

C O R R E C T E D 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 May 15, 2014, regarding Specific Design Plan SDP-1202-01 for Canter Creek Phase One, Lots 1–54, Block A; Lots 1–38, Block B; and Lots 1–14, Block C, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a SDP for Phase One of the development, which proposes 106 single-family lots and architectural elevations for Lots 1–54, Block A; Lots 1–38, Block B; and Lots 1–14, Block C, to be built by Ryan Homes and Mid-Atlantic Builders. The previously approved Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 provided the entirety of infrastructure serving the proposed 106 lots subject to the current SDP.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Zone	R-S	R-S
Uses	Vacant	Single-Family Detached
Parcels	6	6
Total Acreage	342.38	342.38
Area of Phase One	N/A	24.48 acres

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the west side of Frank Tippett Road, approximately 1,000 feet south of its intersection with Rosaryville Road, in Planning Area 82A, within the Developing Tier, and Council District 9.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** To the north of the subject property is the Williamsburg Estates single-family home subdivision in the One-Family Detached Residential (R-80) Zone and a single-family detached lot in the Rural Residential (R-R) Zone. In the northeastern corner, the subject property surrounds the R-R-zoned Merrymount Equestrian Center, which is located on a separate parcel and under separate ownership. Across Frank Tippett Road, to the east, are several undeveloped parcels, two churches, and a single-family detached residential development, the Brookwood subdivision, in the R-R Zone. To the south of the subject property are the Graystone at Marlborough single-family home subdivision and an undeveloped lot in the R-R Zone. To the west of the subject property is a 404-acre undeveloped property in the Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) Zone which is owned by Maryland Environmental Services.

The specific area of this subject SDP for 106 lots is located off of the proposed entrance into the development at its southern end.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The overall site, formerly known as TLBU Property, was rezoned by the Prince George's County District Council on May 14, 1990 (Zoning Ordinance No. 25-1990) from the R-A (Residential-Agricultural) and R-R Zones to the R-S Zone through Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9738-C, subject to 9 conditions and 16 considerations.

Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-9007 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI-110-90 were submitted for review, but were withdrawn before being heard by the Prince George's County Planning Board. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-00064 and TCPI-110-90 for the proposed development of the property (in accordance with County Council Bill CB-94-2000) for a private university, a 250-room hotel and conference center, and dormitories was approved by PGCPB Resolution No. 01-79(A).

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-002-02, was approved for Parcel 1 and Outparcel A on January 17, 2002 with no associated development application.

On November 18, 2008, Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0701 and a revision to the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-110-90/01, was approved by the District Council, subject to 31 conditions.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07005 and TCPI-110-90/02 were disapproved by the Planning Board on July 17, 2008 for lack of conformance with the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* (Green Infrastructure Plan). By letter dated September 23, 2008, the applicant requested reconsideration for the purpose of addressing the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Green Infrastructure Plan and adjusting the lotting pattern to accommodate the same. On October 30, 2008, the Planning Board approved the request for reconsideration based on the concept of "good cause" associated with conformance to the Green Infrastructure Plan and Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

On October 29, 2009, the Planning Board heard testimony regarding the reconsideration and approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI-110-90/02 and Preliminary Plan 4-07005 subject to conditions contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-112(A).

On October 25, 2012 the Planning Board reviewed Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 for Canter Creek, Phase One, for infrastructure only and adopted PGCPB Resolution No. 12-102 on November 1, 2012. On November 19, 2012 the District Council elected to review the case and, on February 12, 2013, the District Council remanded the case back to the Planning Board for additional consideration and information. On April 25, 2013, the Planning Board considered additional evidence and approved the SDP with one additional condition, for a total of 17 conditions, and amended findings in response to the Order of Remand.

6. **Design Features:** The proposed development consists of Lots 1–54, Block A; Lots 1–38, Block B; and Lots 1–14, Block C, with two-story, single-family, detached dwelling units. The subject application proposes 12 models by Mid-Atlantic Builders and 23 models by Ryan Homes.

The Mid-Atlantic models range from a base square footage of 2,451 to 3,859 square feet and feature varied rooflines and roof types and a variety of façade options, including full or partial brick and siding front façades and partial stone façades. Other features include reverse and sloping gables, dormers, bay and double-bay windows, and two-car front-load garages with an optional side-load available. Living area extensions include spa bath, morning room, guest and /or owner suite, in-law suite, library, California gourmet kitchen, sunroom, and screened lanai. Three-car garages are also available.

The Ryan models range from a base square footage of 1,715 to 3,439 square feet. Full or partial brick and siding is available; partial stone and shake siding are also options. Rooflines are broken by gables, reverse gables, and optional dormers, porches, and living area extensions. Options also include side-load and three-car garages, luxury owner suite, great room, “bonus” room, and morning room.

The submitted site plan shows only a few each of the Mid-Atlantic and Ryan proposed house types, but any house type could be built on any lot as long as it fits within the required setbacks. All of the proposed models offer several different front elevations with varied roof types and decorative architectural elements, such as shutters and enhanced trim. Some elevations lack sufficient roof variation or front façade articulation and have, for that reason, are conditioned to either be enhanced or removed from the approved set. Each dwelling has a standard front-load garage and multiple other options as described above. Most of the side elevations for the Mid-Atlantic models provide a minimum of two standard architectural features although recommendations are included to provide additional features where they provide balance. The Ryan models did not generally include two standard endwall features. This requirement is included as a condition of approval to ensure that all models have the minimum number of endwall features in a balanced composition.

**Architectural Model Data:**

Mid-Atlantic Models	Base Square footage	Elevations
Amherst	3,859 sq. ft.	#1206, #1208, #1210, #1212, #1214, #1216
Aspen	2,747 sq. ft.	#1501/1502, #1505, #1509/1510, #1513/1514, #1531
Casina	2,451 sq. ft.	#202, #206, #210, #214
Modena	2,517 sq. ft.	#302, #304, #306, #310, #314

Monticello	3,227 sq. ft.	#1601/1602, #1609/1610, #1617/1618, #1626/1676, #1631, #1652, #1658, #1660, #1668, #1672/1630, #1676 #1678, #1680/1682
Orvieto	2,660 sq. ft.	#402, #406, #410, #414
Sierra	3,675 sq. ft.	#1801/1802/1852, #1805/1806/1856, #1809/1810/1860, #1811/1812/1862, #1815/1816/1866, #1866 (Executive Series)
Signoria	3,306 sq. ft.	#702, #704, #706, #708
Somerset	3,294 sq. ft.	#501/502, #505/506, #519/520, #521/522, #523/524, #538, #550, #556, #560, #572, #574, #576
Sorrento	3,404 sq. ft.	#602, #604, #606, #608, #610
Torino	3,383 sq. ft.	#1302, #1304, #1306, #1308, #1310
Windsor	3,032 sq. ft.	#1401/1402, #1405/1405, #1408, #1409/1410, #1411/1412, #1416, #1420, #1424, #1428, #1434, #1436

<b>Ryan Models</b>	<b>Base Square Footage</b>	<b>Elevations</b>
Brentwood	1,788 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Carolina Place	1,715 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Castleton	2,074 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Chantilly Place	2,054 sq. ft.	A, B,C,K,L
Courtland Gate	2,902 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L
Florence	2,112 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Genoa	2,380 sq. ft.	A,B,K,L,M
Jasmine Grove	2,746 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Jefferson Square	2,761 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,K,L
Lincolnshire	2,656 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Milan	2,528 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Naples	2,760 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Oberlin Terrace	2,737 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,K,L
Palermo	2,553 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Ravenna	2,560 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N

<b>Ryan Models</b>	<b>Base Square Footage</b>	<b>Elevations</b>
Rome	3,060 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Sheffield	2,341 sq. ft.	A,B,C,K,L
Springhaven	1,952 sq. ft.	A,B,C
Torino	3,439 sq. ft.	A,B,C,N
Venice	2,224 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L,M,N
Verona	2,822 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E
Victoria Falls	2,472 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D,E,K,L
Zachary Place	2,272 sq. ft.	A,B,C,D

7. **Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9738-C:** On May 14, 1990, the District Council approved Basic Plan A-9738-C subject to 9 conditions and 16 considerations. Of the conditions and considerations attached to the approval of A-9738-C, the following are applicable to the review of this SDP:

**Conditions**

- 1. Land uses shall be only as shown on the Basic Plan.**

The subject SDP is for single-family detached development, which is in conformance with the basic plan.

