

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George’s County Planning Board is charged with approval of Specific Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George’s County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on July 12, 2018, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-1701-01 for Timothy Branch, Phase 1, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject approval is for additional architectural models and to modify the maximum allowed lot coverage for Phase 1 of the overall development.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zones	R-M/M-I-O	R-M/M-I-O
Use	Vacant	Residential
Gross Total Acreage	322.41	322.41
R-M Zone	250.15	250.15
L-A-C Zone	72.26	72.26
Residential Units in SDP-1701	323	323
Single-Family Detached	0	39
Single-Family Semidetached	0	18
Single-Family Attached	0	194
Two-Family Attached	0	72
Lot Coverage	30/35 percent	60 percent

3. **Location:** Phase 1 is in the middle of the larger development known as Timothy Branch, which is a tract of land consisting of wooded, undeveloped land and open farmland located on the east side of US 301 (Robert Crain Highway), and south of MD 381 (Brandywine Road), in Planning Area 85A, Council District 9.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The entire Timothy Branch property consists of 322.41 acres and is bounded to the north by MD 381 (Brandywine Road), to the northwest by Short Cut Road, to the east by the Timothy Branch Stream Valley, to the south by vacant and light industrial uses in the I-1 (Light Industrial) and I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park) Zones, to the west by US 301 (Robert Crain Highway), a single-commercial parcel zoned C-M (Miscellaneous Commercial), and multiple I-1-zoned industrial parcels along the US 301 frontage. Additionally, there is an internal parcel (Parcel E) located in the central northern portion of the property, which is split zoned I-3 and E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) and is developed as an existing warehouse. The 72.26-acre L-A-C-zoned (Local Activity Center) portion of the property is in the northeast corner,

just south of MD 381, and the 250.15-acre, R-M-zoned (Residential Medium Development) portion is located to the south, abutting US 301. Phase 1, the subject of this SDP, is located wholly in the R-M Zone.

5. **Previous Approvals:** Zoning Map Amendments (Basic Plans) A-9987 and A-9988 were approved by the Prince George's County District Council on July 11, 2008, rezoning the property from the I-3 and E-I-A Zones to the L-A-C and R-M Zones, subject to 12 conditions and 1 consideration. The 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 5 Master Plan and SMA), retained the subject property in the R-M and the L-A-C Zones.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0901 for the L-A-C-zoned portion was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on October 7, 2010 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-111). The District Council elected to review the case at a hearing on November 14, 2011 and issued an order of approval on January 23, 2012, subject to 46 conditions. Subsequently, the applicant requested a reconsideration of the decision, which was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on March 19, 2015. The final resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-111(A)), including 38 conditions, was adopted by the Planning Board on the same day.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0902 for the R-M-zoned portion was approved by the Planning Board on October 7, 2010 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110). The District Council elected to review the case at a hearing on November 14, 2011. The District Council remanded the case to the Planning Board on January 23, 2012, and the case was reapproved by the Planning Board on April 5, 2012. The District Council reviewed the revised approval and issued an order of approval on November 4, 2013, subject to 50 conditions. Subsequently, the applicant requested a reconsideration to the decision, which was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on March 19, 2015. The final resolution (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110(A)) including 42 conditions, was adopted by the Planning Board on the same day.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-09003, which included the entire Timothy Branch project, was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2010 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-117). The applicant's request for a reconsideration of this decision was granted on April 5, 2012. The Planning Board heard testimony regarding the reconsideration and approved PPS 4-09003 subject to 32 conditions contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 10-117(A/1).

An SDP for infrastructure, Specific Design Plan SDP-1304, which included rough grading, dedication and construction of Mattawoman Drive, and a stormwater management pond, was approved by the Planning Board on October 23, 2014 (PGCPB Resolution No. 14-116).

Specific Design Plan SDP-1701, was approved by the Planning Board on September 14, 2017 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-119) for 39 single-family detached, 18 single-family semidetached, 194 single-family attached, and 72 two-family attached residential units, known as Phase I of the overall development.

