



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PGCPB No. 10-76

14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
TTY: (301) 952-4366
www.mncppc.org/pgco

File No. DSP-02023/01

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on June 24, 2010, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023/01 for Town Center at Camp Springs, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The application requests the approval of a revision to an approved detailed site plan (DSP) to add twenty-six fee-simple townhouse lots and associated common space to a previously approved 397 unit multifamily project with a community building and recreational facilities. The plan also clearly delineates the subdivision of Lot 1 into three parcels. The DSP consists of the site plan, landscape plan, TCPII and the architectural elevations for the townhouses.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

**Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023-01
Town Center at Camp Springs, Phase 1-A
Lots 2-27, Parcels A, B, and C**

Zone	M-X-T
Gross Tract Area	12.39 acres
Area Within 100-Year Floodplain	0.01 acres
Net Tract Area	12.38 acres
Area Within Nontidal Wetlands	0 acres
Parcel A	8.51 acres
Parcel B	2.67 acres
Parcel C	1.22 acres
Proposed Use	26 Townhouse Units
Existing Use	Multifamily and Community Building
Square Footage of Development	
Multifamily (previously approved)	437,746 square feet
Community Building (previously approved)	8,113 square feet
Townhouses	39,900 square feet

Floor Area Ratio (FAR)

Minimum FAR required (Per CSP-01015)	0.30 FAR
FAR Proposed (as applied to the existing Lot 1)	0.91 FAR

*Required Parking (per Section 27-574)	669 spaces
--	------------

Parking Proposed	283 surface spaces
	342 structured spaces
Townhouse (1 garage, 1 tandem)	52 spaces
Total Parking Proposed	677 spaces

*See Finding 3 below for parking discussion.

3. **Required Parking** - In letter dated March 19, 2010 the applicant provided the following analysis regarding the proposed parking for the entire development.

"The Traffic Group, Inc. has undertaken an analysis of the parking for the proposed Detailed Site Plan revision for the Camp Springs @ Town Center Project, DSP-02023/01.

"The proposed revision includes the addition of 28 new townhouse units to the existing 397 multifamily apartments for a total of 425 dwelling units. The current parking ratios utilized under the Site Plan approval is 1.33 spaces per one (1) bedroom unit, 1.66 spaces per two (2) bedroom unit, and 2.04 spaces per townhome and nine (9) spaces for the Community Building and tennis courts. Under these ratios, the additional units would require a total of 675 spaces. Of these spaces, 58 are dedicated for the townhouse units exclusively and the 342 spaces in the garage are exclusively for the multi-family units. This results in 275 spaces that are shared between the residential units and the community center.

"The Community Center contains a 984 sq ft Leasing Office along with other facilities for the residents use. All of the other uses in the Community Center are ancillary uses. As part of our analysis, we have conducted a Shared Parking Analysis utilizing the Urban Land Institute's (ULI) Shared Parking Publication to determine the number of spaces needed on the subject site based on the two (2) different uses. Attached to this letter is a table which shows the calculations from 7 AM to 12 Midnight on a weekday and a weekend and computes the maximum spaces necessary to serve the subject property for each hour of the day. Please note that the percentages for each hour for the office use have been limited to the hours of operation of the Leasing Office based on existing demands. The percentages for the residential units are based on the data contained in the ULI Shared Parking Publication. Based on the County's Zoning Ordinance, four (4) parking spaces would be required for the leasing Office in the Community Center. A total of nine (9) parking spaces have been provided for the Community center as previously approved.

"A review of the attached exhibit indicates that when applying the Shared Parking Methodology to the subject site, the maximum weekday demand would be 266 parking spaces

which is a reduction of 9 parking spaces. This is a result of the residential units only utilizing 100% of the parking between 11 PM and 5 AM. The facilities at the Community Center would not be utilized during this time period.

“Therefore, based on an evaluation of the existing parking for the subject site, 270 parking spaces have been provided which can be shared with minor modifications to the existing parking areas and the parking for the new townhouse units. This is illustrated on the attached plan.

“Based on the above, it is our opinion that the revised parking layout and the Shared Parking Methodology illustrates that sufficient parking has been provided to comply with the parking requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.”