- 2. The minimum lot size for the proposed development shall be 8,000 square feet. Those lots adjacent to the Williamsburg Estates subdivision, Piscataway Creek and Dower House Pond Branch shall be a minimum of 10,000 square feet.**

The subject SDP appears to be in conformance with this condition. The minimum lot size in the proposed development is 8,001 square feet, which is for an interior lot. Lots adjacent to Piscataway Creek and Dower House Pond Branch appear to exceed the 10,000-square-foot minimum lot area requirement; however, several lot sizes are not consistently shown on the site plan and in the Lot Coverage Percentage table. The provision of accurate lot areas is required by a condition below.

- 5. The Basic Plan shall be modified as follows:**

- c. That portion of the property adjacent to Frank Tippett Road shall be supplemented with plant materials or other screening.**

The basic plan was modified as necessary to reflect this condition. Plant materials and screening have been provided to a depth of 100 feet along Frank Tippett Road, as

approved for in SDP-1202. This condition is not directly applicable to the subject SDP and will be further examined at the time of a future SDP for final site development.

- d. No driveways shall have direct access to Frank Tippett Road. All access shall be from the internal roadway system.**

The basic plan was modified as necessary to reflect this condition. The subject SDP shows all driveway access from the internal roadway system.

- e. All trails shall be in accordance with the recommendations of the Trails Coordinator, Exhibit 44, as recited in the body of the decision.**

This SDP only includes the land directly associated with the proposed 106 lots. There are no trails in this area.

- 6. The Equestrian Center and facilities and equestrian trails shall be designed, located and approved prior to any other approvals by plan, plat or permit.**

The previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure showed the equestrian center as existing and proposed the design and construction of the two equestrian trails located within the main part of the subject property. The other two proposed equestrian trails will be located on the proposed Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) parkland and be constructed with public funding.

### **Considerations**

- 1. The applicant shall prepare a tree stand delineation plan for approval by the Natural Resources Division. Where possible, major stands of trees shall be preserved, especially along streams, adjoining roads and property lines.**

A forest stand delineation was submitted with approved Natural Resources Inventory NRI-015-07. The approved TCPI showed the preservation of woodlands along streams and adjoining roads, and preserves a major forest stand identified by the NRI as Forest Stand D. The submitted TCPI conforms to this consideration because it preserves a major stand of trees on the northern portion of the site that is adjacent to a stream and property lines, and preserves additional woodland along Piscataway Creek. This condition does not apply to the current SDP.

- 2. The applicant shall submit a 100-year floodplain study and a stormwater management concept plan for approval by the Department of Environmental Resources (DER).**

A 100-year floodplain study was approved for the subject property on November 20, 1989. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8327602-2000-05, has been approved by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). A letter from Dawit Abraham, Associate Director,

DPW&T, dated September 22, 2009, indicates that Floodplain Study FPS No. 900058, approved on November 20, 1989, remains valid.

3. **A minimum 50-foot-wide buffer shall be retained along all streams. This area shall be expanded to include the 100-year floodplain, wetlands, steep slopes and areas of erodible soils.**

In conformance with this consideration, the approved NRI and submitted TCPII show all of the required expanded stream buffers on the property.

4. **The character and visual image of Frank Tippett Road shall be protected and maintained as equestrian/suburban through design techniques such as trees, berms, and vegetative buffers. The layout of building lots and internal streets shall be planned so that the rear of view of houses will not be clearly visible from Frank Tippett Road.**

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 provided landscaping and buffering along Frank Tippett Road which will maintain the suburban character of the area of Phase One. The current site plan does not propose any lots with rear yards fronting on Frank Tippett Road. The distance of the lots on Pirouette Court from Frank Tippett Drive (approximately 4,000 feet), in addition to existing trees between the roadway and the lots, will ensure that no lots will be clearly visible from the roadway.

7. **The applicant shall designate 17± acres adjacent to the Dower House Pond Branch and Piscataway Creek for public park purposes suitable for active recreational development. This acreage could be combined with adjoining property, if acquired by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, to provide continuous open space within the established stream valley park acquisition program. This park land will also provide active neighborhood recreation opportunities. The entrance for the 17-acre parcel shall have a minimum 200-foot frontage on the primary roadway.**

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 provided for the designation of approximately 122 acres of parkland in two parcels, adjacent to both the Dower House Pond Branch and Piscataway Creek, to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for public parks. Both parcels have more than 200 linear feet of frontage on proposed Dressage Drive, which connects to Frank Tippett Road.

8. **The stormwater management facility may be located on park dedication land, providing the facility is designated as multi-purpose wet pond and upgraded with landscaping and recreational amenities.**

There are no stormwater management ponds proposed on dedicated parkland. The two ponds shown on Parcels G and I, which are included in the subject SDP, were previously approved as part of SDP-1202 for infrastructure.

- 10. The width of building lots adjacent to Frank Tippett Road shall be in accordance with those for the R-R Zone.**

The current SDP does not propose any residential building lots adjacent to Frank Tippett Road.

- 12. All structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13 and all applicable County laws.**

This condition has been carried forward.

8. **Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0701:** Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0701 for the subject property was approved on November 18, 2008 by the District Council, subject to 31 conditions. The following conditions of the CDP approval are applicable to the subject SDP and warrant discussion as follows:

- 4. At the time of final plat, the applicant shall dedicate approximately 115 acres to M-NCPPC for a stream valley park and a community park. The exact acreage of each park shall be determined at the time of the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to the following conditions:**
- b. The applicant and M-NCPPC shall work in partnership with the Brookwood-Hollaway Civic Association and the Williamsburg Estates Citizens Association on the nature of the recreation facilities to be constructed on the land to be conveyed for a community park.**

The Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) will work in partnership with the applicant and each of the specified communities mentioned above in development of the recreational program for the community park on proposed Parcel E.

- e. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.**

The boundaries and acreage of dedicated parkland are indicated on the SDP. Parcel E is proposed as 25 acres and Parcel D is proposed as 94.56 acres.

- 9. The applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of Class III bikeway signage. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit. If road frontage improvements are required by DPW&T, wide outside curb lanes or asphalt shoulders are recommended to accommodate bicycle traffic.**



This payment will be due prior to issuance of the first building permit.

**10. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**

Standard sidewalks were shown on both sides of all internal roads in SDP-1202 for infrastructure.

**15. Prior to certificate approval of the subject comprehensive design plan application:**

- b. Upon receipt of the report by the Planning Department, if it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of the first of either a preliminary plan of subdivision or a specific design plan, the applicant shall provide a plan for:**

- (1) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or**
- (2) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.**

**If a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner, prior to any ground disturbance or the approval of any grading permits.**

Site 18PR996 is located in the area included within the subject SDP. Phase II investigations were completed for this site in November 2009. The Historic Preservation Section did not request any further investigations on Site 18PR996 because of its lack of integrity.

**16. Prior to the approval of a specific design plan, the applicant shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and M-NCPPC staff archeologist. The installation of the signage and the implementation of public outreach measures shall occur prior to the issuance of the first building permit for the development.**

Given that the Phase II study concluded that Site 18PR996 lacked integrity and was not eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, the previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure did not require interpretive signage for this site.