The site development approved herein has an approved Stormwater Management (SWM) Concept Plan, 11355-2009-00, which was approved on May 9, 2017 and is valid through May 9, 2020.

6. **Design Features:** The subject approval is for additional architectural models and to amend the maximum lot coverage development standard for both single-family detached lots in Blocks D–G and H and single-family semidetached lots in Block H within Phase I. The following architectural models are proposed:

NVR Homes

Two-family Attached

Model	Elevations	Base Square Footage
Matisse	10	1,606
Picasso	10	2,617

Single-family attached (Townhouse)

Model	Elevations	Base Square Footage
Mozart	2	1,709
Mozart Attic	2	2,202
Strauss E	6	1,989
Strauss Attic E	6	2,257
McPherson (24 feet wide)	10	2,307
McPherson Grand (24 feet wide)	10	2,677

Single-family semidetached (Duplex)

Model	Elevations	Base Square Footage
Allegheny	3	1,823
Ballenger	3	2,114

Single-family detached

Model	Elevations	Base Square Footage
Allegheny	2	1,823
Ballenger	1	2,114
Palermo	1	2,264
Columbia	1	2,423
Hudson	1	2,718
Lehigh	2	3,010
Seneca	5	3,306
York	3	3,656

The single-family attached units approved herein range in size from 1,709 square feet to 2,677 square feet. The two single-family semidetached (duplex) units approved herein measure 1,823 and 2,114 square feet. The single-family detached units range in size from 1,823 to 3,656 square feet. The two-family attached units measure 1,606 and 2,617 square feet.

The two-family attached models (the Matisse and the Picasso) approved herein present an attractive four-story architectural design. Brick is included as the primary architectural material for the model and is utilized on the first story of all façades except the pediment and on the rear and side elevations. The roofline is well articulated on the front façade, where dormers or a pediment create some visual interest. The front doors to the units are recessed, providing some protection from the elements. The windows are of varying design, including bay, double, and triple designs, some with shutters and most with a row lock forming the lintel of the window with a keystone in the center. Decorative oval or louvred windows provide accents in the design.

The townhouse models approved herein are a simpler design with brick or stone used more sparingly and with window design somewhat less varied, but the architectural design is acceptable. All side elevations have several optional end-wall features. A condition, of this approval, requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant include a side elevation with a minimum of three standard (not optional) end-wall features for use on lots designated “highly visible.” In addition, the Planning Board found a design anomaly on the McPhearson (24-foot-wide model) in that brick is wrapped from the front to the side elevation and extended on the water table, but not above. A condition of this approval requires that the brick in this location be removed, simply wrapped, or be extended as shown in the full length of the side elevations.

The side elevations are required by Condition 5(e)(8) of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0902, to have a minimum of two architectural features in a reasonably balanced arrangement. A small window that is louvred or paned would not, in this instance, be considered a full-sized architectural feature. A condition of this approval requires that the applicant revise the architecture as indicated.

Condition 1(q)(2) of Specific Design Plan SDP-1701, identifies the highly visible lots located in Phase 1 and states that the specified lots require enhanced architectural treatment pursuant to Condition 5(e) of CDP-0902, including a minimum of three architectural features. As the following models have only two full-sized architectural features, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the applicant revise the architecture of the side elevations, as necessary, to enable all units to be utilized on any lot regardless of its status as “highly visible:”

- Allegheny duplex
- Allegheny single-family detached
- Lehigh single-family detached
- Palermo single-family detached.

As the design on highly-visible lots should be superior, and no specific architecture is included for the highly-visible lots, a condition of this approval requires that, prior to certificate approval, the plans should be revised to include a side elevation for all models containing additional architectural detail and/or brick on the first story.

