THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

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

PGCPB No. 10-121

File No. DSP-04067/05

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 November 4, 2010, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-04067/05 for Balk Hill Village, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** This application requests the addition of the Tuscany and Piedmont architectural models to the architecture approved for the subdivision.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Single-family detached residential and vacant land	Single-family detached
Acreage	125.40	125.40
Lots	192	192

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 5. More specifically, it is located 2,500 feet northwest of the intersection of Campus Way North and Lottsford Road.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the east by Phase 2 of the project, with a commercial shopping center in the M-X-T Zone beyond; to the north and east by Campus Way North, with residential land use in the Residential Suburban Development (R-S) Zone beyond; and to the south by vacant land in the M-X-T and I-3 Zones, residential land use in the Commercial Office (C-O) Zone, and Landover Road.

5. **Previous Approvals:** Basic Plan A-9956 was approved for the project on July 23, 2002 and its approval memorialized in Zoning Ordinance No. 16-202. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03001 was then approved for the project on September 11, 2003 and its approval formalized in PGCPB Resolution No.03-176. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03094 was approved by the Planning Board on February 19, 2004 and its approval formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 04-33. The Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-04067 for Balk Hill Village on September 14, 2005 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-202). The District Council then elected to review the case and, in an Order of Remand dated March 13, 2006, returned the case to the Planning Board which reapproved the case June 1, 2006, with conditions. The District Council then finally approved the application on July 18, 2006, with conditions. Since the time of the original approval, the application has been the subject of four revisions prior to the subject DSP. These include: DSP-04067/01 for the installation of a public water line, which was later withdrawn;

DSP-04067/02 was approved for the addition of four architectural models; DSP-04067/03 is a pending application for 86 townhouse units and 96 detached units; and DSP-04067/04 was approved for a revision to the entrance sign and decorative wall along Campus Way. The project is also subject to approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 315-2005-00, approved on March 21, 2008 and valid until March 21, 2011.

6. **Design Features:** This application requests the addition of the Tuscany and Piedmont architectural models to the architecture approved for the subdivision. The base square footage for the Tuscany model is 2,894 square feet and 2,714 square feet for the Piedmont model. These new units have front-loading garages, though most other architecture previously approved for the project has been rear loading. These units, therefore, can only be utilized on Lots 1 through 23 in this first phase of the Balk Hill Village project. These are the only lots that are not served by alleys at the rear, except for the Manor homes along Campus Way North, which are already built and a different architectural type.

The existing approved architecture for the Balk Hill Village project includes the following models, with their square footage indicated:

- The 64-foot, two-unit manor house (2,736 square feet and 2,440 square feet)—End Mansion
- The 100-foot, three-unit manor house (2,736 square feet and 2,440 square feet)—Interior Mansion
- Unit G— 3,216 square feet (40-foot)
- Unit G— 3,463 square feet (45-foot)
- The Harrison— 2,945 square feet
- The Monroe— 2,959 square feet
- The Taylor— 3,312 square feet
- The Filmore— 2,585 square feet

The last four models were revised as part of the /02 revision to the detailed site plan. The approved architecture, as revised, includes well-balanced form and massing and the consistent and aesthetically pleasing use of architectural detail and ornamentation so as to create a rich visual presentation. The two additional models under consideration present a somewhat simpler architecture which, on the whole, presents a less pleasing appearance and does not maintain the level of architectural quality established by the previously approved models. The Planning Board has reviewed the variety of dissimilar elevations offered for each model and, by selecting the more visually-pleasing elevations and selectively conditioning the choice and application of architectural

detail and ornament, find them compatible with the approved architecture and fitting for the superior quality of the Balk Hill development.

Below, all proposed elevations are evaluated and conditions discussed that would improve the use of architectural detail and ornament. The Piedmont and Tuscany elevations are almost identical except for, generally, a reversal in the window placement from one side of the entranceway to the other. Thus, the seeming diversity offered by nine different elevations of two different models results, in essence, in the addition of a single model to the approved architecture for the case.

The Piedmont
The Piedmont model, offering nine different elevations, is basically rectilinear in form with the garage section of the unit separated from the primary living space by a differentiated roofline. The primary living space generally has windows on both stories, while the garage section has either one or no windows. On most of the nine elevations, the window to the left of the entrance door is either elevated or the lower portion of a two-story-high window.

Architectural treatment of the windows should be regularized in placement, design, and detail. The window design should remain constant except where justified by a design consideration such as the inclusion of a small window under the pedimented roofline above the garage door. The application of architectural detail is irregular, with keystone-like features utilized on some parts of the fenestration, but not all. The various elevations also propose a variety of roofline treatments. Unlike the previous approved architecture for the project, some offer no embellishment, while others have multiple-pedimented cross-gables and window accents, offering more visual interest. Due to the perspective of the elevation drawings offered, it is sometimes difficult to discern whether sidelights are included on either side of all front entranceways. Therefore, the Planning Board has conditioned, after the applicant indicated that use sidelights on both sides was impossible on the Piedmont, the use of decorative pilasters down either side of the door, together with well balanced light fixtures on either side of the door and either a peephole or small window in the door to ensure visibility for safety.

