



**Architectural Model Data:**

<b>Model</b>	<b>Base Finished Square Footage</b>
Emory II	2,868
Florida State	2,660
Kingsport	3,510
Monticello	4,536
Oxford	2,530
Penn State	3,050
Princeton	3,002
Rembrandt	3,110
Westminster	3,450

- Location:** The subject site is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Enterprise Road (MD 193). The site is located within Planning Area 70, Council District 5, in the Developing Tier.
- Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the north by the right-of-way of Annapolis Road (MD 450); to the east by the right-of-way of Enterprise Road (MD 193); and to the southwest by existing single-family dwellings in the R-R Zone.
- Previous Approvals:** The subject site has a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04124, which was approved by the Planning Board on January 13, 2005 (PGCPB Resolution No. 05-28), subject to 15 conditions. Subsequently, Detailed Site Plan DSP-05052 was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on September 14, 2006, and then reviewed and approved by the District Council on May 14, 2007, subject to seven conditions. The subject site has an approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPH-160-05. The site also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 34128-2003-00, which is valid through February 14, 2016.
- Design Features:** The proposed subdivision is accessed via Parallel Road, which currently terminates in a cul-de-sac to the west of the subject site. The subject property consists of 7.23 acres of woods in the R-R Zone. The proposed development consists of Lots 1–11 with two-story, single-family detached dwelling units. The subject application proposes no changes, except for the addition of nine new Caruso house models for the subject site which include the Emory II, Florida State, Kingsport, Monticello, Oxford, Penn State, Princeton, Rembrandt, and Westminster. The smallest base finished square footage approved with DSP-05052 was 2,984 square feet, whereas the smallest proposed with the subject application is 2,530 square feet, a reduction of approximately 15 percent. The submitted site plan shows at least one of each proposed house type, but any house type could be built on any lot, as long as it fits within the required setbacks. The proposed models each offer several different front elevations, which are mainly of traditional architectural style, with

varied roof pitches and decorative architectural elements, such as shutters and enhanced trim. Some elevations lack sufficient roof variation and/or trim features and have for that reason been conditioned in this approval to be removed from the proposed elevations. Each single-family house has a front-load two-car garage as a standard feature, and multiple other options, including porches, side-load garages, morning rooms, and sunrooms. All are finished with standard vinyl siding or brick veneer. Most of the side elevations for the models provide a minimum of two standard architectural features; however, this has been included as a condition of approval to ensure all of them do. The total gross floor area of the proposed single-family dwellings is between 2,530 and 4,536 square feet.

The subject application proposes no changes to recreational features, limits of disturbance, stormwater features, noise mitigation measures, or other improvements proposed with the original approval.

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the R-R Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:
  - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27- 441(b), which governs permitted uses in residential zones. The proposed single-family detached dwellings are a permitted use.
  - b. The DSP is in general compliance with the requirements of Section 27-442, Regulations, for development in the R-R Zone, with the exception of the over six-foot-high required noise barrier which sits within the required 20-foot rear yard setback along the rear property lines of Lots 3–6. The previous DSP approval included a variance for this requirement, which remains valid as it has not changed with the subject application.
  
8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04124:** The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04124 for the subject property with 15 conditions on January 13, 2005. The conditions that are relevant to the review of this revision to a DSP are discussed as follows:
  2. **At the time of review of the LDSP, a Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved.**

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-160-05, was approved with the original DSP-05052 application. A revision to the TCPII is approved with this application.
  3. **Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #24231-2004-00 and any subsequent revisions.**

The subject site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 34128-2003-00, which is a revision of the approval identified in this condition. The current approval will expire on February 14, 2016. The approval letter submitted with this DSP includes a condition that requires a 50-foot-wide landscape buffer to screen the residential homes from the existing stormwater

management pond on the northern side of these lots. The proposed plan is in conformance with that condition.

**5. Prior to approval of the final plat of subdivision a Limited Detailed Site Plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to:**

- a. Ensure noise mitigation measures are established to mitigate noise to 65dBA Ldn from MD 450 and Enterprise Road, and that usable outdoor activity areas outside the 65dBA Ldn mitigated noise contour are provided. A Phase II noise study shall be submitted.**

The proposed change to house types does not affect the noise mitigation measures, which remain unchanged. The plan still demonstrates usable outdoor activity areas outside the 65 dBA Ldn mitigated noise contour.