**19. The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and all subsequent plans shall ensure that no part of any conservation easement is on any residential lot. When the TCP II is formulated with the SDP, consideration shall be given to the placement of woodland**

**conservation areas into permanent, recorded conservation easements because they will not be located on residential lots.**

No part of the expanded stream buffer, which will be placed into conservation easements at the time of final plat, is located on a residential lot in the current TCPII application. There are areas of “woodland retained-assumed cleared” located on portions of several residential lots which will not be credited as woodland conservation. Although these areas will not be placed into a woodland conservation easement, specific protection of the woodland conservation areas proposed are conditioned below.

**28. Prior to approval of a Specific Design Plan, the following shall be demonstrated:**

**a. That portion of the property adjacent to Frank Tippett Road shall be supplemented with plant materials or other screening.**

The previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure indicated a proposed landscaped buffer consisting of evergreen and deciduous trees and shrubs of 100 feet in width along the Frank Tippett Road frontage.

**b. No driveways shall have direct access to Frank Tippett Road. All access shall be from the internal roadway system.**

All driveway access is shown from the internal roadway system.

**d. The width of building lots adjacent to Frank Tippett Road shall be 70 feet at the street line.**

The subject SDP does not propose any residential building lots adjacent to Frank Tippett Road.

**e. Those lots adjacent to the Williamsburg Estates subdivision, Piscataway Creek and Dower House Pond Branch shall be a minimum of 10,000 square feet.**

The subject plan has been reviewed for conformance with the applicable portions of this condition, which does not include the area adjacent to the Williamsburg Estates subdivision, and finds it in conformance.

**29. All structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13 and all applicable County laws.**

This requirement has been carried forward.

- 31. The applicant shall meet and work with M-NCPPC Parks and Recreation staff and the parties of record to assist in the selection and construction of recreational facilities for the parkland being dedicated. At the time of building permit, the applicant shall contribute \$500 per unit to a Parks and Recreation fund for the construction of a recreational park, as part of a future recreational center. The applicant is permitted up to 410 units on the property.**

The previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure proposed only the dedication and grading of the identified parkland, with no specific plan for recreational facilities. The applicant has submitted a concept plan for the proposed park on Parcel E to DPR, which is addressed further in Finding 10 of this report. The park construction will be funded through a future M-NCPPC Capital Improvement Program and the applicant's monetary contribution of \$500 per dwelling unit. DPR will coordinate any future meetings with the applicant and the community relating to planning and design of the recreational facilities for the park.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07005:** The relevant Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-07005, was approved by the Planning Board on October 29, 2009 subject to 35 conditions. All of the conditions of the preliminary plan approval are still applicable and the following warrant discussion in relation to the subject SDP:

2. **A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved at the time of specific design plan (SDP).**

A TCPII was submitted with the subject SDP and is recommended for approval.

3. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with the Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 8327602-2000-04 and any subsequent revisions.**

Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8327602-2000-04 was revised and is valid through May 15, 2016. General Note 11 on the SDP will need to be revised to provide the current stormwater management concept plan number and approval date.

9. **The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the grading of Parcel E and installation of the ten-foot-wide asphalt trail along Dressage Drive on park property to DPR of M-NCPPC prior to the approval of building permits.**

This condition must be fulfilled prior to issuance of the first building permit.

11. **Prior to the approval of final plats, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall convey to M-NCPPC 120± acres of open-space land (Parcel D and E) as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**

**Exhibit A and maybe modified by the approved specific design plan (SDP) which includes Parcels D and E. Land to be conveyed shall be subject the following:**

- c. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to the M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.**

The submitted SDP indicates the boundaries and acreage of proposed Parcels D and E, to be dedicated to M-NCPPC, which combined total approximately 120 acres.

- 12. Prior to the approval of each building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall contribute a per dwelling unit fee to DPR (M-NCPPC). Funds shall be placed in an account specifically established for the Community Park on Parcel E, as set forth in CDP-0701.**

This condition has been carried forward.

- 13. Prior to the approval of the first final plat the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall obtain approval of a specific design plan which includes:**
  - a. The design, specific of the location, and trigger for the construction of a ten-foot-wide asphalt trail and equestrian trail along the south side of Dressage Drive from Frank Tippett Road, crossing Dressage Drive and then the ten-foot-wide trail along the entire frontage of Parcel E, at the location as shown on DPR Exhibit A. Detailed construction drawings including trail locations, grading and details shall be reviewed and approved and reflected on street construction permits approved by DPW&T, either within the ROW or on Parcels D and E. The trail shall be constructed in phase with Dressage Drive construction, or as determined with the SDP.**
  - b. At the time of Dressage Drive road construction, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a curb cut for the future vehicular access the Community Park. DPR staff shall review and approve location and width of the curb cut at the time of SDP approval.**
  - c. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall rough grade and stabilize 15 acres of the Community Park area (Parcel E) north of Dressage Drive in phase with development. Rough grading shall be completed prior to issuance of 100th building permit, or as determined appropriate with the SDP. The grading plan for the Community Park shall be reviewed and approved by DPR staff at the time of SDP approval for the purpose of assuring that the park is usable.**

- d. Determine the appropriate location for one vehicular access from an interior public street to Parcel D (M-NCPPC) at the proposed locations as shown on DPR Exhibit A. The boundary between Parcel C (HOA) and Parcel D shall be adjusted to provide direct vehicular access from the park property to the internal public street.**

Each of the above requirements of Condition 13 was addressed in Finding 9 of the previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure. Plats MMB 239-61, MMB 239-62, and MMB 239-63 for road dedication were approved by the Planning Board on December 6, 2013 in conformance with SDP-1202. The approval of any plat beyond road dedication will be subject to this condition.

- 22. Prior to Planning Board approval of a specific design plan which includes 18PR971 and/or 18PR996, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a plan for:**
  - a. Evaluating the resources at the Phase II level, or**
  - b. Avoiding and preserving the resources in place.**
- 23. Prior to the approval of the first specific design plan the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review.**
- 24. Prior to the approval of the first specific design plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs successors, and/or assignees, shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I, Phase II, or Phase III archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and the public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and the M-NCPPC staff archeologist. The SDP shall include the timing for the installation of the signage and the implementation of public outreach measures.**

The subject SDP includes Archeological Site 18PR996. Phase II investigations were completed on this site in 2009; no further work was requested by Historic Preservation staff.

- 25. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, and/or assignees, shall coordinate all Section 106 review with the Historic Preservation Section (M-NCPPC), the US Army Corp of Engineers, and the Maryland Historical Trust. National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of the development on historic resources, to include archeological sites.**

The Environmental Planning Section will coordinate the protection of historic resources with the Historic Preservation Section during Section 106 review for the proposed disturbances to wetland,

wetland buffers, streams, and waters of the U.S. This condition has been carried forward as a condition of approval of this SDP.

- 28. The first specific design plan shall demonstrate an attractive treatment of Parcel A in its interim state, prior to the filing of a SDP for development of Parcel A as a day care center. This treatment may include the planting of vegetation near the roadway frontage, planting of a wildflower mix or any other treatment that will provide for an attractive view from the roadway, unless the development of Parcel A is the first SDP.**

The previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure proposed a 100-foot-wide buffer with attractive plantings near the roadway frontage of Parcel A in fulfillment of this condition.

- 30. Prior to the approval of the first final plat, in conformance with the 1993 and 1994 Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Subregion VI Study Area (Planning Areas 79, 82A, 82B, 86A, 86B, 87A, 87B) CDP-0701 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-111), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the following trail improvements, subject to the approval of a specific design plan:**

- a. Provide a standard sidewalk along the subject site's entire frontage of Frank Tippett Road, unless modified by DPW&T.**

The previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure showed a sidewalk along the frontage of Frank Tippett Road.

- b. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.**

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 for infrastructure showed sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.

- c. The applicant shall construct the East-West Trail required as part of Exhibit 44 of approved Basic Plan A-9738-C. The timing of construction shall be determined at the time of specific design plan.**

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 for infrastructure showed the subject trail and a condition setting the timing of its construction as prior to issuance of the 250th building permit. This condition has been carried forward.