With regard to on-site parking, the submitted plan shows a total of 677 parking spaces, of which 342 are in the parking structure incorporated into the multifamily building. By utilizing the reduced parking ratios for development near a metro station, (1.33 spaces per one-bedroom unit, 1.66 spaces per two-bedroom unit, and 2.04 spaces per townhome), and the required nine spaces for the Community Building and tennis courts, the proposed uses would require a total of 675 spaces. Given that the subject property is zoned M-X-T, the applicant has also prepared a shared parking study in accordance with the requirements of Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance. The detailed demand calculations show a total of 677 parking spaces would be sufficient to meet the maximum hourly demand for parking by the proposed development on any day, weekday or weekend. The submitted parking demand calculations are based on the dedication of 58 parking spaces for the proposed 28 townhouse units exclusively, the 342 garage parking spaces exclusively for the multifamily units, and remaining 272 parking spaces as shared use parking. While the proposed shared parking calculation and assignment of parking spaces meets the minimum parking requirements of the Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, it is important to note that the implementation of the proposed parking arrangement would mean that almost every surface parking space, even those located directly in front of the proposed townhouses, could be used by the multifamily residents or any other person.

The applicant has submitted Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023, Parking Exhibit, to demonstrate the location of all of the parking spaces proposed for the development. The plan proposes that the entire surface parking, even those spaces located directly in front of the proposed townhouses, be allocated for the use of the multifamily residents. The applicant is meeting the base requirement of the M-X-T Zone; however, the parking exhibit and analysis have not taken into consideration the need for additional parking spaces for the townhouse units to serve guests and residents who may own more than two vehicles. Some residents will use their single-car garage for storage, which is a common practice among townhouse dwellers. Due to lack of consideration of these factors, there is a strong potential of a significant shortage of parking spaces, especially for the townhouse dwellers. The applicant has argued that the project should not be required to provide more than the minimum number of parking spaces because it follows the concept of smart growth due to its proximity to the Metro.

The product type being developed, townhouses with single-car garage and one tandem space, is in keeping with the majority of the product type directly adjacent and surrounding the subject site, on Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024, which consists of townhouses and two-family dwellings. In Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024, the number of parking spaces approved in the original plan for the overall development was 2.35 spaces per unit.

At the time of the review and approval of DSP-02024 the Planning Board made the following finding:

"Required Parking (per Section 27-574)	828 spaces
"Parking Proposed	576 garage spaces 254 tandem spaces 12 handicap spaces 6 standard spaces 125 compact spaces
"Total Parking Proposed	973 spaces

"The chart above indicates that the parking required is 828 spaces and the provided parking is 973 spaces. The number of handicap spaces provided (12 spaces) is less than the minimum requirements of the Zoning Ordinance (20 spaces). A condition has been included in the recommendation section of this report requiring compliance prior to signature approval. The chart above also indicates that the number of compact spaces far exceeds the number of standard-size spaces. Based on the popularity of SUVs and other large vehicles, it is unreasonable to expect that guest parking and vehicles of the residents will be comfortably accommodated with compact parking spaces. Further, the applicant has proposed space sizes that are substandard to the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. In order to reduce the sizes of the parking spaces, the applicant must file a Departure from Design Standards. Since this has not been filed, the staff recommends that the spaces conform to the requirements of Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance. The applicant should substitute standard-size spaces for the compact spaces for not less than 50 percent of the additional spaces.

"Staff would generally recommend in most suburban subdivisions that additional parking facilities for overflow vehicles be provided. This includes guest vehicles and vehicles that the owners could theoretically park in their single-car garages were those garages not so often used for storage. Staff has frequently requested that extra parking be provided at a rate of 0.5 spaces per unit. This figure generally equates to one additional space per two units. However, because this property is within one-half mile of the Metro, staff is not recommending more parking spaces than the amount shown on the plans, which is approximately 0.33 spaces per unit above the Zoning Ordinance requirements. The applicant should consider incorporating a restriction contained within the Condominium

Association documents that prevents future residents from converting garage space into living space.”

It should be noted that Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024-05 is being processed concurrently with the subject detailed site plan and is proposing to add townhouse units to the existing overall development in that case. In that case, the applicant is proposing to create additional parking spaces in order to address the complaints of the existing residents of that development, because they believe there is not sufficient parking for the project. They are proposing to increase the parking in areas previously shown as green area. If the applicant recognizes the problem as expressed by the residents of that adjacent development and is addressing the parking problem by adding more parking spaces, the applicant should benefit from that experience and be proactive by attempting to provide sufficient spaces to avoid a parking shortage in the subject development. It would seem prudent to at least mirror results for each development in regard to the number of parking spaces provided.

