The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission Prince George's County Planning Department Development Review Division 301-952-3530



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

# SPECIFIC DESIGN PLAN

## **SDP-9910/06**

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Hampton Property  Location: Approximately one mile north of the intersection of Branch Avenue (MD 5) and Crain Highway (US 301)  Applicant/Address: NVR Inc. 4780 Corridor Place Beltsville, MD 20	Date Accepted:	5/16/2006
	Planning Board Action Limit:	NA
	Plan Acreage:	0.2771
	Zone:	R-S
	Dwelling Units:	2
	Square Footage:	N/A
	Planning Area:	85A
	Council District:	9
	Municipality:	NA
	200-Scale Base Map:	217SE07

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
Revision of the minimum distance between single-family dwellings on Lot 34 and Lot 35, Block A.	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-12-2003)	4/6/2006
	Sign(s) Posted on Site:	5/22/2006

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Noushin Rashtian		
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS		DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
X				

## **MEMORANDUM**

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Noushin Rashtian, Urban Design Section, Development Review Division

SUBJECT: Specific Design Plan, SDP-9910/06

Hampton Property

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 as described in the recommendation section of this report.

## **EVALUATION**

The specific design plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-S Zone;
- b. The requirements of Zoning Map Amendment A-9853-C and A-9853/01;
- c. The requirements of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9403;
- d. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for Specific Design Plans, Section 27-528.

## **FINDINGS**

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

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of revision to the specific design plan to revise the minimum 10 feet distance to 8.5 feet between houses on Lots 34 and 35. A drafting inaccuracy on the specific design plan caused the foundations for the houses on Lots 34 and 35 to be constructed with 8.5 feet between them instead of 10 feet as is required by the comprehensive design plan (CDP).

## **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	R-S	R-S
Use(s)	Single-Family Dwelling	Single-Family Dwelling
Lots	2	2
Detached Dwelling Units	2	2

## **Architectural Data**

Model Total Finished Area w/all options		Garage	
Zachary			
"B"	2,793	2	
"D"	2,793	2	

- 2. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 85A, Council District 9 in the Developing Tier. More specifically, it is located on the east side of Dyson Road, and approximately 500 feet north of its intersection with Brandywine Road (MD 381).
- 3. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is located approximately one mile north from the intersection of Branch Avenue (MD 5) and Crain Highway (US 301). The property surrounds the existing Gwynn Park Middle School on the west side of Dyson Road and abuts the Gwynn Park Senior High School to the south. To the north of the site and along Dyson Road are single-family dwellings in the R-R Zone. The property is also is bounded by US 301 to the east.
- 4. **Previous Approvals:** On May 22, 1992, the District Council adopted Zoning Ordinance No. 19-1992 (Application No.A-9853-C) and amended the Zoning Map by rezoning the subject property, consisting of 189.32 acres, from the R-R and R-A Zones to the R-S (1.6-2.6 DUs per acre). The rezoning was approved with 32 conditions and three considerations.

On September 14, 1993, the Hampton property was included in the new *Approved Master Plan* and *Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion V, Planning Areas 81A, 81B, 83, 84, 85A, and 85B* approved by the District Council.

On December 1, 1994, the Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9403 (PGCPB No.94-345) for 180 single-family detached units, 289 attached units, a park-and-ride facility, quasi-public uses, and open space for the Hampton property.

On November 25, 1995, the District Council approved Basic Plan Amendment A-9853/01 (Zoning Ordinance No. 18-1995) to amend the basic plan, text and conditions 10, 11, and 12 of the original basic plan.

On May 9, 1996, the Planning Board approved Specific Design Plan SDP-9517 (PGCPB No. 96-157) for 450 dwelling units.

On November 18, 1999, the Planning Board approved the Preliminary Plan 4-99048 for a total of 314 single-family detached lots.

On March 30, 2000, the Planning Board approved Specific Design Plan SDP-9910 (PGCPB No. 00-32) for 287 single-family dwelling units.

On May 17, 2001, the Planning Board approved a revision to the Specific Design Plan (PGCPB No.01-96) to add a phasing plan.

On November 15, 2001, the Planning Board approved a revision to the Specific Design Plan SDP-9910/02 (PGCPB No.01-206) for the proposed architecture.

5. **Design Features**: The approved architecture for Lots 34 and 35 consists of single-family dwellings. The Zachary model "B" and "D" with approved SDP-9910/02 will be built on Lots 34 and 35. The

- 2 - SDP-9910/06

drafting inaccuracy on the specific design plan caused the foundations for the houses on Lots 34 and 35 to be constructed with 8.5 feet between them at their closest point, instead of the 10 feet required by the CDP. The 1.5-foot difference will not significantly impact the privacy of the future residents and will probably not be noticeable to most passersby. The garages have turned gables that are one-story forward projections, which will ease the "closeness" perception. The subject single-family dwellings both have brick fronts and two-car garages.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 6. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-S Zone (residential suburban development) and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
  - a The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-512, which governs permitted uses in residential suburban development. The proposed single-family dwellings are a permitted use in the R-S Zone.
- 7. **Zoning Map Amendment (ZMA) A-9853/01:** The proposed specific design plan is in general conformance with Basic Plans A-9853-C (Zoning Ordinance No. 19-1992), which shows the subject site designated for the R-S Zone (residential-agricultural).
- 8. **Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-9403):** On December 1, 1994, the Planning Board approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9403 (PGCPB No.94-345) for 180 single-family detached units, 289 attached units, a park-and-ride facility, quasi-public uses, and open space for the Hampton property. The Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-9403) was approved with 28 conditions, of which condition 7 is applicable to the subject SDP and warrants discussion as follows:
  - 7.2. Minimum Building Separation—the minimum distance between buildings on different lots irrespective of lot line location. Applicable fire codes may require additional building separation based on the fire ratings of walls, use of interior spaces, and the amount of windows in a particular wall. Minimum building separation does not apply to the required distance between necessary structures such as detached garages when two garages are adjacent to one another. Garages on separate lots may be attached.

Comment: The condition 7 of the CDP indicates a minimum 10 foot requirement for building separation. The proposed SDP requests an 8.5-foot building separation for Lots 34 and 35 due to drafting inaccuracy and subsequent construction based on inaccurate plans.

In a letter dated May 4, 2006, the applicant explains that construction of the single-family house on Lot 34 came to a halt as soon as the discrepancy was discovered, after the foundation was built and walls were under construction. Lot 35 is already developed with a single-family dwelling. Since the foundation on Lot 34 is already constructed it will cause hardship for the developer to demolish the foundation and will cause construction delay for the property owner on Lot 34.

- 9. Required Findings for approval of a specific design plan (Section 27-528 Planning Board action):
  - (1) The plan conforms to the approved comprehensive design plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual;

- 3 - SDP-9910/06

Comment: The subject revision will have no appreciable effect on the original Specific Design Plan SDP-9910. Therefore, the plan would continue to conform to the approved comprehensive design plan and the applicable standards of the *Landscape Manual*.

(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;

Comment: Findings for adequate public facilities were made in conjunction with the preliminary plan and the original specific design plan for the development. The subject SDP will not alter the findings made for the specific design plan, that the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed facilities.

(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: The subject SDP will not alter the findings made for the specific design plan that adequate provision has been made for draining surface water so that there are no adverse effects on either the subject property or adjacent properties.

(4) The plan is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

Comment: The subject SDP will not alter the findings that the original SDP is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation, analysis and findings of this report, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan SDP-9910/06, for Hampton Property.

- 4 - SDP-9910/06