- d. The applicant shall construct the Tributary Trail required as part of Exhibit 44 of approved Basic Plan A-9738-C. The timing of construction shall be determined at the time of specific design plan.**

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 showed the subject trail. A condition set the timing of its construction as prior to issuance of the 150th building permit. This condition has been carried forward.

- e. **The design of the equestrian trails should be in accordance with the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. Alignment of the trails (the Tributary and East-West Trails) shall preserve mature tree specimens as much as possible. The developer shall be responsible for clearing the trails to a width of 12 feet with a vertical clearance of 12 feet. The trail surface shall be eight feet wide, of compacted earth with stumps removed and shall afford dry passage. The use of geofabrics may be necessary in wet areas, applied beneath a gravel base course. Fords at stream crossings shall afford safe footing for horses and the approach slopes be minimized to prevent erosion.**
- f. **The trail along Dressage Drive shall be designed to accommodate equestrians from Frank Tippett Road to the Tributary Trail. A minimum four-foot-wide grass strip shall be included adjacent to the paved trail. This grass strip shall be free of landscaping, above ground utilities and other obstructions. The equestrian component of the trail shall be indicated on the approved SDP.**
- g. **Signage shall be required and reviewed at the time of SDP indicating that the Tributary Trail and East-West Trail are for the use of residents of the subject site and patrons of Merrymount Equestrian Center only, and shall include the triggers for construction.**

Conditions were included in the previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure to ensure that these requirements were met.

- 31. **Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210.00 to DPW&T for the placement of a bikeway sign(s) along Frank Tippett Road, designated a Class III Bikeway. A note shall be placed on the final plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit. If DPW&T declines the signage, this condition shall be void. If road frontage improvements are required by DPW&T, wide outside curb lanes or asphalt shoulders are recommended to accommodate bicycle traffic.**

This condition will be fulfilled prior to issuance of building permits.

- 32. **Prior to the approval of the first final plat the applicant and the applicant's heirs and or assignees shall record in land records of Prince George's County the cooperative use agreement for part of Parcel F between the applicant and Merrymount Equestrian Center dated July 12, 2008. The applicant shall also demonstrate at that time, a cooperative use agreement between the HOA (applicant)**

**and Merrymount Equestrian Center for the equestrian trails on Parcel B and C. Both agreements shall terminate in the event that Equestrian Center ceases to operate, unless extended with the agreement of all parties to the easement.**

This condition was included in the previously approved SDP-1202 for infrastructure and is required to be fulfilled prior to final plat approval.

**33. At the time of final plat the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall dedicated a 10-foot public utility easement (PUE) along all the public rights-of-way.**

The submitted SDP shows a ten-foot-wide public utility easement along all public rights-of-way.

**35. All structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 13 and all applicable County laws.**

This condition has been carried forward.

10. **Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 for Infrastructure:** Specific Design Plan SDP-1202 for infrastructure was approved by the Planning Board on April 25, 2013 subject to 18 conditions. The following condition warrants discussion in relation to the subject SDP:

**18. The applicant shall include in any future Specific Design Plan application a specific infrastructure plan for the recreational facilities that will serve this development and the surrounding community. This plan shall include the selected recreational facilities for the parkland being dedicated and provide a projected timetable for its construction. In formulating this plan, the applicant shall have met and consulted with the M-NCPPC Parks and Recreation staff, the Brookwood-Hollaway Civic Association, and the Williamsburg Estates Citizens Association.**

The applicant submitted a concept plan for the proposed park to DPR along with a timetable for the anticipated park construction. DPR is recommending a condition that a revised concept plan be submitted for approval prior to certificate of approval of the subject SDP. Further discussion of the concept plan is found in Finding 14 of this report.

11. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the Residential Suburban Development (R-S) Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. The subject application is in conformance with the applicable requirements of Section 27-511, Purposes; Section 27-512, Uses; Section 27-513, Regulations; and Section 27-514, Minimum Size Exceptions, of the Zoning Ordinance governing development in the R-S Zone.



b. 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);**

The plan conforms to the requirements of CDP-0701 as detailed in Finding 8 above and the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* as detailed in Finding 11 below.

(2) **The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development;**

The proposed plan for architecture and the creation of 106 lots will have no impact on the previous finding that the project will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time, as was found in the approval of Preliminary Plan 4-07005.

(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 provided a copy of approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8327602-2000-05 dated May 2, 2013. A referral received from Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) indicated that the subject SDP is consistent with that approved plan. General Note 11 should be corrected to provide the current stormwater management concept number and date. This is required by a condition below.

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

In a memorandum dated April 9, 2014, the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of TCPII-002-02-02 subject to conditions. Those conditions have been included in the Planning Board approval.

**(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).**

In a memorandum dated October 4, 2012, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is grandfathered from this requirement because the project has a previously approved preliminary plan.

12. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per Section 27-528(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, a SDP must conform to the applicable standards of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). The proposed development of residential lots is subject to conformance to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the Landscape Manual.

The applicant has not provided the required landscape schedules for Sections 4.1, 4.6, or 4.7. The submitted SDP provides the required schedule and notes showing the requirements being met for the proposed landscaping per Section 4.9. Although it appears the applicant has provided the required landscaping on the lots in compliance with Section 4.1, a schedule must be provided indicating the number and type of plant units provided to meet the requirements of the section. The applicant must also show compliance with Section 4.6 for those lots which have rear yards that face a street. The SDP is further subject to Section 4.7. The applicant should provide notes on the appropriate SDP sheets indicating that no buffer is required for those lots adjacent to the stormwater management facilities on Parcels G and I. It is anticipated that Phase Two development will also consist of single-family detached development which will be compatible with those lots currently proposed which abut Phase Two; however, further analysis will be undertaken at the time Phase Two is proposed. These revisions may require the applicant to revise the schedule and plantings list for Section 4.9. All landscape plan revisions will be required prior to certificate of approval.

13. **Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site is more than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. This site also has previously approved tree conservation plans that have not been implemented. A revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-110-90/02, was approved with Preliminary Plan 4-07005 that reflects the currently proposed use for the subject property.

The revised TCPII appropriately reflects the site statistics found on revised Natural Resources Inventory NRI-015-07-01.

The revised TCPII uses a phased worksheet, which includes the current revised SDP for Phase One proposing the clearing of 9.70 acres of the existing 26.89 acres of upland woodland, and clearing 0.75 acre of the existing 44.14 acres of woodland in the 100-year floodplain. The woodland conservation threshold for the entire site is 49.73 acres and, based upon the currently proposed clearing, the woodland conservation requirement for Phase One development is 52.90 acres. The plan proposes 16.43 acres of on-site preservation with Phase One, and 91.44 acres of on-site preservation in future phases in fulfillment of the woodland conservation requirement for the subject property.

The revised TCPII is consistent with the previously approved plan certified as TCPII-002-02-01, except for the addition of lot lines, structural footprints, and site elements for the current phase. No champion, specimen, or historic trees are proposed to be removed.

One technical revision to the TCPII plan is required to revise the title block on all sheets to read “Infrastructure for Site and Phase One Development,” which accurately reflects the current application, and will be further updated as additional phases are developed.

The technical revisions are included in the Planning Board approval.

14. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The comments are summarized as follows:

- a. **Historic Preservation**—In a memorandum dated February 26, 2014, the Historic Preservation Section offered the following information:

The subject property does not include any identified historic resources, but is adjacent to the Joshua Turner House, Historic Site 82A-017, located at 8801 Frank Tippett Road (Tax Map 118 A-2).

The Joshua Turner House, built in the 1880s, is a two-and-one-half story, cross-gable frame dwelling with paneled gable peaks and a twentieth century stucco covering. The house was built for Joshua J. Turner, a Baltimore entrepreneur who specialized in agricultural fertilizers. The house, which also exhibits elegant Victorian interior trim, is significant as the late 19th century country house of a successful businessman, and for its fine Queen Anne-style decorative detail. The historic site’s environmental setting includes approximately five acres (Part of Parcel 91).

