



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

Detailed Site Plan Departure from Design Standards Variance

DSP-08070
DDS-595
VD-08070

Application	General Data	
Project Name: Quincy Commons Location: East side of Addison Road, approximately 300 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road Applicant/Address: Quincy Commons, LLC 5840 Banneker Road, Ste. 100 Columbia, MD 21044	Staff Report Date:	09/09/09
	Date Accepted:	06/01/09
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	10.56
	Zone:	R-T/R-18
	Dwelling Units:	100
	Gross Floor Area:	N/A
	Planning Area:	75A
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	06
	Election District	18
	Municipality:	N/A
	200-Scale Base Map:	202SE06

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
45 Two-family dwelling units in the R-T Zone and 54 multifamily and 1 two-family dwelling units in the R-18 Zone	Informational Mailing:	01/29/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	05/24/09
	Sign Posting Deadline:	09/01/09

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Jeanette Silor	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-08070
Variance VD-08070
Departure from Design Standards DDS-595
Quincy Commons

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan, variance and departure from design standards for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL as described in the Recommendation Section of this report.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan (DSP) was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Multifamily Medium-Density Residential (R-18) and Townhouse (R-T) Zones.
- b. The requirements of Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding criteria for granting variances.
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098.
- d. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- e. The requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- f. Referral comments.

The departure from design standards (DDS) was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of Section 27-587 of the Zoning Ordinance regarding criteria for granting a departure from design standards.
- b. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** This application includes a request for approval of 46 two-family and 54 multifamily dwelling units and associated recreational facilities on 10.56 acres in the R-T and R-18 Zones. The companion Variance, VD-08070, requests a variance from Footnote 76 of the Table of Uses for the R-18 Zone, found within Section 27-441(b) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow individual parking structures in lieu of a single parking garage. Per Footnote 76, a multifamily development is permitted in the R-18 Zone and not subject to bedroom percentage requirements when condominium or cooperative form of ownership is proposed and a minimum of 90 percent of all required parking spaces are located within a parking structure. The companion Departure from Design Standards, DDS-595, requests a departure from Section 27-551(e)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance to allow tandem parking spaces to count in fulfillment of the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per unit.

Development Data Summary

	Existing		Proposed	
Zones	R-18 & R-T		R-18 & R-T	
Uses	Vacant		Two-family & Multifamily Residential	
Acreage	R-18	4.66		4.66
	R-T	5.63		5.63
	Total	10.56		10.56
Lots		81		0
Parcels		2		2
Units		0	R-18	54 Multifamily & 1 two-family
			R-T	45 Two-family
			Total	100

Other Development Data

	Required	Proposed
Parking:		
	R-18	110
	R-T	90
	Total	200
		121*
		104*
		225

*The applicant has requested a departure from design standards to allow one of the two spaces required per unit to be a tandem parking space. This request is discussed in detail below in Finding 7.

2. **Location:** The subject site is located on the east side of Addison Road, approximately 300 feet north of its intersection with Ronald Road and approximately 3,000 feet south of the Addison Road metro station within Planning Area 75A, Council District 6 and the Developed Tier.
3. **Surrounding Uses:** The site is bounded to the north by the Seat Pleasant Methodist Church in the R-55 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zone and vacant M-NCPPC-owned parkland in the

R-O-S (Reserved Open Space) Zone; to the east by vacant M-NCPPC-owned parkland in the R-O-S Zone; to the south by a multifamily development known as the Addison Arms Apartments in the R-18 Zone; and to the west by Addison Road.

4. **Previous Approvals:** In October 1987, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-87179 (PGCPB Resolution No. 87-482) for the property subject to 12 conditions. Detailed Site Plan SP-88050 was subsequently approved on June 9, 1988 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-270). A final plat was recorded pursuant to that approval at NLP 147 @ 81, showing 81 lots and two parcels. The property was never developed. In 2004, a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-04007, was submitted and reviewed for the subject property under the name Lincolnshire. This application was withdrawn. On July 7, 2005, the Planning Board denied Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04173 for the subject property due to the inadequacy of fire and rescue facilities. On July 27, 2006 the Planning Board denied Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05131, again due to the inadequacy of fire and rescue facilities. On March 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098 (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-31) to consolidate the 81 existing lots and two parcels into two parcels.