In the subject case, Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023-01, the number of spaces in the parking garage is capped at the total shown on the plans at 342 spaces for exclusive use by the multifamily and 58 spaces are for the exclusive use of the townhouses in their garages and the driveway, which leaves a total of 270 surface parking spaces shown on the plan. The deletion of 8 spaces that were added to the plan during the review of the application, in the location of a green island that would provide a buffer between the two parcels, it is critical to provide some green space to create visual definition for the separation of the multifamily and the townhouses. Deleting 8 spaces leaves 262 surface spaces total. The applicant states that 266 surface spaces are required to support the uses. In that statement it is the assumption that the townhouses would only be allocated 2.04 spaces per unit. Additional spaces should be provided to reduce the likelihood of a parking shortage for the townhouse units. Ten additional spaces should be provided in the location of two of the townhouse units, which would result in the loss of a unit shown on Lot 9 and the loss of a unit shown on Lot 29. This would result in a total of 272 parking spaces or 2.38 spaces per unit, which is consistent with the Planning Board's previous Finding in the review of the adjacent case, Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024.

4. **Location:** The subject property is located northwest of the intersection of Auth Way and Telfair Boulevard, approximately 1,500 feet north of the intersection of Britannia Way and Auth Way. The site is in Planning Area 76A and Council District 9.
5. **Surrounding Uses:** The multifamily building and the majority of the townhouse lots surrounding the subject application are developed. The lots which are the subject of this application are proposed to the rear of the multifamily building in an area currently used as a parking lot for its residents. To the north of the subject property are the rears of townhouses that back to the north property line of existing Lot 1.
6. **Previous Approvals:** The subject property was previously zoned I-1 and was known as Capital Gateway Office Park. The property had a preliminary plan approved in 1990, and subsequently the

property received approval for final plats of subdivision. The property was rough graded and infrastructure was placed on the site including stormwater management, the main loop road (Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive), street trees, and sidewalks. The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) acquired a portion of the land for the terminus of the Green Line, which is the Branch Avenue Metro Station.

In October 2000, the District Council rezoned the property from the I-1 and R-R Zones to the M-X-T Zone by sectional map amendment. The Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015 was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on June 28, 2001 (PGCPB Resolution No. 01-120).

The original Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023, for this property was approved by the Planning Board on June 27, 2002 (PGCPB Resolution No. 02-146).

The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07010 which was approved by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232) on January 8, 2008, for the development of twenty-eight townhouse dwelling units, on part of Lot 1 (which had been recorded in land records in plat book VJ 169@77). Lot 1 was approved for the development of a multifamily building and recreation area. The applicant filed Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07010 to convert a portion of an existing parking compound on the property which served the existing multifamily development into twenty-eight townhouse lots. The addition of the townhouse lots is the subject of this revision to the detailed site plan. The townhouse lots are not yet the subject of a record plat. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 31, 2010 pursuant to the adoption of County Council Bill CB-8-2009.

7. Ryan Homes is requesting approval of the following model:

Builder/Models	Minimum Base Finished Area (square feet)
Ryan Homes	
*Hepburn Unit	1,425

*The Hepburn model is a sixteen-foot-wide two-three story townhouse unit with a rear load single-car garage. Lots 2-8 are proposed as three story units, built on slabs while Lots 9-28 are two-story front units and three-story at the rear, as the slope falls off in that area.

8. The proposed revision to add twenty-eight new townhouse lots will have no substantial impact on the previous findings made for conformance to Section 27-546 of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the M-X-T Zone as were made in Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023. The required findings of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance for development in the M-X-T Zone are as follows:

- (1) **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;**

The site is located within close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro Station and the major vehicular interchange of I-95/495 and Branch Avenue (MD 5). The development of this property will promote the effective and optimum use of transit. The proposal will provide for an expanding source of living opportunities for the citizens of the county because the development provides for high density in one of the three required uses in the M-X-T Zone, Residential. The proposed development has the potential to encourage a 24-hour environment with the inclusion of an office component and a community building. The visual character of different parts of the development will be related to one another through the consistent approach to the architectural design of the buildings and the high-quality materials.

- (2) **The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The proposed lots are integrated into the grid pattern of townhouse lots that exist on the adjacent property of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024.