The duplex models herein approved (the Allegheny and the Ballenger), which are also offered in single-family detached models, and the additional single-family detached models were under-designed on their side and rear elevations, offering little variety in form and massing minimal fenestration with entirely unadorned windows and doors and virtually no architectural detail. A condition of this approval requires that the side and rear architecture of these units be improved to include a minimum of two full-sized architectural features in a reasonably balanced arrangement and additional architectural detail, fenestration, and/or brick, with the final design of these elevations to be approved by the Planning Board or its designee. A side elevation, including a minimum of three full-sized architectural features in a reasonably balanced arrangement and additional architectural detail, fenestration, and/or brick shall also be provided for use on lots deemed highly visible.

Requested Lot Coverage Increase

The applicant has requested and the Planning Board herein approves that the lot coverage for both the single-family detached lots in Blocks D, G, and H, and the single-family semidetached lots in Block H be increased from a maximum of 30 percent and 35 percent respectively, to 60 percent. Development standards, including lot coverage, were established for the R-M-zoned portion of the site in Condition 5(c) of the approval of CDP-0902 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110(A)). For a detailed discussion of the applicant's request to increase lot coverage, see Finding 9 of this approval. As the General Notes on the plans still reflect 30 and 35 percent lot coverage, a condition of this approval requires that the allowed lot coverage be revised therein to 60 percent.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9987:** Basic Plan A-9987-C was approved by the District Council on July 11, 2008 subject to 12 conditions and 1 consideration. The subject project does not affect previous findings of conformance with the requirements of Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9987 and none of the conditions or the considerations of this approval are relevant to the subject SDP amendment approval. All conditions of approval of Basic Plan A-9987-C shall remain in full force and effect.
8. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject SDP is in general compliance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:
 - a. The subject approval is in conformance with the applicable requirements of Section 27-507, Purposes; Section 27-508, Uses; and Section 27-509, Regulations, governing development in the R-M Zone.

- b. Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone: A portion of the project is also located within the Noise Impact Zone (65–70 dBA noise contour) of the M-I-O Zone. The subject SDP amendment does not impact previous findings of conformance with the requirements in the M-I-O Zone.
- c. Section 27-528 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following criteria for approval of a SDP:
 - (a) **Prior to approving a Specific Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

- (1) **The plan conforms to the approved Comprehensive Design Plan, the applicable standards of the Landscape Manual, and except as provided in Section 27-528(a)(1.1), for Specific Design Plans for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the applicable design guidelines for townhouses set forth in Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and (a)(11), and the applicable regulations for townhouses set forth in Section 27-433(d) and, as it applies to property in the L-A-C Zone, if any portion lies within one-half (1/2) mile of an existing or Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority Metrorail station, the regulations set forth in Section 27-480(d) and (e);**

As discussed in Findings 9 and 13 below, the plan conforms to the requirements of the approved comprehensive design plan and the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). In addition, the architectural models approved herein conform to the requirements of Section 27-274(a)(1)(B) and Section 27-274(a)(11) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, as found in the original SDP-1701 approval. Conformance to the regulations for townhouses in Section 27-433(d) of the Zoning Ordinance was demonstrated previously in CDP-0902 and SDP-1701, with conditions as appropriate, which are still applicable to the subject amendment approval. As the portion of the project discussed herein is located in the R-M Zone, not the L-A-C Zone, the final portion of this subpart does not apply to the subject approval.

- (1.1) **For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies all requirements for the use in Section 27-508 of the Zoning Ordinance.**

As the subject project is not a Regional Urban Community, this required finding is not applicable.

- (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, provided as part of the private development or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, participation by the developer in a road club.**

The subject amendment approval does not affect the previous finding of conformance with this requirement by the Planning Board at the time of approval of SDP-1701.

- (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.**

The applicant has an approved SWM plan (11355-2009-00), which was approved on May 9, 2017 and is valid until May 9, 2020. The subject approval has made adequate provision for draining surface water, with no adverse effects.

- (4) **The plan is in conformance with an approved Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan.**

The subject amendment approval will not affect the prior finding in the approval of SDP-1701 of conformance with Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-068-93-02.

- (5) **The plan demonstrates that the regulated environmental features are preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).**

The subject amendment approval does not affect the finding in the approval of SDP-1701 of conformance to this requirement.

9. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0902:** Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0902, for the R-M-zoned portion of the subject property, was originally approved by the Planning Board on October 7, 2010 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110). It was then remanded by the District Council to the Planning Board on January 23, 2012, and the case was reapproved by the Planning Board on April 5, 2012. The District Council elected to review the remand and issued an order affirming the Planning Board's approval on November 4, 2013, subject to 50 conditions. Subsequently, the applicant requested a reconsideration to the decision, which was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on March 19, 2015.

The final resolution, including 42 conditions, was adopted by the Planning Board on March 19, 2015 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110(A)). The following conditions of that approval warrant discussion:

5. Prior to certificate of approval of the subject comprehensive design plan:

c. Revise the development standard chart in the text and on the plan as follows:

The following standards shall apply to the development. (Modifications to the standards may be permitted on a lot-by-lot basis by the Planning Board at the time of specific design plan if circumstances warrant.)

RESIDENTIAL USES—R-M ZONE¹

	One-family detached 6,000 sq. ft.	Two-family attached	Single-family semidetached^{8,9}	Single-family attached^{3,8,9}	Multifamily
Minimum Net Lot Area		N/A	3,600 sq. ft.	1,800 sq. ft.	N/A
Minimum frontage at street R.O.W	60	N/A	36 feet	20 feet	N/A
Minimum frontage at Front B.R.L.	60	N/A	36 feet	20 feet	N/A
Minimum frontage – corner lot	70	N/A	40 feet	30 feet	N/A
Maximum Lot Coverage (%)	30	35⁴	35	35⁴	50⁴
Minimum building setback from Mattawoman Drive	50 feet	50 feet	50 feet	50 feet	50 feet
Minimum building setback from Robert Crain Highway (US 301)	TBD¹⁰	TBD¹⁰	TBD¹⁰	TBD¹⁰	200 feet¹⁰
Minimum front setback⁵	25	N/A	20 feet	3, 6	7
Minimum side setback⁵	10	N/A	10 feet	6	7
Minimum rear setback⁵	20	N/A	20 feet	6	7
Minimum side setback to street⁵	25	N/A	20 feet	6	7
Maximum residential building height¹¹	40	55 feet	45 feet	45 feet	80 feet
Maximum percentage of total units	N/A	N/A	N/A	50²	25²
Minimum frontage on cul-de-sac	40	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

¹ All parking is governed by Part 11 of the Zoning Ordinance.

² Variance requested from the maximum townhouse and multifamily dwelling unit percentage, which allows a maximum 30 and 10 percent respectively of units in the R-M Zone.

³ Applies to both front and rear loaded garage townhouses. Rear-load garage townhomes shall have a minimum 25-foot front yard setback in order to reduce the length of the driveway.

⁴ **This percentage is for building coverage (and not for lot coverage) of the overall net tract area**

⁵ **Stoops and/or steps may encroach into yard area.**

⁶ **Minimum yard area of 800 square feet to be allocated for front, side, or rear yard. May be reduced to 500 square feet for providing stoops, steps, and terraces which may project into yard area. Decks may project into rear yards only.**

⁷ **For multifamily buildings, the minimum building setback along a street shall be 25 feet, except for Mattawoman Drive, which requires a 50-foot setback unless it is deemed that a lesser BRL provides sufficient area to adequately buffer the units.**

⁸ **Fences and retaining walls up to six feet high may be constructed anywhere in a rear yard without meeting setback requirements.**

⁹ **On lots consisting of one acre or less, fences in the front yard shall not be more than four feet high.**

¹⁰ **The minimum building setback for one-family detached, two-family detached, single-family semidetached, single-family attached and multifamily from Robert Crain Highway (US 301) shall be determined at the time of SDP review.**

¹¹ **These height limits may be increased if a variance and/or modification is granted by the Planning Board at the time of SDP.**

With respect to the increase in the maximum allowed lot coverage requirement for the single-family detached lots in Blocks D, G, and H from 30 to 60 percent and for the single-family semidetached Lots in Block H from 35 percent to 60 percent, the applicant offered the following:

“The added architecture conforms to the development standards, with the exception of modifications to the maximum lot coverage development standard for single-family detached lots in Blocks D, G, and H, and the single-family semidetached lots (duplex) in Block H.