The Joshua Turner House historic site has included an equestrian training and riding facility, Merrymount, operated by its current owners for approximately 30 years. A portion

of Merrymount's operations are located on the adjacent developing property through cooperative agreements between the owners of Merrymount and the owners of the adjacent property. Over time, Merrymount has become a prominent local and regional equestrian facility. The portion of the developing property that includes some of the Merrymount facilities is not currently proposed for development through the subject application.

As currently proposed on the subject plan, the applicant's street names are based on equestrian terms that reflect both the area's equestrian heritage and the operation of the adjacent Turner House historic site as the Merrymount equestrian facility.

### **Archeology**

Phase I archeological investigations were conducted on the subject property in May 2009. Four copies of the final Phase I report were submitted and were approved by the Historic Preservation Section on August 6, 2009. Three archeological sites were identified in the survey. Site 18PR971 is an early twentieth century domestic site, Site 18PR972 consists of the ruins of a twentieth century tenant farmer house and adjacent barn, and Site 18PR973 is a dense scatter of brick that likely represents a nineteenth century tobacco barn that had been destroyed by the late twentieth century. No further work was recommended on any of the archeological sites. The Planning Board concurs that no additional archeological work is necessary on Sites 18PR972 and 18PR973.

The Planning Board did not concur with the report's conclusion that no additional work was necessary on Site 18PR971. Site 18PR971 represents a late nineteenth to early twentieth century tenant house, a common property but one not well studied archeologically, in Prince George's County. The Planning Board finds that Phase II investigations should be conducted on Site 18PR971 to determine if any intact cultural deposits or features are present. A Phase II work plan should be submitted to Historic Preservation staff prior to beginning any work.

The Phase I survey also identified an area in the southeastern portion of Field F2 where brick and some nineteenth century domestic material were found. The applicant's archeological consultant was directed to record the brick fragments and associated nineteenth century artifacts as an archeological site. Although the subject property was not the primary residence of any of the eighteenth or nineteenth century owners, it is likely that tenant houses or slave quarters were located on the subject property. The Calverts, Brookes, and Sewalls, who owned the property during the course of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, owned large numbers of slaves. These types of sites leave few physical remains or extensive artifact scatters that are visible on the surface. However, subsurface features may still exist. This sparse scatter of brick and domestic material was believed to represent one such site. The Planning Board finds that the artifact scatter should be assigned an archeological site number and that Phase II investigations should be conducted to determine if any intact cultural deposits or features were intact below the plow zone.

The artifact scatter was designated archeological site number 18PR996 and Phase II investigations were conducted in November 2009. Seventeen artifacts were recovered, including pieces of brick, hand wrought and cut nails, one piece of earthenware, five pieces of pearlware, and oyster shell. A shallow pit feature was identified in Test Units 2 and 3. The feature was likely part of what was once a much larger borrow pit that had been filled. No artifacts were found in the pit. The site was heavily eroded from continued use as a plowed field. Site 18PR996 was defined as a severely truncated early nineteenth century domestic site and possibly represents a temporary habitation for enslaved laborers working the adjoining fields. Due to the disturbance of the site by plowing and erosion, the site lacked integrity and no further work was recommended. The Planning Board concurred that no further work was necessary on Site 18PR996. Four copies of the final Phase II report were accepted and approved by the Historic Preservation Section on January 6, 2010.

Section 106 review may also require archeological survey for state or federal agencies. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties to include archeological sites. This review is required when state or federal monies or permits are required for a project. A Section 106 review has been completed.

The descriptions of the archeological sites on the plans should be changed from “Historic Site 18PR996” and “Historic Site 18PR971” to “Archeological Site 18PR996” and “Archeological Site 18PR971.”

### **Conclusions**

1. The area within the subject SDP is not adjacent to the Joshua Turner House (Historic Site 82A-017) and will not have a direct visual impact on the site. However, the SDP for the portion of the proposed development that is adjacent to the historic site should address the buffering requirements of the Landscape Manual, the layout of streets and street lighting, the pattern of building lots, the orientation of buildings, and the specific character and materials of the proposed architecture that may be visible from the Joshua Turner House.
2. The use of the Joshua Turner House historic site as an equestrian facility is part of the long-standing equestrian heritage of Prince George’s County that dates to the eighteenth century. Although the portion of the developing property that includes some of the Turner property equestrian facilities is not proposed for development through the subject application, the retention and expansion of these facilities as an amenity for the developing community would enhance and continue the county’s historic equestrian tradition. The character and design of the developing property should reflect the presence of the adjacent equestrian facility and provide

tangible connections to it through a network of pedestrian and equestrian trails. Every effort should be made to ensure the protection of the equestrian facility.

3. The applicant's proposed street names for the developing community reflect the historic significance of the developing property, the immediate vicinity, and the area's equestrian heritage.
4. Phase II archeological investigations have been completed on Site 18PR996. The final reports for the Phase I and II investigations have been submitted and approved by the Historic Preservation Section.
5. Phase II archeological investigations have not been completed on Site 18PR971. Phase II and, if required, Phase III investigations should be completed prior to approval of the first SDP for the area that contains Site 18PR971.

The Planning Board concludes that the subject application will not impact any significant archeological resources or the Joshua Turner House historic site. The previous conditions applicable to the area located within the subject plan have been satisfied.

- b. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated March 27, 2014, the Community Planning Division offered the following comments in regard to the subject application:

The development proposal conforms to the 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA) recommendations for a residential low land use. The proposed project design also meets the relevant policy and strategies associated with the Subregion 6 Master Plan.

The subject property is located within the Joint Base Andrews Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) impact area. The western portion of the property is within Imaginary Surface E, establishing a height limit of approximately 488 feet above the runway surface. The eastern portion of the property is within Imaginary Surface F, establishing a height limit of 500 feet above the runway surface. Where there is a height limit for the underlying zoning district and for the ILUC, the most restrictive will apply. This property is outside of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contours, so noise attenuation is not required. The property is not in an accident potential zone, so no controls on use or density are required. The mapped categories on the subject site do not prevent any of the proposed development and should be noted and graphically depicted on the SDP and any other future development plans.

- c. **Transportation Planning**—In a memorandum dated March 26, 2014, the Transportation Planning Section indicated that, as of this writing, none of the transportation-related conditions approved with Preliminary Plan 4-07005 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-112(A)) have been met and, therefore, they all still remain valid.

Upon review of the pending application, the applicant is proposing a road network that is consistent with the approved preliminary plan. The approved 410-lot subdivision will be served by two access points on Frank Tippett Road. One of the two proposed access roads will be Dressage Drive, a proposed 80-foot road with a 36-foot curb-to-curb cross section. This road, in combination with the second access road (with a similar cross section) will function as the “main street” through the development. As a result of its functionality, it is expected to carry the heaviest traffic volumes amongst the internal roads within the development. It is for this reason why every effort should be made to limit the number of driveways that front directly on this road. In situations where a lot is located at the intersection of Dressage Drive and other internal streets, the preferred location of that driveway should be on the minor street. There are several instances in this proposal where this preference was not evident. A condition is included in the Planning Board approval addressing this issue.

- d. **Subdivision Review**—The Subdivision Review Section provided an analysis of the site plan’s conformance with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07005 in a memorandum dated April 17, 2014.

The subject site is located on Tax Map 117 in Grid F-2 and is within the R-S Zone. The site is currently undeveloped. The applicant has submitted a SDP for the development of 106 single-family dwellings. The acreage provided in the general notes of the SDP indicates that the SDP is for the entire area of land (324.38 acres) covered by the preliminary plan, which should be corrected.