- (3) **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;**

The subject site is bordered by land owned by Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), and land that is the subject of the companion Detailed Site Plan (DSP-02024). The companion detailed site plan is designed directly in association with the subject site, sharing a central recreational area. The proposed townhouse units are generally compatible with, and complementary to, existing and proposed development in the vicinity. However, the size of the townhouse units is substantially smaller than the size of units existing and developed under Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024.

- (4) **The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;**

The mix of proposed uses and the arrangement of the townhouses, apartment building, the community building and recreational facilities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability, if the architectural elevations are enhanced by providing brick end walls on highly visible side elevations.

- (5) **If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

The detailed site plan indicates one phase for the development of the townhouses.

- (6) The pedestrian system is convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

A pedestrian system near a Metro station becomes very important in promoting Metro ridership. It must be convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian movement within the development to the Metro. Proposed pedestrian circulation will filter from the development to the loop road and connect to other future uses within the development or the Metro.

- (7) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

The original detailed site plan has addressed the need for a central gathering place on the site by including the community building and the associated recreational facilities. The additional townhouse units will provide a transitional architectural product that fill in a surface parking lot. The buildings would benefit from additional brick on highly visible units. The architectural elevations must be revised to add more brick and increase the pitch of the roofline of the units. Proposed conditions below would require additional brick on the endwall façades of the highly visible units, and would increase the slope on the rooflines from 6:12 to 8:12 pitch.

- (8) On a Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant. (CB-1-1989; CB-26-1991)**

Fewer than six years have elapsed since the preliminary plan found adequacy for the road system for the subject site (see attached PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232).

9. Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance establishes the required Design Guidelines for the site for detailed site plans. The proposed revision to add twenty-eight townhouses continues to meet all of the applicable site design guidelines.
10. The detailed site plan is in conformance with the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015.
11. The proposed townhouses are located off of Telfair Boulevard, a private street, which provides the main access point for the subject site and a large portion of the existing townhouse development located north and east of the subject site. The townhouses are located within proposed Parcel B, which is the Homeowners association parcel that is required for the development of fee simple townhouses per Sections 27-548(g) of the Zoning Ordinance which states the following:

- (g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.

The townhouse lots are proposed to be served by private streets and an access right-of-way.

Subtitle 24 allows private streets to serve townhouses per Section 24-128(h) of the Subdivision Regulations which states the following:

- (7) **In Comprehensive Design and Mixed Use Zones:**
 - (A) For land in the V-L, V-M, R-L, R-S, R-M, R-U, M-U-I, L-A-C, M-A-C, M-X-C, M-U-TC, and M-X-T Zones, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision (and all attendant plans of development) with private roads to serve attached single-family dwellings, two-family dwellings, and three-family dwellings, but not single-family detached or multifamily dwellings, in accordance with the requirements of Subsections (e) and (f) of Section 27-433 of the Zoning Ordinance, except as hereinafter provided. In all of the above zones, and in the R-R Zone when developed as a cluster subdivision, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision with alleys to serve any permitted use, provided the lot has frontage on and pedestrian access to a public right-of-way. The District Council may disapprove the inclusion of alleys during the consideration of the detailed site plan for a cluster subdivision. For the purposes of this Section, an "alley" shall mean a road providing vehicular access to the rear or side of abutting lots, and which is not intended for general traffic circulation.

These townhouse units will be served by alleys.

- (i) The pavement width of private roads may be reduced to not less than a minimum of twenty-two (22) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, hierarchical street system for a development.

The pavement of the private road, Telfair Boulevard, is shown as 20 feet wide for each direction of traffic.

- (ii) The pavement width of private alleys shall be not less than eighteen (18) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, vehicular access to individual lots. Since alleys only provide vehicular access to lots with frontage on a public street, alleys shall not be required to be improved with street trees or curb and gutter, unless a drainage

problem has been identified by the Department of Environmental Resources or the Department of Public Works and Transportation.

The plans indicate an 18-foot-wide alley.

Section 27-433(e) and (f) states the following:

(e) Streets.

- (1) The following requirements shall apply only to the development of townhouses, one-family semidetached dwellings, two-family dwellings, three-family dwellings, and one-family attached metropolitan dwellings:**

- (A) The tract of land used for the project involving these dwellings shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street having a right-of-way width of at least sixty (60) feet;**

The plans indicate that Parcel B, the parcel on which the townhouses are located, has frontage on and direct vehicular access to Auth Way.