5. **Design Features:** The subject detailed site plan proposes the construction of 100 dwelling units and associated recreational and stormwater management facilities on two parcels. The subject property is irregularly shaped and is bisected by a zoning line, creating a 4.66-acre R-18-zoned portion and 5.63-acre R-T-zoned portion. The easternmost portion of the site is characterized by steep slopes and is impacted by the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour of Addison Road. Therefore, the proposed development is set back substantially from Addison Road. A stormwater management facility is proposed to be located on a separate parcel in the eastern portion of the site, north of the main access drive. The stormwater management facility’s access drive is proposed to be constructed with grass pavers to camouflage its functional use and enhance its appearance as a more naturalized facility. One main private street and several alleys are proposed to serve the dwelling units.

Although 54 of the dwelling units are proposed to be multifamily and 46 are proposed to be two-family (two-over-two) dwelling types, the architectural elevations of the two unit types are nearly identical. The multifamily façades will feature one entrance per two “buildings,” thereby providing a common entrance for four units. Otherwise, the proposed multifamily and two-family models, NVR’s Matisse and Picasso, feature the same combination of materials, detailing and articulation and will blend seamlessly with one another to establish a cohesive architectural character for the overall development.

Architectural Model (Two-family & Multifamily)	Square Footage
Matisse (lower two floors)	
Elevations A, B, C & D	1,642
Elevation E	1,682
Elevation F	1,659
Picasso (upper two floors)	
Elevations A, B, C, D & E	2,641
Elevation F	2,658

To ensure a minimum level of architectural quality is maintained within the development, 60 percent of the proposed buildings (two units arranged vertically) should feature a full brick front façade. Each stick or building group should feature a minimum average of 75 percent brick on all elevations (front, sides and rears). An enhanced end wall treatment to include a full-brick façade

and all optional windows as standard features should be provided on all side elevations facing interior streets. In addition, architectural shingles should be used on all proposed buildings to add dimension to the roofs. According to the plans, dormers and reverse gables are optional features. To ensure that a single flat plane of roof is avoided, sticks containing six or seven buildings (two units arranged vertically) should have no more than two buildings without gables or dormers and sticks containing five buildings (two units arranged vertically) or less should have no more than one. Several conditions relating to architectural treatments have been incorporated in the Recommendation Section of this report.

The proposed units feature rear-loaded garages to be accessed via alleys, many of which will be double loaded. Since many of the alleys will be visible from the main internal road, it is important that the rears of the units feature a consistent, high-quality design. The plans show optional rear decks ranging in depth from eight to ten feet, which will be supported by brick piers. As optional features, decks would not necessarily be provided for every unit at the time of construction. However, since the units will be condominiums, a deck will be the only outdoor space designated for private use by the occupants of a specific unit. As such, it is anticipated that there will be a high demand for decks and that most units will feature decks. The future owner of a unit not initially constructed with a deck may wish to add a deck in the future. Due to the nature of the unit type where one unit is located directly on top of another, the decks for the two units must be integral. In addition, consistency of design and material use in deck construction is critical in alley situations where the combination of multiple design elements, colors and materials can create visual confusion. Therefore, it is recommended that the plans be revised to indicate that a deck will be a standard feature for each unit. This will ensure that the design and materials of all proposed decks will be identical and that all alleys will feature a consistent design. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant should provide additional construction details for the proposed decks indicating a standard depth and high-quality, low maintenance construction materials. Decks should not feature exposed wood left to weather.

Individual attached parking structures are proposed on the rears of the multifamily buildings and are discussed in detail in Finding 6 below. The stick or building group that is bisected by the zoning line, Building 9, features both multifamily and two-family dwelling units. Therefore, parking structures are proposed to be provided on only some of the buildings in this stick. The rear of this stick is oriented toward the rear of another stick, creating a double-loaded alley situation. In order to maintain a consistent rear treatment and continuity of design within this alley, parking structures should be provided for all of the units in Building 9. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section of this report which would require that parking structures be provided for all units within proposed Building 9.