The Planning Board makes the following recommendations regarding the Piedmont model:

a. Piedmont Front Elevations A, D, and G, evidencing virtually no variation in roofline, shall be redesigned with cross gables and/or dormers so as to add articulation to the roof line. Final design of said façades shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

b. Piedmont Front Elevation B

(1) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(2) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(3) Shutters should be utilized on all of the windows.

c. Piedmont Front Elevation C

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

d. Piedmont Front Elevation D

(1) The architectural detail of the keystone-type detail in the first story lintel and transom should be included over the entrance door and the windows on the upper story.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

e. Piedmont Elevation E

(1) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(2) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(3) Shutters should be utilized on all of the windows.

f. Piedmont Elevation F

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type detail, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

g. Piedmont Elevation G

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

h. Piedmont Elevation H

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

i. Piedmont Elevation I

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The window to the right side of the front entranceway should be regularly positioned in line with the two windows to the left.

The left and right elevations for the Piedmont model are acceptable, utilizing four reasonably well-balanced architectural features. This design will be somewhat embellished, on highly visible lots, by the addition of four-inch trim and a brick watertable as proposed in Condition 1a below, carried forward from the original approval of the Balk Hill Village case, on corner lots where the sides of single-family detached homes are exposed to public streets. Staff is recommending extending this treatment to several other vacant lots in the subdivision identified as highly visible on Staff's Exhibit 1. The Piedmont rear elevations, though quite plain and unadorned, are found acceptable by staff.

The Tuscany

The Tuscany model, offering nine different elevations, is basically rectilinear in form with the garage section of the unit separated from the primary living space by a differentiated roofline. The primary living space generally has windows on both stories, while the garage section has either one or no windows. On most of the nine elevations, the window to the right of the entrance door is either elevated or the lower portion of a two-story-high window.

The architectural treatment of the windows should be made more consistent in placement, design, and detail. The window design should remain constant except where justified by a design consideration such as the inclusion of a small window under the pedimented roofline above the garage door. The application of architectural detail is irregular, with keystone-like features utilized on some parts of the fenestration, but not all. The various elevations are also inconsistent regarding roofline. Unlike the previous approved architecture for the project, some offer no embellishment, while others have multiple pedimented cross-roofs and window accents, offering more visual interest. Due to the perspective of the elevation drawings offered, it is sometimes difficult to

discern whether sidelights are included on either side of all front entranceways. Therefore, a condition below requires that sidelights be located on both sides of the entrance doors.

The Planning Board makes the following recommendations regarding the Tuscany model:

j. Tuscany Front Elevations A, D, and G, evidencing virtually no variation in roofline, shall be redesigned with cross gables and/or dormers so as to add articulation to the roofline. Final design of said façades shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

k. Tuscany Front Elevation B

(1) The windows to the right of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(2) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(3) Shutters should be utilized on all of the windows.

l. Tuscany Front Elevation C

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the right of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(3) Shutters should be included on all windows.

m. Tuscany Elevation E

(1) The windows to the right of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(2) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(3) Shutters should be utilized on all of the windows.

n. Tuscany Elevation F

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the right of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

(3) Shutters should be utilized on all of the windows.

o. Tuscany Elevation H

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The windows to the left of the entrance door should line up with the windows on the right side of the entrance door.

p. Tuscany Elevation I

(1) The architectural detail and ornament, such as keystone-type details, should be utilized uniformly on all transoms and lintels on the façade.

(2) The window to the right side of the front entranceway should be regularly positioned in line with the two windows to the left.

The left and right elevations for the Tuscany model are acceptable, utilizing four reasonably well-balanced architectural features. This design will be somewhat embellished, on highly visible lots, by the addition of four-inch trim and a brick watertable as required by Condition 1a below, carried forward from the original approval of the Balk Hill Village case, on corner lots where the sides of single-family detached homes are exposed to public streets. The Planning Board hereby extends this treatment to several other vacant lots in the subdivision identified as highly visible on Staff's Exhibit 1. The Tuscany rear elevations, though quite plain and unadorned, are found acceptable by staff.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-543, which governs permitted uses in mixed-use zones. The proposed single-family detached residential development is a permitted use in the M-X-T Zone.

b. The proposal is also in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-544, Regulations, regarding additional regulations for development in mixed-use zones.

8. **Basic Plan A-9956:** Basic Plan A-9956 was approved for the project on June 12, 2002, subject to 14 conditions. None of the conditions of that approval relate to the subject review of architectural models.

9. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03001:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03001 was approved for the project on September 11, 2003. The PGCPB Resolution, No. 03-176, was subsequently adopted by the Planning Board, formalizing that approval and containing 11 conditions. None of the conditions of that approval relate to the subject review of architectural models.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03094:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03094 was approved by the Planning Board on February 19, 2004. The PGCPB Resolution, No. 04-33, was subsequently adopted by the Planning Board, formalizing that approval and containing 23 conditions. None of the conditions of that approval relate to the subject review of architectural models.

11. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-04067, as revised:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-04067 was finally approved by the District Council on July 18, 2006 and its approval formalized in an order affirming the Planning Board's decision, containing 27 conditions. The following conditions are germane to the review of this case and are included in bold face type below, followed by comment:

1. Prior to certification of the Detailed Site Plan, the following shall be provided:

d. Architectural models shall be revised to provide a minimum of two standard architectural features, such as a door, window or masonry fireplace on the side elevations of all models.

The proposed architectural models meet and exceed this requirement.

5. On corner lots where the sides of single-family detached homes are exposed to public streets, a brick watertable shall be provided along the entire length of the side elevations and windows and doors shall be provided with a minimum four-inch trim.

This condition has been brought forward as a condition of the subject approval.

6. A minimum of 60 percent of the approved dwelling units shall have brick or stone front façades as shown on the approved architectural elevations. A tracking chart shall be provided on the coversheet of the Detailed Site Plan to account for the brick façades at the time of building permit.

This condition has been brought forward as a condition of the subject approval.

7. No two identical façades may be located next to or across from one another.

This condition has been brought forward as a condition of the subject approval.

12. **The Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed revision does not affect the previous findings of conformance with the requirements of the Landscape Manual.

13. **The Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The proposed revision does not affect the previous findings of conformance with the requirements of the previously applicable Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance, nor render the application subject to the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance.

14. As required by Section 27-285(b) 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, without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states:

(d) In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:

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

As discussed in Finding 7 of this resolution, the subject application is in compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone. These requirements include the purposes of the M-X-T Zone (Section 27-546.01) and uses, regulations, and site plans (Section 27-543, Section 27-544, and Section 27-546). Section 27-545, Optional method of development, has not been utilized by the subject project. Addition of the two proposed house types has no effect on previous findings that the Balk Hill Village development is in conformance with Division 2 of Part 10 of the Zoning Ordinance.

(2) For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;

The property was not placed in the M-X-T Zone through a sectional amendment approved after October 1, 2006.

(3) 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 subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types has no effect on previous findings that the Balk Hill Village development has an outward orientation that should catalyze adjacent community improvement.

(4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

The subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types has no effect on previous findings that the Balk Hill development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

(5) The mix of uses, arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, and provision of public amenities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

The subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types has no effect on previous findings that this mix of uses, arrangement, and design of buildings and other improvements and the provision of public amenities for the Balk Hill development reflects a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

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

The subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types will have no effect on previous findings for the Balk Hill development that this staged development provides phases that are designed to be a self-sustaining entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases.

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

The subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types will have no effect on previous findings that the

pedestrian system for the Balk Hill development is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development.

(8) **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 subject application involves only the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project, not the placement of lots within the subdivision. Addition of the two proposed house types will have no effect on the previous findings for the Balk Hill development that 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 in areas which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people.

(9) **On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant, or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

The subject project does not involve a conceptual site plan. Therefore, this required finding is not applicable to the subject project.

(10) **On the 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.**

The subject detailed site plan for the addition of two architectural models to the approved architecture for the project does not affect previous findings regarding the adequacy of public facilities to serve the subject project.

(11) **On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.**

The subject site measures only 125.40 acres and the project does not involve the creation of a mixed-use planned community. Therefore, this required finding is not applicable to the subject project.

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-04067/05, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans for the project as follows:

   a. On corner lots where the sides of single-family detached homes are exposed to public streets, and on lots identified as "highly visible" on staff's exhibit a brick watertable shall be provided along the entire length of the side elevations, and windows and doors shall be provided with a minimum four-inch trim.

   b. A minimum of 60 percent of the approved dwelling units shall have brick or stone front façades as shown on the approved architectural elevations. A tracking chart shall be provided on the coversheet of the detailed site plan to account for the brick façades at the time of building permit.

   c. No two identical façades may be located next to or across from one another.

   d. Plans for the architectural models shall be maintained in the sales office of the subdivision.

   e. The applicant shall revise the side architectural elevations in the case file to comport with those presented at the Planning Board hearing.

   f. All front architectural elevations for the Tuscany model, including sidelights on one side of the front entranceway, shall be revised to include sidelights on the opposite side as well. All front architectural elevations for the Piedmont and Tuscany models with Front Elevations A, D and G, shall be redesigned with cross gables and/or dormers so as to add articulation to the roof line. Final design of said façades shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

g. All front elevations for the Piedmont and Tuscany models, Front Elevations A, D, and G, shall be made standard or these elevations shall not be approved and shall be redesigned with cross gables and/or dormers so as to add articulation to the roof line. Final design of said façades shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Cavitt, with Commissioners Squire, Cavitt, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 4, 2010, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 18th day of November 2010.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Acting Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:RG:arj

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.
M-NCPPC Legal Department
Date 11/5/10