- (B) Private streets which are interior to the project (and are not dedicated to public use) shall be improved to not less than the current standards set forth in Subtitle 23 of this Code which apply to a public, twenty-six (26) foot wide secondary residential street, except that roadside trees are not required (within the street right-of-way). In a mixed-use activity center designated as a "Transit Village" the width of the private streets may be reduced to a minimum width of twenty-four (24) feet when it is determined that the provision of the minimum width is consistent with a safe, efficient, hierarchical street system. Sidewalks may be omitted when it is determined that there is no need for them. Sidewalks cast monolithically with the curb and gutter shall be permitted;**

Street width is allowed to be reduced further to 22 feet per Section 24-128(h)(7).

- (C) Private streets shall be common areas conveyed to a homes association, and provisions for maintenance charges shall be made in accordance with Subsection (i). (For the purpose of this Section, "private streets" are internal vehicular access roadways serving the development by means of private streets approved pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code, except driveways which dead-end within a parking lot); and**

This provision requires that the configuration of Parcel B include the private drive serving the units, even though parking spaces are located between the drive and the actual townhouse unit.

- (D) Points of access to public streets shall be approved by the County Department of Public Works and Transportation, State Highway Administration, or other appropriate highway authority, as applicable.**

The point of access, where Telfair Boulevard intersects with Auth Way, was previously approved in the original plan of development.

(f) Access to individual lots.

- (1) The following requirements shall apply only to the development of townhouses, one-family semidetached dwellings, two-family dwellings, three-family dwellings, and one-family attached metropolitan dwellings:**

- (A) While it is not necessary that each individual lot have frontage on a street, each lot shall be served by a right-of-way for emergency and pedestrian access purposes. The right-of-way shall either be owned by a homes association and approved by the Planning Board, or a dedicated as a public right-of-way.**

The plans propose that the 28 lots will be served by a right-of-way for emergency and pedestrian access, which will be owned by a homeowners association.

- (B) If the individual lot does not have frontage on a street, a right-of-way at least sixteen (16) feet wide shall abut each lot. The right-of-way shall be at least twenty-five (25) feet wide if it contains an easement for sanitary sewerage.**

The plans must be revised to indicate the minimum width of 25 feet where the sewer is proposed within any right-of-way and should be independent of the public utility easement (PUE).

- (C) Each right-of-way shall contain a sidewalk at least six (6) feet wide which connects parking areas with the individual lots. The maximum grade of the sidewalk shall generally be not more than five percent (5%). However, when the normal**

grade of the land exceeds five percent (5%), ramps or steps may be utilized to remain consistent with that grade.

The plans must be revised to provide a six-foot-wide sidewalk along the front of the lots and provide a connection to the existing sidewalk within Telfair Boulevard.

(D) No individual lot shall be more than two hundred (200) feet from a point of approved emergency vehicle access.

The applicant must provide evidence from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) that the units are adequately served for emergency access prior to signature approval of the plans and prior to final plat.

12. Section 27-548(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.

The proposal to revise the plans to add twenty-eight townhouses is subject to Section 4.1 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. The plans demonstrate conformance to Section 4.1 in regard to the number of required trees. However, the 12 hawthornes located along the rear property line should be removed and replaced with 12 columnare shade trees. These trees should be relocated to screen the upper portion of the units from the view of the units 321–332 on the adjacent site.

13. **The Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site has previously approved Tree Conservation Plans (TCPI/007/90-02 and TCPII/58/02). A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted.

The site is subject to the 1989 Woodland Conservation Ordinance which requires the provision of woodland conservation equaling ten percent of the site's gross tract. This provision was met when the site was approved for a tree conservation plan covering a larger site that included the subject site. The TCPII was reviewed and determined to be in conformance with the previously approved TCP with regard to woodland conservation because no additional clearing is proposed. The TCPII has been correctly revised to show the proposed development for this application.

The TCP worksheet was not shown on the plan. The worksheet from the previously approved TCP must be shown on the plan because no clearing is proposed. The signature and date of the original approval needs to be shown in regular typeface in the approval block.

Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCP shall be revised as follows:

- a. Show the worksheet.
 - b. Show the original approval in regular typeface in the approval block.
 - c. Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.
14. The proposed twenty-eight lots have no impact on the previously approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023 and the associated conditions of approval.
15. **Referral Agencies and Departments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies/divisions and is summarized as follows:
- a. **Subdivision**—The property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07010 approved by the Planning Board for the development of twenty-eight townhouse dwelling units, on part of Lot 1 which had been recorded in land records in plat book VJ 169@77. Lot 1 was originally approved for the development of a multifamily building and recreation area. The applicant filed Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07010 to convert a portion of an existing parking compound which served the existing multifamily development into twenty-eight townhouse lots.

The addition of the townhouse lots is the subject of this revision to the detailed site plan and the townhouse lots are not the subject of a record plat. The detailed site plan now proposes three parcels. Parcel A which would contain the multifamily apartment building, Parcel C which would include the private recreational facilities, and Parcel B as a homeowners parcels on which the proposed 29 townhouse lots will be located. Parcel B will extend to Auth Way providing frontage on and direct access to a 92-foot public right-of-way (ROW). The applicant has indicated that the creation of the parcels is to address the different ownership entities, as acknowledged with this detailed site plan. In this particular instance staff does not find that the creation of the three parcels will substantively alter the findings or conditions of the Planning Board's approval of the preliminary plan ((PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232). The parcels are not intended for additional development over that which was approved with the preliminary plan.

The resolution of approval of the preliminary plan (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232) for the conversion of a portion of the parking lot to townhouse lots was adopted on January 3, 2008 with the following conditions (**in bold**). Comments have been provided for additional clarification where needed. The preliminary plan remains valid until December 31, 2010 pursuant to the adoption of County Council Bill CB-8-2009.

10. **Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan for these lots, each lot shall demonstrate that its rear driveway provides at least 20 feet of length between the alley right-of-way and the garage door to allow for vehicle parking without obstructing the alley.**

Condition 10 above requires a minimum of 20-foot-long driveways on each lot outside of the alley right-of-way. The site plan should be revised to demonstrate conformance, and dimension each driveway.

11. **At Detailed Site Plan review, special attention shall be given to the design of the three lots on the southeastern end of the proposed attached group fronting on Telfair Boulevard (Lots 2, 3 and 4). These three lots shall be designed such that there will be attractive and appropriate views of the rear of these lots from the street. If no such design of these lots is found to be acceptable by the Planning Board during its consideration of the Detailed Site Plan for this portion of the property, these three lots will be removed from the plan, and may not be approved as part of the final plat for this property.**

The applicant has provided rendered elevations for the rears that include entry doors and carriage garage doors and the architectural elevations should be the same. This requirement should be extended to all lots within the building stick, including lots 5, 6, 7, and 8, for purposes of visual continuity. In addition, the first floor of rear elevation of Lots 2-8 must be brick.

12. **Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan for these lots, the number of compact spaces within the parking areas adjacent to the townhouses (not including the spaces provided in garages and unit driveways) shall be reduced to no more than one third of the number of standard spaces provided within these parking areas.**

All the spaces referred to above are shown as a standard size space. However, there is a retaining wall located between the front of Lots 9-16, and the use of compact spaces of this location will allow for additional room to reduce slopes and possibly rearrange sidewalk and tree locations. Further analysis of this area is warranted prior to signature approval.

13. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited by the existing approved site plans CSP-01015, DSP-02023, DSP-02024, and DSP-05051. Any modifications to these plans or succeeding plans shall be determined to be consistent with the overall trip cap for the Capital Gateway site described in Conditions 8 and 10 of PGCPB Resolution No. 90-253 approving Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-90037.**
14. **The improvements described in Condition 7 of PGCPB Resolution No. 90-253 shall be verified to be complete prior to the issuance of any building permit within the subject property.**

15. All residents of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property of this application shall have full access to the clubhouse and other recreational facilities operated by the Town Center at Camp Springs Homeowners Association, located at 4300 Telfair Boulevard. It is acknowledged that the Homeowners Association currently charges an optional initiation fee and annual fee (separate from the annual Homeowners Association dues) specifically for use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court within the clubhouse. The initiation fee for the use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court shall be waived for a period of three (3) months after the date of settlement for the initial residents of each of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property.