- b. The noise wall shall be compatible with the SHA noise wall.**

The subject application does not propose a change to the noise wall, which was found to be compatible in the original approval.

- c. The noise wall shall not be located on individual homeowners' lots if it reduces the yard area associated with the principal dwelling below 20,000 square feet. In order to maintain minimum 20,000-square-foot lots, a homeowners association parcel may be created to accommodate the noise wall and/or associated berm.**

The subject application does not propose a change to the noise wall or lot configuration, which were found to fulfill this condition in the original approval.

- d. If variances are required (associated with the noise wall), they shall be filed with the LDSP. If not approved, appropriate berming may be necessary, resulting in a loss of lots.**

The subject application does not propose a change to the noise wall. A variance was required for the noise wall, and it was filed and approved with the original DSP.

- e. Review private recreational facilities on Parcel B to be conveyed to M-NCPPC. Review shall include conformance to the Parks and Recreational Facility Guidelines, establishing a bonding amount and triggers for construction of the trail connection to be constructed by the applicant from Parallel Road onto Parcel A, Holmehurst West Neighborhood Park providing a connection to the facilities on park property.**

The subject application does not propose a change to Parcel B or the private recreational facilities approved with the original DSP.

- f. Review of the lotting pattern to accommodate a more conventional lotting pattern, where side lot lines do not cross into the front yard, in front of the dwellings. Specifically Lot 4, at the end of the cul-de-sac. Revisions to the lotting pattern should result in the dwellings on Lots 4 and 5 being closer to the front street line.**

The subject application does not propose any changes to the lotting pattern approved with the original DSP.

- g. Grading and house sitings to ensure a harmonious relationship between dwellings and the dwellings and the street, and promote more on-site woodland conservation.**

The subject application, with a revision to proposed house footprints, requires only minor modifications to grading and house sitings. This does not substantially affect conformance with this requirement as was found with the original DSP approval.

- 6. Prior to signature approval of the TCPI the plan shall be revised as follows:**
  - a. Reflect revised preliminary plan per Planning Board hearing of January 20, 2005. Provide the required 40 feet of cleared rear yard area between the dwelling and the forest preservation edge, and show a continuous 50-foot-wide wooded buffer/forest preservation area in relation to the stormwater management pond. After this redesign has been made, adjust the woodland conservation worksheet accordingly.**

The subject application includes changes to the proposed house footprints, but maintains the 40 feet of cleared rear yard area and 50-foot-wide wooded buffer next to the stormwater management pond as required by this condition.

- 11. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a standard sidewalk along both sides of Parallel Road within the subject site, unless modified by DPW&T.**

The submitted site plan shows a standard sidewalk along both sides of Parallel Road.

- 9. Detailed Site Plan DSP-05052:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-05052 was approved by the Planning Board on September 14, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-202). Subsequently, the District Council reviewed the DSP on May 14, 2007 and approved it subject to seven conditions, of which the following are relevant to the review of this revision:

**1. Prior to signature approval of DSP-05052, the applicant shall:**

- b. Provide a detail sheet for the noise wall that illustrates a color compatible with the existing SHA noise wall.**

The subject application does not propose a change to the noise wall, which was found to be compatible in the original approval.

- c. Provide the following note on the plan: “No two units located next to or immediately across the street from each other may have identical front elevations.”**

The subject application provides the required note on the plan, and this will be enforced at the time of building permit.

- e. Provide the following note on the plan: “A homeowners’ association (HOA) with appropriate covenants will be established for maintenance of the vinyl noise wall. The wall shall be of a type substantially similar to Cambium Vinyl Fencing, manufactured by Crane Fencing Solutions, with a similar transferable limited lifetime warranty. Prior to final transfer of the wall, for HOA maintenance, the Department of Environmental Resources shall conduct a full inspection. All deficiencies found by DER shall be corrected or repaired, before maintenance of the wall is assumed by the HOA.”**

The subject application provides the required note on the plan.

- f. Provide a landscape plan schedule in compliance with Section 4.1 of the Landscape Manual.**

The submitted site plan provides a landscape plan schedule demonstrating conformance to the requirements of Section 4.1 of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual*.

**2. Prior to approval of final plats a Recreational Facility Agreement (RFA) shall be completed and recorded in the Land records of Prince George’s County.**

The subject property was recorded in Plat Book PM 223, Plat No. 76, on October 19, 2007. That plat indicated that there is a recorded recreational facilities agreement at Liber 28458, Folio 481.