“The amendment is to increase the maximum lot coverage for the single-family detached units in the R-M Zone from 30 percent to 60 percent in Blocks D, G, and H, and for the single-family semidetached (duplexes) in the R-M Zone from 35 percent to 60 percent in Block H, which are located in residential pod RM-2. The entirety of the RM-2 residential pod has extensive environmental constraints that have been taken into consideration with the design of SDP-1701 and SDP-1701-01. The development proposed in RM-2 was carefully designed to stay within the limited development envelope, as to not further impact the regulated environmental features that bound this portion of the development pod on three sides (i.e., the north, east, and south). However, in so doing, and in order to maintain the development densities envisioned with previous approvals, the applicant hereby requests a modification to this development standard to increase the maximum lot coverage for the single family detached units in the R-M Zone from 30 percent to 60 percent for certain single-family detached lots within

Blocks D, G, and H, and a modification to the single-family semidetached units in the R-M Zone from 35 percent to 60 percent within Block H. Thus, the applicant contends that the requested increase to the maximum lot coverage for the single family detached units in the R-M Zone from 30 percent to 60 percent, and the increase to the maximum lot coverage for the single-family semidetached units in the R-M Zone from 35 percent to 60 percent, will not adversely impact the future development or future residents of said lots, but will offer the residents more architecture choices, while preserving the significant on-site environmental features that this community will offer. Prior variance approvals to Subtitle 25 for the Timothy Branch development have already determined that the property is unique given its elongated shape, size, and significant environmental features that include, among other things, a large stream valley. The totality of the environs presents special conditions peculiar to the property that focus development to the middle of the site in order to accommodate the desired development pattern while protecting regulated environmental features. It is also worth noting that similar comprehensive design zoned developments, have been approved with a greater percentage of lot coverage for similar sized lots, ranging from 60 percent to 75 percent.”

The applicant requested additional architectural models that, if placed on certain lots in the subdivision, would result in lot coverage greater than 30 or 35 percent, up to 60 percent. The applicant’s assertion that a number of similar comprehensive-design-zoned developments were permitted a greater lot coverage, with no negative affect, is true. Examples of CDPs that meet this criterion include Springdale Estates, CDP-9601-01, approved for 75 percent; Parkside, CDP-0501, approved for 75 percent; and Beechtree, CDP-9706, approved for lot coverages varying from 40 percent to 75 percent. The additional coverage does not affect the finding required by Section 27-528(a)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance that adequate provision has been made for draining surface water, so there are no adverse effects on adjacent properties. The project has an approved SWM concept plan (11355-2009-00), dated May 9, 2017 and valid until May 9, 2020, which will not be impacted by the increase in lot coverage. As there are no planning-related concerns connected with the request, the Planning Board herein grants this requested modification. Further, this aspect of the approval is a modification to the standards in accordance with the lead-in clause approved at the time of the CDP to allow flexibility at the time of SDP.

- e. **The following Architectural Design Parameters shall apply and be revised in the CDP text:**
 - (1) **A minimum of 60 percent of all townhouse units shall have a full front façade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors) and all highly-visible endwalls, which shall be identified at the time of SDP, shall be brick, stone or stucco, or other masonry materials of equivalent quality.**

Notes and a tracking chart are provided on the SDP demonstrating conformance with this requirement.

- (2) **Townhouses and single-family semidetached dwellings facing a public street and the side elevation of the same unit facing a public street (corner lots) shall be faced up to 60 percent with high-quality materials such as brick, stone or stucco (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors) or other masonry materials of equivalent quality.**

The architecture for the single-family attached, duplex, and single-family detached architecture approved herein do not provide options showing the ability to have a front and/or side elevation faced with up to 60 percent masonry materials. Therefore, a condition of this approval requires this to be added prior to certificate approval.