The site is the subject of Preliminary Plan 4-07005 for the TBLU Property (342.38 acres). The Planning Board adopted the resolution of approval (PGCPB No. 08-112(A)) on November 19, 2009. The validity period for the preliminary plan was extended to December 31, 2015 pursuant to Council Bill CB-70-2013. A final plat for the subject property must be accepted by M-NCPPC before the preliminary plan expires or a new preliminary plan is required. The applicant may request an extension of the validity period for the preliminary plan beyond the validity date.

Specific Design Plan SDP-1202-01 is in substantial conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-07005, including lot layout and size, if all of the applicable conditions have been addressed. Failure of the site plan and record plat to match (including bearings, distances, and lot sizes) will result in permits being placed on hold until the plans are corrected.

The Planning Board approval includes a condition to address two minor technical revisions.

- e. **Trails**—In comments dated March 31, 2014, the Transportation Planning Section reviewed the SDP application referenced above for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and/or the appropriate area

master/sector plan in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements.

The Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA includes three master plan trail issues that impact the subject site. Stream valley trails are proposed along both Piscataway Creek and Dower House Branch. Frank Tippet Road is designated as a master plan bike/trail corridor. The master plan trails issues and internal connectivity were addressed via the SDP for infrastructure, as well as the approvals for the preliminary plan, CDP, and basic plan. The prior approvals all contained a large amount of detailed analysis regarding the trails network and included many subsequent conditions of approval. The submitted plans are for the development of residential units within the already approved infrastructure. The plans appear to be in conformance with these prior approvals.

As part of this review, Planning Board evaluated the sidewalk network serving the proposed residential units and recommends that, prior to certification, the plans be amended to reflect ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) curb cuts and ramps at all sidewalk and road intersections. A short additional segment of sidewalk is also recommended along Dressage Drive. All prior conditions of approval regarding master plan trail facilities still apply.

Sidewalks and ADA ramps are shown on the plan. They were included on the previous SDP-1202 for infrastructure and are not within the scope of the current SDP.

### **Conclusion**

From the standpoint of non-motorized transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable, fulfills the intent of applicable master plans and functional plans, fulfills prior conditions of approval, and meets the finding required for a SDP as described in Section 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance.

- f. **Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In a memorandum dated April 25, 2014, DPR reviewed the above referenced SDP for conformance with the requirements of Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0701, Preliminary Plan 4-07055, and Specific Design Plan-1202 as they pertain to this SDP, and their findings are below.

The applicant has submitted a revision to the previously approved SDP-1202 (for infrastructure only) which proposes to add the first phase of the proposed residential development. The proposed first phase of development is to include 106 single-family detached homes on 106 lots. The previous approvals on this property (also known as TLBU) include CDP-0701, 4-07005, and SDP-1202. All of these prior approvals had conditions which addressed the mandatory dedication of parkland, along with additional recreational facilities requirements.

The applicant has provided verbal acknowledgment that they have consulted with the Brookwood-Hollaway Civic Association and the Williamsburg Estates Citizens



Association, but DPR has not received any written documentation or results from those meetings.

### **Findings**

The park facilities as proposed by the applicant are typical and consistent with a community park that DPR would construct on property of this size. DPR has reviewed the park concept and believes that some refinements to the park concept will be necessary. DPR believes that, due to the size and shape of Parcel E, it may accommodate a separate football and soccer field. DPR also believes that the playground area should be relocated away from the rear of the proposed residential dwellings. DPR requests that a revised concept plan be submitted for review prior to final plan approval. DPR acknowledges that this plan is only a concept for the proposed park facilities and that the facilities plan could be amended pending final programming for the park. DPR has reviewed the proposed timetable as submitted by the applicant and agrees to add the proposed park as a candidate project in a future Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) based on funding capacity. The required developer contributions will not be sufficient to construct a community park; therefore, development of the community park will require additional funding to be appropriated by the County Council. Should this funding be appropriated, it will be placed in the M-NCPPC CIP. Meanwhile, with the approval of this plan, DPR will set up an account to allow for collection of the developer fees (on a per unit basis) that will be used towards the new park.

The Planning Board approval includes a condition that the applicant submit a revised park concept plan that reflects more efficient use of Parcel E.

- g. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated April 9, 2014, the Environmental Planning Section offered a summary of the environmental site description and provided an analysis of the SDP and Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) for conformance with various environmental requirements.

The subject application is grandfathered from the requirements in Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because the project has a previously approved preliminary plan.

The project is also grandfathered from the most recent requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, because it has a previously approved tree conservation plan.

### **Site Description**

The 342.38-acre property in the R-S Zone is bounded by Piscataway Creek on the west, Frank Tippett Road on the east, and Dower House Branch on the south. There are streams, wetlands, and 100-year floodplains on the property associated with Piscataway Creek in the Potomac River watershed. There are no nearby sources of traffic-generated noise. The proposed development is not a noise generator. Based on the most recent Air Installation

Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study released to the public in July 2008 by Joint Air Force Base Andrews, aircraft-generated noise is not significant. According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the principal soils on the site are in the Adelphia, Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Chillum, Croom, Fallsington, Iuka, Marr, Matapeake, Ochlockonee, Sassafra, Shrewsbury, and Westphalia series. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MD DNR), Natural Heritage Program, a sensitive species project review area (SSPRA), as delineated on the SSPRA GIS layer, is found on this property. No designated scenic or historic roads are affected by this development. The site is in the Developing Tier according to the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. The site contains regulated areas, evaluation areas, and network gaps as identified on the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* (Green Infrastructure Plan). The site is located within a priority funding area.

#### **Conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan**

The subject property was evaluated for conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan during the review of the CDP and preliminary plan and is not reviewed for conformance with the current application.

- (1) A revised Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-030-05-01, was signed by the Environmental Planning Section on June 30, 2008. The environmental features shown on the revised NRI plan have been correctly reflected on the revised SDP and TCPH.

The signed NRI contains a forest stand delineation which describes four forest stands totaling 183.06 acres (53 percent of the property). There are 135.90 acres of upland woodlands and 47.16 acres of woodlands within the 100-year floodplain based on the 1989 floodplain delineation. Sixteen specimen trees were identified which suggests that logging may have occurred in the past. Of the 16 specimen trees, nine are noted to be in poor condition and none are significant by either county or state standards.

There are woodlands on this site that are part of the cultural and natural heritage of Prince George's County where woodland conservation on-site has been focused.

Stand A contains 93.13 acres of bottomland forest dominated by red maple, sweetgum, and yellow poplar with an average diameter at breast height of 11.9 inches. The boundaries of this forest stand are apparent on the 1938 air photos because, except for Stand D, the remainder of the property was either agricultural fields or pasture. Thirteen specimen trees occur in this stand. This stand is almost wholly within the expanded stream buffers addressed in Consideration 3 of Basic Plan A-9738-C, the buffers required by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations, and the regulated areas shown in the Green Infrastructure Plan, and has a very high priority for preservation.

Stand B contains 37.37 acres of early-successional mixed hardwoods dominated by red oak, sweetgum, and yellow poplar with an average diameter at breast height of 5.3 inches. Aerial photography indicates that, in 1938, all of the areas occupied by this stand were in pasture or agricultural use, but by 1965 these areas were no longer being cultivated and beginning to generate into woodland.

Stand C contains 8.36 acres of early successional woodland dominated by Virginia pine and red oak with an average diameter at breast height of 8.6 inches. In 1938, all of the areas occupied by this stand were in pasture or agricultural use. Aerial photography from 1965 shows that these areas were no longer being cultivated, and beginning to regenerate into woodland. Only one specimen tree occurs in these stands.

Neither Stand B nor C contain expanded stream buffers and do not abut expanded stream buffers. Portions of these stands are within evaluation areas designated by the Green Infrastructure Plan. These stands are relatively immature, have low diversity of trees and understory species with no special characteristics, and are rated as fair- to low-priority for preservation.