The condition above is carried over to this approval, but should be clarified, in that the previously approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023 included the following findings and condition relating to the use of the recreational center area:

Condition 14 and 15 below were conditions of the CSP and were reviewed at the time the Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023, in order to find conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015:

"CSP-01015 Conditions:

- "14. The applicant, his successors, and/or assigns shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities for each Detailed Site Plan in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. The applicant, his heirs or successors, shall consider the feasibility of organizing the recreational facilities into one or more central recreational areas.
- "15. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division (DRD) for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.

"Comment: Conditions 14 and 15 above have been met through the proposal for a central recreational area on the subject application. The central recreational area is located across the main entrance road and consists of a community building, pool, tennis court and tot-lot. In addition, facilities within the community building include an exercise room, basketball court, media and conference room, and a community room. The applicant has agreed to place an easement over the tot-lot for perpetual use by the resident of the adjacent townhouse development. This shared arrangement will benefit both developments and contribute to the sense of place."

Based in the Planning Board findings above, the following condition was required by the Planning Board:

- “8. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for the main multifamily building, adequate provision (by easement or other appropriate legal instrument) shall be made to assure the perpetual use of the tot-lot by the adjacent town house and multifamily homeowners included in DSP-02024.”**

It seems appropriate at this time that the applicant for the development of the site should provide an easement as prescribed in this condition, to ensure that the tot-lot is available for use by residents of the entire development, including those future residents that will live within the boundaries of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023 and those within the boundaries of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024. This was the intent of the original application in which it was found that the maintenances of the tot-lot and the remainder of the central recreational area was the burden of the developer of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023. The creation of the easement referenced above was also the responsibility of the developer of the subject site. A new easement should be executed as anticipated in the original approval of the case. Therefore the staff recommends that the following conditions be included in the approval of the subject DSP:

- a. Prior to the final plat of subdivision for the subject site, the applicant and staff shall determine if adequate provision (by easement or other appropriate legal instrument) will ensure the perpetual use of the tot-lot by residents of the entire development included in Detailed Site Plans DSP-02024, DSP-02023 and all subsequent revisions.
- b. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan and Type II tree conservation plan stamped as received on December 17, 2009. The Planning Board recommends approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023-01 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/58/02-01 subject to the conditions at the end of the memorandum.

Background

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the subject application as Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015, Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-89207 and 4-90037, Type I Tree Conservation Plans, TCPI/007/90 and TCPI/007/90-01, Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/58/02. The most recent review of this site was in 2007 for a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-07010) and revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/007/90-02). The subject site is currently developed with multifamily residential units. The current application is for twenty-eight single-family attached units in the M-X-T Zone.

Site Description

The 12.40-acre site in the M-X-T Zone is located just south of Suitland Parkway at the Branch Avenue Metro. A review of the available information indicates that 100-year floodplain, and steep and severe slopes are found to occur on the property. The site

contained gravel and borrow pits, however; a majority of the site is currently developed. The soils found to occur according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* are in the Bibb, Falsington, and Sassafras soil series. Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. Suitland Parkway and the Branch Avenue Metro are considered significant noise generators that may create adverse noise impacts for the proposed use. Suitland Parkway is also a Nationally Registered Site; however, the view shed of the parkway is not an issue with this application. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity. No designated scenic or historic road is located along the frontage of this property. This property is located in the Henson Creek watershed of the Potomac River basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*.

Review of Previously Approved Conditions

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject applications. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides the comments on the plan's conformance with the conditions.

PGCPB Resolution No. 07-232, Preliminary Plan, 4-07010

6. **At the time of the detailed site plan, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to show the location of the noise attenuation fence for the rear outdoor activity areas of the proposed lots and provide a detail for its construction, or add the following note to all sheets where fences appear:**

"All fences shown as noise attenuation fences shall be constructed of solid wood with no gaps or openings."

This condition has been addressed. The TCPII and DSP show a fence along northwest boundaries of the site that will attenuate noise for the proposed lots. According to the detail and notes on the DSP, the fence will be constructed of solid wood, which is adequate to mitigate noise impacts to this site. However, for privacy and consistency of design, the fence must be extended to the north property line of Lot 332. This will protect the existing residences on Lots 321–332 from interfacing with the alley traffic.

8. **At the time of the detailed site plan approval, a Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved.**

A TCPII has been submitted. Woodland conservation is discussed in the Environmental Review Section below.

Environmental Review

- (1) The site has a signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/23/07), dated November 13, 2007. The site also has an approved final preliminary plat, dated July 2, 2003, which shows a revised 100-year floodplain easement. The easement is correctly shown on all plans.