One monument-style entrance feature is proposed on the south side of the access drive across from the proposed stormwater management facility and includes two brick piers connected by a lower brick wall with a cast stone area for project identification signage. The proposed sign is in conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

A central recreational area is proposed on the north side of the main access drive. The applicant proposes to construct a plaza area with decorative paving, extensive landscaping, a pergola, benches and an 18-foot gazebo. A community garden is also proposed in this area to provide an opportunity for residents to grow their own produce and/or flowers. Details of the pergola and community garden fencing should be provided prior to certification of the detailed site plan. East of the community garden, the applicant proposes to construct a multi-station adult fitness area, an open play area, and a picnic area with tables and grills. Two additional sitting areas are located in

the western portion of the site, which feature benches and concrete paving with brick accent bands. The proposed bench design is utilitarian and not consistent with the high quality residential character desired for this development. The proposed benches should be replaced with a more decorative model appropriate for use within a residential context.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

6. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the R-T (Townhouse) and R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential) Zones and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance. Two-family dwellings are permitted in the R-T Zone; however multifamily dwellings are only permitted in the R-T Zone pursuant to footnote 88 of the Table of Uses found within Section 27-441(b) of the Zoning Ordinance:

(88) Permitted only where the multifamily development is the subject of a condominium regime, the property is located in a Transit Development Overlay Zone, the property abuts the District of Columbia, and the development includes a mix of residential and commercial uses. A Detailed Site Plan shall be approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance. Regulations concerning lot size, coverage, frontage, setbacks, density, bedroom percentages, and other requirements applicable to multifamily dwellings shall apply; these dimensional (bulk) requirements shall be those approved by the Planning Board (or the District Council) in the Detailed Site Plan.(CB-82-2008)

This development does not meet the requirements of footnote 88. Therefore multifamily is not a permitted use within the R-T-zoned portion of the site. The Permit Review Section indicated that the plans should be revised to remove the multifamily use from the R-T-zoned portion of the site; however, the unit in question is bisected by the zoning line and has been determined to be a two-family dwelling, which is a permitted use in both the R-T and R-18 Zones.

Multifamily dwellings are permitted in the R-18 Zone pursuant to Footnote 76 of the Table of Uses found within Section 27-441(b) of the Zoning Ordinance without special exception approval, provided that:

- (A) A condominium plat is recorded, in accordance with the provisions of the Maryland Condominium Act, setting out each dwelling unit as a separate unit, or a housing cooperative is established to own the dwelling units; and**
- (B) At least ninety percent (90%) of all required parking spaces are provided in a parking structure. (CB-109-2004)**

The applicant has submitted an application for a variance from Footnote 76, VD-08070, to allow individual attached parking structures to substitute for a single consolidated parking garage, thereby permitting the multifamily dwelling units without subjecting the use to the bedroom percentage requirements set forth in Section 27-419 of the Zoning Ordinance. Section 27-230 of the Zoning Ordinance sets forth the following required findings for approval of a variance:

- (1) A specific parcel of land has exceptional narrowness, shallowness, or shape, exceptional topographic conditions, or other extraordinary situations or conditions;**

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The entire 10.56 acre site is irregularly shaped and possesses significant topographic relief and other extraordinary conditions which necessitate the need for the requested variance. The western portion of the property which is triangularly shaped is zoned R-T and the eastern portion, zoned R-18, is a very oddly shaped, eleven-sided site. Even though the R-18 portion is the smaller of the two it is more densely developed than the R-T portion. Limited sight distances and relatively narrow road frontage onto Addison Road restricts the location of the property’s single ingress and egress drive. In addition to the limited site frontage along the east side of Addison Road the R-T portion of the development is encumbered with a large on-site storm water management facility which can only be located along the western edge of the site between Addison Road and the proposed two-family dwellings north of the entrance drive. Further restricting development of the R-T portion of the site is the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour which is located well onto the site (approximately 228 feet from the centerline of Addison Road). The R-18 portion of the property straddles a highpoint in the center of the site and then drops down in elevation at the eastern tip of the site.

“As a result of the entrance drive location, the existing steep topography, the required on-site storm water management facility, and the irregular shape of the property, and an encroachment of an existing parking lot which is to be conveyed to the adjacent apartment complex the possible locations and orientations of the multifamily buildings and associated structured parking on the R-18 portion are limited. (Applicant has filed a DDS to permit “tandem” parking due to these same extraordinary site constraints.) The buildings must run roughly parallel to the slope in order to create the level parking courts which contain the attached parking structures between the rears of the buildings.