Stand D contains 44.20 acres of upland hardwoods dominated by white oak, yellow poplar, hickory, American beech, and red oak with an average diameter at breast height of 14.3 inches. Two specimen trees occur in this stand, which contains a high diversity of tree species, shrub species, and native herbaceous species. The stand forms an upland connection between the main stem of Piscataway Creek on the west to the headwaters of the stream on the east. On September 7, 2007, the MD DNR, Natural Heritage Program, and the Environmental Planning Section conducted a field visit. Stand D was extensively studied and determined to be a "rich woods," which is an uncommon designation within any portion of the Maryland coastal plain. The Environmental Planning Section classifies this woodland type as exceptional because small patches of this type of woodland are rarely encountered and many of the understory species are uncommon. Stand D is entirely within a designated evaluation area of the Green Infrastructure Plan. Because of the age of this woodland, the high plant diversity in all elements of its structure, the size of this uncommon woodland type, continuity with the Piscataway Creek stream valley, and inclusion within the evaluation area of the Green Infrastructure Plan, this stand has a very high priority for preservation.

No further information is required with regard to revised NRI-030-05-01.

- (2) According to information obtained from the MD DNR, Natural Heritage Program, a SSPRA as delineated on the SSPRA GIS layer occurs on this property. A state-listed endangered species (few-flowered tick-trefoil, *Desmodium pauciflorum*)

was discovered within Stand D on a field visit in 1990. Although this species was not found on the September 7, 2007 field visit by staff, it is not to be construed that the species no longer occurs on the site even though the plant has not been physically located. It may still occur in this area and, if the woodlands are preserved, it may be physically located in the future. This is one of the reasons why forest Stand D is an extremely high priority for preservation.

At the time of preliminary plan, it was recommended that all woodland conservation areas proposed on-site, except for those on property to be dedicated to DPR, be included in the delineated conservation easements on the final plat.

The entire woodland conservation requirement will be met on-site with high-priority woodland preservation in environmentally-sensitive areas. Protection of the woodland conservation areas as platted conservation easements of this site will be addressed at the time of final plat.

- (3) Impacts to significant environmental features that are required to be protected by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations require variation requests in conformance with Section 24-113 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Variation requests for nine impacts were submitted and evaluated with Preliminary Plan 4-07005. The Environmental Planning Section supported all nine variation requests for the reasons stated below. Impact 1 was for the installation of an outfall for a stormwater management facility. Six of the proposed impacts were to allow connection of new development to existing sanitary sewer lines that are wholly within the expanded stream buffers (Impacts 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, and 9). Impacts 4 and 7 were for installation of the public roads that will allow access and services to the majority of the property. All of the impacts for outfalls for stormwater management ponds have been shown.

The impacts to the expanded stream buffer shown on the revised SDP and TCPII are in general conformance with those approved at the time of preliminary plan review and those approved with the previous SDP and TCPII approvals.

- (4) According to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*, the principal soils on the site are in the Adelpia, Aura, Beltsville, Bibb, Chillum, Croom, Fallsington, Iuka, Marr, Matapeake, Ochlockonee, Sassafra, Shrewsbury and Westphalia series. Development has been placed in areas where the soils should not pose special problems for foundation or drainage.

This information is provided for the applicant's benefit. A soils report may be required by Prince George's County during the permit review process.

- (5) Based on the Air Installation Compatible Use Zone (AICUZ) Study released to the public in 2007 by Joint Air Force Base Andrews (JBA), aircraft-generated noise in the vicinity is significant, but the modeled noise levels for the subject property are less than the state acceptable noise level of 65 dBA Ldn for residential land uses.

The JBA Joint Land Use Study (JLUS) from December 2009 recommends mitigation for noise, height, and accident potential zones in neighborhoods near JBA. Legislation implementing JLUS has been proposed, but not adopted. This referral addresses the recommendations of JLUS, not the proposed legislation. This property is outside of the 65 dBA Ldn lines, so recommended noise attenuation is not required. The property is not in an accident potential zone, so no controls on use or density are recommended.

No further information concerning mitigation of noise impacts is required with the subject application.

- (6) A valid stormwater management concept approval letter and associated plans, 8327602-2000-05, were submitted with the current application which expires on May 2, 2016.

Condition 26 of CDP-0701 required that the SDP show the use of forebays with the proposed stormwater management plan. The current SDP and TCPII show the use of forebays in accordance with the requirements of the Maryland Department of Environment's Stormwater Management Design Manual.

No additional information with regard to stormwater management is required with the current application.

### **Summary of Recommended Findings**

- (1) The revised SDP and TCPII can be found in conformance with A-9738-2.
- (2) The revised SDP and TCPII can be found in conformance with CDP-0701, Preliminary Plan 4-00064, and TCPI-110-90.
- (3) The regulated environmental features within the development envelope on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible.

The Planning Board approval includes conditions found below.

- h. **Public Facilities**—In a memorandum dated February 21, 2014 the Special Projects Section provided the following comments:

The Special Projects Section of the Countywide Planning Division has reviewed this SDP in accordance with Section 27-528(a)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, which states that:

**The development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities either shown in the appropriate Capital Improvement Program or provided as part of the private development.**

**Fire and Rescue**

The Special Projects Section has reviewed this SDP for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(d) and Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(C) and (E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(E) states that “A statement by the Fire Chief that the response time for the first due station in the vicinity of the property proposed for subdivision is a maximum of seven (7) minutes travel time. The Fire Chief shall submit monthly reports chronicling actual response times for call for service during the preceding month.” The proposed project is served by Clinton Fire/EMS Company 25, a first due response station (a maximum of seven minutes travel time), is located at 9025 Woodyard Road.

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

The Prince George’s County Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Years 2014–2019 provides funding to complete a major renovation of the existing Clinton Fire/EMS Company 25 facility at 9025 Woodyard Road.

The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.”

**Police Facilities**

The Special Projects Section has determined that this SDP is located in District V, Clinton. Police facilities have been determined to be adequate.

**Schools**

**Single-Family Detached**

<b>Affected School Clusters #</b>	<b>Elementary School Cluster 4</b>	<b>Middle School Cluster 2</b>	<b>High School Cluster 2</b>
Dwelling Units	106 DU	106 DU	106 DU
Pupil Yield Factor	0.164	0.130	0.144
Subdivision Enrollment	17	14	15
Actual Enrollment	3,383	4,599	11,684
Total Enrollment	3,400	4,613	11,699
State Rated Capacity	4,399	5,540	13,106
Percent Capacity	77%	83%	89%

County Council Bill CB-31-2003 established a school facilities surcharge in the amount of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. Council Bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation, and the current amounts are \$8,858 and \$15,185 to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

The school facilities surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

**Water and Sewerage**

Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 Water and Sewer Plan placed this property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System.

- i. **Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated April 8, 2014, the Site/Road Plan Review Division offered the following comments:

The property is located along the western side of Frank Tippett Road, just north of the Dower House Branch. A right-of-way dedication and frontage improvement in accordance

with DPW&T's urban four-lane collector road for existing Frank Tippett Road is required. Additionally, right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with DPW&T's specifications and standards are required for the proposed internal subdivision streets. The internal subdivision streets centerline radius is to be designed and constructed in accordance with DPW&T's Table 1-2 Design Criteria. These roadways are to be consistent with the approved master plan for this area.

The proposed site development is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 8327602-2000-05 dated May 2, 2013.

Prior to issuance of street construction permits, an eight-foot-wide concrete master-planned hiker-biker trail within the public roadway rights-of-way (immediately adjacent to the south side of proposed Dressage Drive, an 80-foot right-of-way, within the community), will be required. Additionally, as recommended by DPR, this trail shall be eight feet wide where it is adjacent to roadways in all locations.

It appears that DPIE has modified the trail width within the Dressage Drive right-of-way from ten feet to eight feet.

Any proposed and/or existing master plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between M-NCPPC and DPIE, and may involve rights-of-way reservation, dedication, and/or road construction in accordance with DPIE's specification and standards.