- (3) **All residential buildings with front elevations facing Mattawoman Drive shall have a full front façade of brick, stone or stucco (excluding gables, windows, doors, and trim), or other masonry materials of equivalent quality as long as the buildings are within 100 feet of the Mattawoman Drive right-of-way.**

The subject approval does not affect previous findings of conformance with this requirement, and architectural elevations are provided as appropriate.

- (4) **Front elevations of townhouses and two-family attached units facing Mattawoman Drive shall have dormers or gables to reduce the single plane of roof.**

The subject approval does not affect previous findings of conformance with this requirement.

- (5) **Front elevations of townhouse and two-family attached units facing Mattawoman Drive shall be offset by a minimum of two feet.**

The subject approval does not affect previous findings of conformance with this requirement.

- (6) **Architecture for multifamily buildings shall be faced with at least 60 percent brick, stone, stucco or equivalent, or other masonry materials of equivalent quality. Elevations of multifamily buildings facing Mattawoman Drive and those that are determined at SDP to**

have highly-visible corner façades shall be faced with a minimum of 80 percent brick, stone or stucco (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors), or other masonry materials of equivalent quality.

No multifamily buildings are approved with this SDP.

- (7) **A minimum of 60 percent of one-family detached dwellings shall have a full front façade (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors) of brick, stone, or stucco, or other masonry materials of equivalent quality.**

Notes and a tracking chart are provided on the SDP and conformance with this requirement is demonstrated.

- (8) **Side and rear walls of all residential buildings shall be articulated with windows, recesses, chimneys, or other architectural treatments. All residential endwalls shall have a minimum of two architectural features, except endwalls in highly-visible locations, which shall be identified at the time of SDP, shall have additional architectural features creating a well-balanced composition.**

Most residential end walls show a minimum of two architectural features. A condition of this approval ensures all side elevations have a minimum of two architectural features, and highly-visible lots will have a minimum of three architectural features.

- 16. All future SDPs and associated TCP2 shall have a tree canopy coverage schedule indicating how the TCC requirements have been fulfilled for the subject application.**

The subject SDP and TCP2 contain a tree canopy coverage schedule indicating how the TCC requirements have been fulfilled for the subject approval in accordance with this requirement. However, the subject approval does not affect previous findings of conformance with this requirement.

- 17. At time of specific design plan application for residential units in the R-M zone, a Phase II noise study shall be submitted for review. The Phase II Noise Study shall address how noise impacts to the residential units will be mitigated to provide interior noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or less and exterior noise levels of 65 dBA Ldn or less within outdoor activity areas based on the final site design. The approval of architecture at time of SDP shall also demonstrate how the proposed structures are in conformance with the noise mitigation measures recommend in the Phase II noise report for interior residential uses.**

A Phase II noise study was submitted for review with SDP-1701. The noise study identified one single-family detached lot (Lot 28, Block D) that requires noise mitigation for traffic noise generated by Mattawoman Drive. If one of the architectural models approved herein is selected for placement on that lot, it will require a certification on it by an acoustical engineer at time of issuance of a building permit stating that the inside noise levels will be attenuated to 45 dBA or lower in accordance with the findings and recommendations of the noise study.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-09003:** The relevant PPS, 4-09003, was originally approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2010. Subsequently, the applicant requested a reconsideration, which the Planning Board heard and approved on April 5, 2012 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-117(A/1)), subject to 32 conditions. The following conditions warrant discussion in relation to the subject SDP amendment approval:

†~~37~~29. **For each individual specific design plan, the applicant shall provide an inventory of the existing quantities of uses (if any) in the development, expressed in cumulative square footage or number of the varying types of residential units and information as to the exact square footage/number of units and types proposed, so that conformance with the overall approved land uses can be evaluated. Each plan of development shall also contain information demonstrating conformance to the density increment analysis completed in association with CDP-0901 and CDP-0902.**

The submitted SDP provides tracking charts and notes with an inventory of total development in this phase in accordance with this requirement.