“The uniqueness and peculiarity of the site in comparison to the surrounding properties causes Section 27-441(b), Footnote 76 to impact the site in a disproportionate manner.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the topographical conditions, irregular shape and 65 dBA Ldn noise contour are unique constraints on the subject property and contribute to a condition that is not conducive to the construction of a consolidated parking garage in a location that would be convenient for all users.

(2) The strict application of this Subtitle will result in peculiar and unusual practical difficulties to, or exceptional or undue hardship upon, the owner of the property; and

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“In light of the uniqueness and physical characteristics of the Site, as described above strict compliance with the requirements of Section 27-441(b), Footnote 76 would result in an unreasonable hardship and undue burden on the Applicant. Were the Applicant to comply with the regulations set forth in Section 27-441(b), Footnote 76, the lot yield would be reduced in order to make land area available for the provision of additional parking garages. A reduction in allowable density due to the rigid application of the undefined term ‘structured parking’ would constitute an exceptional and undue hardship.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the provision of a consolidated parking garage would decrease the land area available for the construction of dwelling units, thereby resulting in a reduction in the ultimate unit yield. Because the topography of the site is so irregular, the grading necessary to create a flat pad to accommodate a large parking garage would consume substantially more land than would be the case on a more level site, which strengthens the applicant’s argument that the particular characteristics of the subject site would create an unreasonable hardship by virtue of the number of dwelling units that would be lost due to grading and other design constraints.

(3) The variance will not substantially impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the General Plan or Master Plan.

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The proposed use is in conformance with the 2002 Prince George’s County General Plan (the “General Plan”) and the 1985 Suitland-District Heights Approved Master Plan & Adopted sectional Map Amendment (the “Master Plan”). The Site is located within the ‘Developed Tier’ of the General Plan and situated within walking distance of the Addison Road Metro.

“The requested variance from the traditional parking garage to attached parking structures as designed will not impair the primary intent of the General Plan Developed Tier’s policies, which is to encourage and facilitate medium to high density, quality infill development. In fact, the granting of this variance will promote the General Plan policies by providing flexibility and innovation necessary to develop infill sites. The Master Plan and SMA designated the subject property R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential). The proposed multifamily units, with structured parking, meet the intent and purpose of the master plan and preserve its integrity.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the variance will not impair the intent, purpose, or integrity of the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan* or master plan.

Although staff concurs with the applicant’s argument that on this particular site individual parking structures constructed as integral elements of each two-unit building may effectively substitute for a traditional parking garage, careful consideration must be given to the design of such structures. Attached rear decks cover a portion of each alley-served driveway. The deck area is extended horizontally with a shingle-clad roof structure supported by brick piers, which serves to fully cover cars parked within the driveways. The side of each structure facing an internal street is enclosed with two brick walls, which step down in height from five to four feet. Adjacent parking structures are proposed to be separated by four- to five-foot-high sight-tight composite fencing. The applicant’s argument relies on the assertion that the proposed attached parking structures should be considered structured parking. While the proposal incorporates permanent structural elements such as a shingled roof and brick piers, fencing does not seem sufficiently durable to be an appropriate component of a permanent structure which will, if the requested variance is approved, stand in combination with all of the other building-specific parking structures legally in-lieu-of a traditional, multistory, concrete parking garage. In addition, the applicant’s statement of justification indicates that each parking structure would be “separated by brick wing walls between pairs of parking spaces and enclosed on each end by brick end walls.”

Staff recommends that the fencing proposed as part of the individual parking structure design be replaced with four-foot-high brick walls matching the side walls proposed on the end structures. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section, which would require this revision to the plans prior to certification.

7. **Departure from Design Standards:** According to Section 27-551(e)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, only parking spaces provided solely for, and on the same lot with, single-family dwellings may be located one behind the other. The companion Departure from Design Standards DDS-595, is a request to allow tandem parking spaces to meet the requirement for one of the two parking spaces required per multifamily and two-family dwelling unit. Each of the tandem spaces will be a full size standard space. The applicant has provided the following general justification in support of this request:

This application is unique in that each of the one hundred building footprints illustrated on the detailed site plan represent two individual dwelling units of two stories over two stories. Each of the individual units has a one car garage which is located on the ground floor and accessed from a common drive running perpendicular to the rear of the units. The second required parking space for each dwelling unit has been provided just outside the garage as a full sized (9½ x 19) “tandem” space. Unlike most multifamily projects constructed in the County these tandem spaces will be assigned to the same resident who occupies the garage space.