- j. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated March 14, 2014, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Health Department stated that they had completed a health impact assessment review of the subject SDP. The scope of the current SDP submission and associated health impact assessment review is limited to details associated with Phase One of the project. They provided the following summarized comments:

- (1) There is an increasing body of scientific research suggesting that community gardens enhance nutrition and physical activity and promote the role of public health in improving quality of life. The developer should consider setting aside space for a community garden.

The applicant is encouraged to consider the feasibility of providing a community garden.

- (2) During the construction phases of this project, no dust should be allowed to cross over property lines and impact adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.



- (3) During the construction phases of this project, no noise should be allowed to adversely impact activities on the adjacent properties. Indicate intent to conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified in Subtitle 19 of the Prince George's County Code.

A condition requiring the applicant to add a note to the plans indicating that they will comply with the above conditions relating to dust and noise during construction is included in the Planning Board approval.

- k. **Prince George's County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated February 28, 2014, the Community Services Division of the Police Department indicated there were no crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) issues at this time and that they will work with DPIE to determine street tree placement adjacent to streetlights.
- l. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—In a memorandum dated February 22, 2014, the Office of the Fire Marshal provided standard comments regarding fire apparatus, hydrants, and lane requirements. Those issues will be enforced by the Fire/EMS Department at the time of issuance of permits.
- m. **Verizon**—Comments had not been received from Verizon.
- n. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—In an e-mail dated August 8, 2012, Verizon commented that a ten-foot-wide public utility easement had been provided along all public rights-of-way, but that in some areas it appeared that this easement was encumbered by other easements.

The exact easement locations will be finalized at the time of final plat; however, the SDP has been revised so as to correct the proposed easement's conflict.

- o. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In an email dated February 27, 2014, WSSC provided comments relating to water and sewer service that will be required prior to issuance of permits.

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 Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-002-02-02), and further APPROVED Specific Design Plan SDP-1202-01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the specific design plan (SDP), the applicant shall revise the general notes to:
  - a. Add a general note indicating the correct acreage of land included in this SDP revision.

- b. Revise General Note 11 to indicate the current stormwater management concept plan number and date.
  - c. Add a general note indicating that all structures shall be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Standard 13 and all applicable county laws.
  - d. Add a general note indicating that the property is within the Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) impact area including the following language: “The property is within both Imaginary Surfaces E and F, establishing a height limit of approximately 488 feet above the runway surface. This property is outside of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contours and is not within an Accident Potential Zone, so no controls on use or density are required. The mapped categories on the subject site do not prevent any of the proposed development.”
  - e. Add a general note indicating compliance with Prince George’s County Health Department requirements relating to dust and noise during construction.
  - f. The day care center shall be deleted from the proposed uses.
2. Prior to certificate of approval, the following revisions shall be incorporated into the specific design plan:
    - a. A table shall be provided on the coversheet indicating the approved front, side, and rear setbacks approved in Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0701.
    - b. The approval sheet shall show the certificate of approval for Specific Design Plan SDP-1202.
  3. Prior to certificate of approval, the applicant shall provide a minimum of two standard endwall features in a balanced composition on all Ryan Homes and Mid-Atlantic Builders models.
  4. A minimum of four standard endwall features shall be provided in a balanced composition on corner and highly-visible lots, including Lots 1, 2, 10, 11, 18, 19, 30, 39, and 54, Block A; Lots 1, 20, 21, and 34, Block B; and Lot 1, Block C.
  5. Prior to certificate of approval, the following revisions shall be made to the Ryan Homes models:
    - a. The Lincolnshire optional dormer above the garage that is not completely enclosed by the roof plane and shall be deleted.
    - b. Milan, Elevation A, shall either include a standard front porch or shall not be offered. Elevation K shall be deleted.

- c. Sheffield, Elevations A, B, and K, shall either incorporate two standard dormers over the garage or be deleted.
  - d. Venice, Elevation C with full brick veneer front, shall include either a standard specialty window, a portico above the front door, or a full porch.
6. Prior to certificate of approval, the following revisions shall be made to the Mid-Atlantic Builders models:
  - a. An additional standard feature (for a total of three) shall be provided for left side elevations where a front-loaded garage is provided and two standard endwall features are shown oriented toward the rear of the unit, to provide a balanced composition.
  - b. Where a side-loaded garage is provided, a standard window shall be provided on the second story left side elevation to provide a balanced composition.
  - c. Sheet 3M of the Monticello model shall be replaced to provide the elevation shown on the exhibit.
  - d. Sheet A22 of the Signoria model shall be revised to correct the title of the rear elevation.
  - e. Sheet 55 of the Somerset model shall be revised to indicate that the side elevations shown are the right side elevations. Sheet 67 shall be revised to indicate the correct standard first floor feature provided on the left side elevation with a garage extension. The applicant shall confirm whether Sheet 74, showing the left side elevation with an optional lower floor owner's suite, is correct as the roofline does not appear to be accurate.
7. No two identical model elevations shall be located immediately next to or across the street from one another.
8. No less than 50 percent of the total number of units shall have full brick or stone front façades.
9. No more than 15 percent of the total number of units shall have full vinyl siding front façades.
10. All architecture approved in this specific design plan for Phase One shall be permitted in subsequent phases of the development.
11. The applicant shall make the following revisions to the landscape plan prior to certificate of approval:
  - a. A Section 4.1 schedule shall be provided indicating the number and type of plant units provided to meet the requirements of the section.

- b. A Section 4.6 schedule shall be provided to show conformance for those lots which have rear yards that front on a street.
  - c. The applicant shall provide notes on the appropriate specific design plan sheets indicating that no buffer is required for those lots adjacent to the stormwater management facilities on Parcels G and I per Section 4.7 of the 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual.
  - d. The schedule and plantings list for Section 4.9 shall be revised as to indicate the additional plantings required.
12. Prior to certificate of approval of the specific design plan, the Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) shall be revised as follows:
- a. The title block on all sheets shall be revised to read: "Infrastructure for Site and Phase 1 Development."
  - b. Have the revised plan signed by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
  - c. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
13. Prior to certificate of approval, the applicant shall review with Urban Design Staff whether the driveways for the proposed corner units on Lots 18, 30, and 39, Block A; and Lots 1, 20, 21, and 34, Block B may reasonably be re-sited so that they are fronting on the minor streets rather than on Dressage Drive.
14. The applicant shall construct a ten-foot-wide concrete trail and a 12-foot-wide equestrian trail along the south side of Dressage Drive from Frank Tippet Road to the Tributary Trail in phase with the construction of Dressage Drive, or a width as modified by Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE).
15. The applicant shall construct a ten-foot-wide concrete trail in the Dressage Drive right-of-way along Parcel E in phase with the construction of Dressage Drive, or a width as modified by Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE).
16. The applicant shall construct a 30-foot-wide curb cut entrance along the frontage of Parcel E in phase with the construction of Dressage Drive, or a width as modified by Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE).
17. The applicant shall rough grade Parcel E and stabilize the graded areas according to the grading plan as approved by Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation, prior to issuance of the 50th building permit.

18. Prior to issuance of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210.00 to Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for placement of a bikeway sign(s) along Frank Tippet Road, a designated Class III bikeway. A note shall be placed on the final plat for payment to be received prior to issuance of the first building permit. If DPW&T declines the signage, this condition shall be void.
19. The applicant shall construct the segment of the Tributary Trail south of Passage Drive prior to issuance of the 150th building permit, as required by Exhibit 44 of approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9738-C.
20. The applicant shall construct the East-West Trail and the segment of the Tributary Trail north of Passage Drive prior to issuance of the 250th building permit, as required by Exhibit 44 of approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9738-C.

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 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Shoaff, with Commissioners Washington, Shoaff, Bailey and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Geraldo absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 15, 2014, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this ~~\*[5th day of June]~~ 29th day of May 2014 ~~\*and was administratively corrected on June 10, 2014.~~

Patricia Colihan Barney  
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:SL/CF:arj

\*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language