†~~38~~30. **An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.**

A note on the plans indicates that an automatic fire suppression system will be provided in all new buildings proposed in this development, unless the contingency is met, in accordance with this requirement.

11. **Specific Design Plan SDP-1304:** SDP-1304 was for infrastructure only, and includes rough grading, dedication and construction of Mattawoman Drive, and SWM ponds, and was approved by the Planning Board on October 23, 2014 (PGCPB Resolution No. 14-116), subject to three conditions. None of those conditions are relevant to the subject amendment approval.
12. **Specific Design Plan SDP-1701:** SDP-1701 was approved by the Planning Board, subject to seven conditions (PGCPB Resolution No.17-119), as adopted on September 14, 2017 for Phase I of the Timothy Branch development, which included 39 single-family detached, 18 single-family semidetached, 194 single-family attached, and 72 two-family attached residential units. Condition

1(q) of this approval is relevant to the subject discussion. Condition 1(q) of that approval required revisions to the architecture to include certain notes and architectural modifications for the single-family semi-detached architecture for side elevations facing a public street. A review of the submitted architecture indicates that some, but not all, the submitted architecture complies with these requirements. Therefore, a condition of this approval ensures that these required revisions are made as necessary to all the models approved herein. Note that all conditions, findings, and notes approved in SDP-1701 remain applicable, except as modified herein.

13. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The addition of architectural models and an increase in the permitted lot coverage has no impact on the previous findings of conformance to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) made in conjunction with the approval of the previous SDP on the subject site.
14. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The approval of architectural models and an increase in the permitted lot coverage has no impact on the previous findings of conformance with the requirements of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance made in conjunction with the approval of previous SDPs for the subject site.
15. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The approval of architectural models and an increase in the permitted lot coverage has no impact on the previous findings of conformance with the requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance.
16. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject approval of architecture and an increase in permitted lot coverage was not referred because the issues raised by the approval are not of concern to outside agencies and other divisions.

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 Specific Design Plan SDP-1701-01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the specific design plan (SDP), the applicant shall apply these recommendations:
 - a. Architecture to be used on lots designated as highly visible shall be provided and labeled "side elevations for use on highly-visible lots." Such elevations shall include a minimum of three full-sized architectural features in a reasonably balanced arrangement. Such elevations may include additional architectural detail and fenestration and/or brick on the first story. Final design of these side elevations shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

- b. The side elevations of the following architectural models shall be revised to have a minimum of two full-sized architectural features in a reasonably balanced arrangement, and may include additional architectural detail, fenestration, and/or brick. Final design of these side elevations shall be approved by the Urban Design Section, as designee of the Planning Board.
- Allegheny Duplex
 - Allegheny Single-family Detached
 - Palermo Single-family Detached
 - Lehigh Single-family Detached
- c. The architecture for the single-family attached, single-family semidetached, and single-family detached architecture shall provide options showing the ability to have a front and/or side elevation finished with a minimum of 60 or 100 percent high-quality materials such as brick, stone, stucco (excluding gables, bay windows, trim, and doors), or other masonry materials of equivalent quality.
- d. All conditions of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0902 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-110(a)) and Specific Design Plan SDP-1701 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-119), remain in full force and effect, including the requirements that certain notes be provided on all architecture and a version of the single-family semidetached architecture side elevations to be used when the unit faces a public street be provided.
- e. The side and rear elevations of the Allegheny and the Ballenger architectural models shall be improved to include a minimum of two full-sized architectural features for use on regular lots, and three full-sized architectural features for use on highly-visible lots, in a reasonably balanced arrangement, and additional architectural detail, fenestration, and/or brick with final design to be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
- f. The applicant shall revise the general notes to reflect that a lot coverage for residential uses of 60 percent is permitted for the specified blocks and lots.

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.

* * * * *

PGCPB No. 18-64
File No. SDP-1701-01
Page 16

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 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Doerner absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 12, 2018, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 26th day of July 2018.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:RG:gh