Section 27-239.01(7) sets forth the required findings for a Departure from Design Standards:

- (A) **In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:**
- (i) **The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal;**

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The use of tandem spaces will allow the applicant to provide all of the required parking associated with the proposed 100 dwelling units, as well as providing an additional twenty-five unassigned visitor spaces on the site. This arrangement will also have the added benefits of minimizing the amount of impervious surface area (thus reducing stormwater runoff), grading, and the removal of existing forested areas to provide the required number of parking spaces.

“The location of tandem parking spaces to the rears of the proposed units will create parking courts off of the primary vehicular access drives throughout the project. Placement of the tandem spaces behind the dwelling units will also hide the parking courts from view from Addison Road. This neo-traditional design will preserve view from the public road of existing forested areas for over fifty percent of the property’s frontage. Unlike many two-family dwellings and multifamily dwellings which are surrounded by a sea of parking the proposed arrangement will preserve, protect and enhance the residential character of the site and the surrounding area.

“Providing the two required parking spaces for each unit immediately adjacent to the units will improve access for the residents and their guests. By contrast, in many older, more traditional multifamily projects the large common lots are located quite some

distance away from the individual units. The increased proximity will also be more convenient and safer especially during periods of inclement weather and in the evenings.

“For all of the reasons stated, the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance will be equally well or better served by this application through the provision of well designed parking garages for the safety and convenience of those who use it.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance will be equally well or better served by the applicant’s proposal.

(ii) The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request;

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“This request is not to reduce the number of parking spaces, but rather to locate the required parking spaces in an alternative arrangement. The proposed tandem arrangement of one standard (9½ x19) space and one interior garage will allow for the provision of adequate on-site parking for residents and guests. This arrangement is the most efficient and functional design, given the unique physical constraints of shape and topography. The requested parking arrangement is the most practical solution. No additional departures are necessary or requested.

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s assertion that the requested departure is the minimum necessary. As stated above, the applicant has not requested a reduction in the number of parking spaces. Due to the nature of the unit type and the applicant’s effort to clearly designate two parking spaces per unit, the proposed arrangement is necessary.

(iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The subject property is located in the ‘Developed Tier’ in the Capitol Heights area of the County. The new upscale multifamily units are precisely the type of infill development use that the Planning Board, County Executive and County Council have been encouraging to revitalize the inner-Beltway communities. Again, the departure requested will not reduce the number of on-site parking spaces provided, it will only allow for an alternative location of those spaces.

“The site itself is also oddly configured and is characterized by steep topography which requires the use of excessive grading and/or retaining walls to create level pads for the buildings and parking. Utilizing an alternative parking arrangement will eliminate the need for additional access drives or a reduction in the number of spaces provided.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s justification. The site contains substantial area of steep topography which limits the land area available for development and associated parking. Allowing tandem parking spaces to meet the requirement for one of

the two parking spaces required per unit will ensure that an adequate number of parking spaces are provided for residents and visitors.

(iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.

The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

“The requested departure will enable the applicant to construct high quality multifamily and two-family dwelling units on the subject site along with adequate numbers of on-site parking spaces to accommodate the residents and their guests. The proposed design will screen the vehicles from public rights-of-way, locate the parking immediately adjacent to the individual dwelling units, and reduce the impervious surface area required to provide the required parking. Granting of the departure will greatly reduce the possible infringement of any of this project’s residents or guests upon the existing parking for adjacent residential development.”

Comment: Staff concurs with the applicant’s justification. The functional integrity of the development will be maintained. In addition to the 25 visitor parking spaces that are shown on the plans, the applicant has indicated that a minimum of 24 additional on-street parking spaces will be available to residents and visitors. The Transportation Planning Section has confirmed that the proposed 26-foot-wide street will accommodate on-street parking. The amount of impervious area is reduced through the provision of narrower driveways and the visual integrity of the site is maintained in that parking is proposed to be located behind the proposed units and will be hidden from Addison Road.

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098:** On March 15, 2007, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098 (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-31) subject to 19 conditions, of which the following are applicable to the review of this detailed site plan and warrant discussion as follows:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision the plan shall be revised as follows:

a. Designate the parking easement as an outlot to be conveyed to the Addison Arms Apartments.