**3. Prior to issuance of any permit, a copy of the approved Technical Stormwater Management Plans shall be submitted. If revisions to the site’s stormwater**

**management facilities impact the TCP II in the proposed woodland conservation areas, the plan shall be reconciled to eliminate any differences.**

This condition will be enforced prior to issuance of any permit as required. The subject application does not propose any revisions to the site's stormwater management facilities.

- 5. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-05052, TCP II/160/05 shall be further revised as follows:**
  - a. Provide a note on each sheet of the TCP II to stipulate: "No future substitution to house footprints is allowed for Lots 4, 5, 7, and 8, which increases the lot coverage or which locates any part of a structure any closer to a property line than is shown on the approved detailed site plan."**

The Environmental Planning Section indicated that, in reviewing approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-160-05 and the newly submitted TCPII plans, it appears that the new house shapes on Lots 4, 5, 7, and 8 are smaller than the previously approved house shapes, and they are located the same distance or slightly further from the property line as previously shown. Therefore, the subject application is in conformance with this condition.

- 6. The asphalt trail connecting with Holmehurst West neighborhood park shall be completed prior to the sixth building permit.**

This condition will be enforced prior to issuance of the sixth building permit as required.

- 7. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-05052, the plans shall be revised, to show the following:**
  - a. A six-foot board-on-board vinyl fence along the entire length of the rear yard of Lots 10 and 11. This fence shall be located on homeowner's property adjacent to the existing parkland.**

The submitted site plan shows a six-foot-tall, board-on-board, vinyl fence along the entire length of the rear yards of Lots 10 and 11 as required by this condition.

- b. A split rail fence on homeowner's property along the west side of Lot 11, where the lots meets the land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC.**

The submitted site plan shows a split-rail fence along the west side of Lot 11, as required by this condition.

- c. A split rail fence along the east side of Lot 47, Block A, of the Holmehurst West subdivision, on land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC.**

The submitted site plan shows a split-rail fence along the east side of Lot 47, as required by this condition.

**d. Additional shade trees in the rear yard of Lot 11.**

The submitted landscape plan shows additional shade trees in the rear yard of Lot 11, as required by this condition.

10. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed single-family residential development is subject 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 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual).

- a. **Section 4.1, Residential Requirements**—Section 4.1 requires that, for single-family detached lots between 20,000 and 39,999 square feet, a total of four shade trees and three ornamental or evergreen trees be provided per lot. The correct schedule is provided on the DSP showing this requirement being met for the 11 lots with a total of 44 shade trees, 14 ornamental trees, and 19 evergreen trees proposed.
- b. **Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets**—Section 4.6 provides requirements for buffering of residential development from public roads (4.6(c)(1)) and buffering nonresidential development from scenic or historic roads (4.6(c)(2)). The subject property is adjacent to Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Enterprise Road (MD 193), both of which are classified as arterial roads and are designated historic roads. Section 4.6(c)(1) applies to this development which proposes rear yards of single-family detached homes oriented towards an arterial road. This Section requires a minimum 50-foot-wide buffer planted with a minimum of 6 shade trees, 16 evergreen trees, and 30 shrubs per 100 linear feet of property line adjacent to the street. The correct schedule is provided on the plan showing this requirement being met for the full length adjacent to MD 193 and MD 450.
- c. **Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses**—The site is subject to Section 4.7; however, the only adjacent incompatible uses are to the south, where there is an existing playground and day care center. Both of these are considered low-impact uses, requiring a Type “B” bufferyard, with a minimum 30-foot building setback, 20-foot-wide landscaped yard, and 80 plant units per 100 linear feet. The submitted landscape plan shows the requirements of this section being met.
- d. **Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—The site is subject to Section 4.9, which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. The submitted landscape plan provides the required schedule and notes showing the requirements of this section being fulfilled.