The site contains one forest stand totaling 0.36 acres and is dominated by American beech but also contains tulip poplar, red oak, red pine, and river birch. This stand has a Priority 1 rating because it is adjacent to the 100-year floodplain. No further information regarding the NRI is required.

- (2) According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* the principal soils on this site are in the Bibb, Fallsington, and Sassafra soil series, and previously contained sand and gravel pits. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. A soils report may be required by the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources (DER) during the permit process review.
- (3) The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Approval letter and plan (CSD 16466-2007-07). According to the plan, the stormwater from the proposed development will be directed to an existing storm drain system that was approved for previous development. Conditions of approval of this concept include a fee-in-lieu payment, submission of a geotechnical report, and the retrofitting of an existing nearby stormwater management pond. No additional information is required with regard to stormwater management.

15. In accordance with Section 27-285 (b) and Section 27-548.25 of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023/01, subject to the following conditions:

- I. Prior to signature approval the detailed site plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Lots 9 and 29 as shown on the original DSP plans shall be deleted and 5 parking spaces shall be provided in each of these locations, for the exclusive use of the residents of the townhouses.
 - b. Show lot dimensions, lot sizes, distances on parcel lines, and lot setbacks from the parcel boundaries on the site plan.

- c. The alleys and private streets shall be dimensioned.
 - d. Provide a note that access is authorized pursuant to Section 24-128(c)(7)(A) for private streets and alleys.
 - e. The noise fence shall be extended along the entire alley to screen it from adjacent lots 325–332, and shall be of a composite material of natural color with 18 inch piers 24 feet on center.
 - f. A 20-foot-long driveway shall be provided on each lot outside of the alley right-of-way.
 - g. The plans shall be reviewed and approved by each of the utility companies and appropriate easements shall be shown.
 - h. The applicant shall provide evidence that the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) has reviewed the plans for adequacy of emergency access.
 - i. Compact size parking spaces shall be provided in front of Lots 9–16 and grading and sidewalk location shall be further analyzed to create an improved pedestrian circulation pattern and enhanced planting bed for the trees in this location.
 - j. The 12 hawthornes located along the rear property line should be removed and replaced with 12 columnare shade trees along the entire property line.
 - k. The landscape plan shall be revised to indicate an ornamental tree in the green area at the rear of Lots 2-8.
2. Prior to signature approval the architectural elevations shall be revised as follows:
- a. The rear elevations for units on Lots 2–8 shall be revised to include entry doors, carriage garage doors.
 - b. The rear elevation for units 2–8 shall be revised to include brick on the first floor elevation.
 - c. Provide an 8:12-pitch roofline for each of the units as a standard feature and any notes relating to the 6:12-pitch roofline shall be deleted from the plans.
 - d. Provide any and all details as shown on Applicant's Exhibit 1 as standard features for the units located at Telfair Boulevard.
3. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCP shall be revised as follows:
- a. Show the worksheet.

- b. Show the original approval in regular typeface in the approval block.
 - c. Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.
4. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 2, 8, 9 and 27, the front and side elevations shall be shown as entirely brick. The front elevation of all building sticks shall be required to be a minimum of 60 percent brick.
5. Prior to the final plat of subdivision for the subject site, the applicant and staff shall determine if adequate provision (by easement or other appropriate legal instrument) will ensure the perpetual use of the tot-lot by residents of the entire development included in Detailed Site Plans DSP-02024, DSP-02023 and all subsequent revisions.
6. All residents of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property of this application shall have full access to the clubhouse and other recreational facilities operated by the Town Center at Camp Springs Homeowners Association, located at 4300 Telfair Boulevard. It is acknowledged that an optional initiation fee and annual fee (separate from the annual Homeowners Association dues) specifically for use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court within the clubhouse may be charged. The initiation fee for the use of the swimming pool and indoor basketball court shall be waived for a period of three months after the date of settlement for the initial residents of each of the townhouses to be constructed upon the subject property.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Cavitt, seconded by Commissioner Squire, with Commissioners Cavitt, Squire, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Vaughns opposing the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 24, 2010, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 15th day of July 2010.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

Frances J. Guertin
By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:FJG:SL:arj

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.

Janell S. [Signature]
M-NCPPC Legal Department

Date 7/9/10.