substantial trail system within Section Five, and there is an alternative sidewalk route within the public right-of-way to connect residents from the north portion of the development to the southern portion of the development, and vice versa, the staff has no objection.

The proposal for Section Seven to delete a 250-linear-foot trail is reasonable because the original purpose of the trail will no longer be fulfilled. The trail was designed to connect a school site, formerly planned to be the Perrywood Elementary school site, to the subject development. That elementary school has been relocated to Watkins Park Road, is constructed and open. The following condition relating to the trail is contained within PGCPB No. 98-218:

1. **Prior to the release of building permits beyond the 64<sup>th</sup>, the recreational facilities within Section Six shall be completed. In addition, the trail connection from Section 7 to the Board of Education property shall be completed, or a revision to SDP-9406/03 to address issues relating to the construction of the trail shall have been approved by the Planning Board. (underlining added for emphasis)**

The Public Facilities Planning Section has had conversations with the staff of the Board of Education and it was determined that there are no immediate plans for the development of the property as a school. The proposal to eliminate the trail at this time does not include deleting the associated 20-foot-wide easement, which will continue to exist. If the Board of Education develops the property as a school site in the future, then the homeowners association could decide to build a trail if they desired.

5. In letter dated June 14, 2002, Cynthia Alston, President of the Perrywood Community Association, Inc., to Susan Lareuse, the homeowners association provides the following support of the application:

■ It is my understanding that the hearing on the above referenced matter scheduled for June 20, 2002, has been cancelled and moved to July 11, 2002. It had been my intention to attend the July 11<sup>th</sup> hearing before the Planning Board. Therefore, please accept this letter to reconfirm my support for the amendment to the Recreation Facilities. This matter has been discussed thoroughly with the Board of Directors of the Community Association for Perrywood and the Board of Directors voted unanimously to support the changes outlined in this amendment to the Recreational Facilities Agreement.●

6. This revision to the Specific Design Plan will have no impact on the previous finding of the original SDP that it will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing programmed public facilities, either shown in the Comprehensive Design Plan or provided as part of the development.
7. The proposed landscaping for the subject property is in conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
8. The Specific Design Plan will have no impact on provisions for draining surface water to prevent adverse effects on the subject property or any adjacent property.
9. The plan is exempt from the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Manual due to prior approvals of grading permits.

#### RECOMMENDATION

The Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE this revision to the Specific Design Plans SDP-9406/08 and SDP-9411/13.