11. **Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the 1989 Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and there are previously approved tree conservation plans for the site. The subject application is grandfathered from the requirements in Subtitles 24 and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010 because the project has a previously approved preliminary plan. The project is also grandfathered from the requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because it has a previously approved tree conservation plan. The Planning Board finds the submitted Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII-160-05-01, to be in conformance with the previous approval.
12. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading or building permit for more than 1,500 square feet of disturbance. Properties that are zoned R-R are required to provide a minimum of 15 percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The subject property is 7.226 acres in size, resulting in a TCC requirement of 1.08 acres, or 47,241 square feet. The subject application provides the required schedule showing the requirement being met through the preservation of woodlands on-site and proposed tree plantings.
13. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
  - a. **Environmental Planning**—There are no environmental-related comments on the proposed house types, there are no wetlands, floodplain, streams or green infrastructure on-site, and noise impacts were evaluated with the original DSP approval, and have not changed with the subject application. The Planning Board reviewed, and adopts as a finding, the following summarized discussion regarding the adjacent scenic/historic roadways:

The two adjacent roadways, Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Enterprise Road (MD 193), were not initially identified as historic roads. In 1990, there were additional roadways added to the list of historic and scenic roads in the revised master plan. Annapolis Road and Enterprise Road are designated historic roads, and have the functional classification of arterials. Any improvements within the right-of-way of a historic road are subject to review by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), under the Prince George's County *Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads*. Roadway design criteria will be determined for the roadway by DPW&T, with consideration for any scenic or historic features of the site which may be identified.

However, both roadways are State roads; therefore final design will be subject to the approval of SHA.

A condition has been included in this approval to address this issue.

- b. **Enterprise Road Corridor Development Review District Commission (ERCDRDC)**—In a memorandum dated May 8, 2013, ERCDRDC provided the following summarized comments on the subject application.

The ERCDRDC Commissioners have determined that the proposed nine new house types for Holmehurst Estates at the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Annapolis Road (MD 450) and Enterprise Road (MD 193) are in conformity with the preservation, quality, integrity, and character of the Enterprise Road Corridor. The ERCDRDC offers the following comments on the architectural design:

- (1) The Commission recommends that there be a space of at least 20 feet between each of the proposed homes to conform to the existing surrounding lots of the Holmehurst Estates neighborhood.

The applicable R-R Zone requires a minimum eight-foot-wide side yard building setback for each property, which will provide a minimum of 16 feet between two homes. The submitted plans actually show a minimum of approximately 21 feet between proposed homes; however, this may shift during final siting and construction, but cannot be less than the 16 feet required by zoning regulations.

- (2) The Commission recommends that a lamp post be placed on each new home site which will contribute to the attractiveness of the neighborhood and improve the economic value and stability of the property.

While a requirement for a lamp post on each lot would probably be within the Planning Board's authority, it does not appear to be typical for other home sites in the area. The applicant may want to consider the option of a lamp post at each new home site, but the Planning Board finds not to require it on this application.

- (3) The Commission recommends that Caruso Homes not permit homebuyers the option to purchase all-siding homes. All homes must be built with at least partial brick finish on the front in order to conform to other homes in Holmehurst Estates.

No requirements regarding brick siding were part of the original DSP approval. However, of the submitted house types, all offer multiple front elevation options with at least a partial brick or masonry finish. Therefore, the suggested recommendation has been included as a condition in this approval.

If these conditions are met, the Commission recommends approval of the architecture additions for nine new house types in Holmehurst Estates.

14. Based on the foregoing analysis, and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII-160-05-01) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-05052/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
  - a. Add a note that all houses shall have at least a partial brick or masonry front façade.
  - b. Add a note that all side elevations shall have a minimum of two standard features.
  - c. List the correct base finished square-footage for each house on the template sheet.
  - d. Revise the architectural plans as follows:
    - (1) Revise all side elevations to include a minimum of two standard features.
    - (2) Remove Florida State Front Elevation 1.
    - (3) Either remove Kingsport Front Elevation 1, or make the optional roof gable standard.
    - (4) Either remove Oxford Front Elevation 1, or make the optional dormers standard.
    - (5) Either remove Penn State Front Elevations 1 and 2, or make the optional dormers standard.
    - (6) Remove Rembrandt Front Elevation 1.
2. Any roadway improvements on Annapolis Road (MD 450) or Enterprise Road (MD 193) shall be carried out in accordance with the *Design Guidelines and Standards for Scenic and Historic Roads*, prepared by the Department of Public Works and Transportation, unless modified by SHA.

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 Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioners Geraldo and Shoaff absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 13, 2013, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11<sup>th</sup> day of July 2013.

Patricia Colihan Barney  
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:JK:arj