Comment: The preliminary plan has received signature approval and the detailed site plan labels Outlot A to be conveyed to the Addison Arms Apartments. Outlot A includes required parking for the abutting property. According to the Subdivision Section, in an effort to avoid the homeowners association land from being encumbered by a parking lot which serves an abutting property, the Planning Board created the opportunity for the area of land encumbered by the existing parking lot to be conveyed out of the subject site as an outlot. However, the resolution of approval of the preliminary plan does not contain a condition to establish bench marks to encourage that the conveyance occur. The applicant should provide evidence that the Addison Arms Apartments owners are in agreement with the conveyance of the outlot to them.

A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section which would require an executed deed of conveyance of Outlot A to the property owner of the Addison Arms Apartments prior to final plat and recordation of such deed prior to the issuance of grading permits. If the applicant is

unable to submit a copy of the executed deed of conveyance of Outlot A to the property owner of the Addison Arms Apartments, prior to approval of the final plat, Outlot A shall be incorporated into Parcel A and the final plat shall reflect the existing non-exclusive easement for parking (Liber 3854 Folio 777), which is to the benefit of the Addison Arms Apartments.

- 2. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan.**

Comment: Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/127/95-01 was submitted for review with the detailed site plan application. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed this plan and is recommending approval of the plan.

- 3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11411-2003-01 and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: According to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), the detailed site plan as submitted to that agency is not in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11411-2003-02 because at the time of review, the detailed site plan did not reflect the ultimate right-of-way (ROW) of Addison Road. This has since been corrected and according to the Transportation Planning Section, the ultimate right-of-way of Addison Road is now accurately reflected on the detailed site plan.

- 6. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, all plans must be revised to show the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour located 228 feet from the centerline of Addison Road or a revised noise study shall be submitted for review. The revised noise study shall provide a justification for the reduction in traffic, base traffic counts on a 10-year projection, and include all relevant information. If approved, the resultant noise contour must be shown on all plans prior to signature approval.**

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section, the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is shown correctly on the TCPII and detailed site plan.

- 7. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, all plans shall be revised to show a six-foot high, solid wood fence for all rear yard areas within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour.**

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section, because there are no outdoor activity areas within the 65dBA Ldn, noise mitigation for outdoor areas impacted by noise levels of 65dBA Ldn or greater is not required.

- 8. Prior to the approval of building permits for dwelling units within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that the building shells have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.**

Comment: According to the Environmental Planning Section, this condition remains valid and should be carried over in modified form as a condition of approval of this detailed site plan.

- 9. The applicant, his heirs, successors and or assignees shall provide a standard sidewalk along the property's entire street frontage of Addison Road unless**

modified by the Planning Board at the time of issuance of street construction permits.

Comment: According to the Transportation Planning Section's Trails Planner, an eight-foot-wide sidewalk is shown along the site's Addison Road frontage; however, the sidewalk is not separated from the road by a grass strip as it should be in order to ensure consistency with properties to the south. The Trails Planner recommends that the sidewalk be separated from the road, unless modified by DPW&T.

10. The applicant, his heirs, successors and or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of the internal private street unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation at the time of detailed site plan.

Comment: According to the Transportation Planning Section's Trails Planner, five-foot-wide sidewalks consistent with DPW&T standards have been provided along the site's internal roads, which will facilitate safe and convenient multimodal access to the Addison Road Metro Station via Addison Road. Sidewalks were provided along the proposed alleys where functionally appropriate and have been deemed adequate by the Transportation Planning Section's Trails Planner; however, sidewalk and ramp details should be provided on the plans prior to certification.

11. The applicant, his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on homeowners association (HOA) open space land. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting, at the time of detailed site plan approval of the preliminary plan by the Planning Board.

A site plan shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) of the Prince George's County Planning Department, which complies with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.

Comment: As noted above, a central recreational area is proposed on the north side of the main access drive. The applicant proposes to construct a plaza area with decorative paving, extensive landscaping, a pergola, benches and an 18-foot gazebo. A community garden, multi-station fitness area, open play area, and picnic area with tables and grills are also proposed. Two additional sitting areas are located in the western portion of the site, which feature benches and concrete paving with brick accent bands. Per the formula for determining the value of recreational facilities to be provided, the applicant is required to provide approximately \$98,000 worth of recreational facilities on site. The proposed recreational facilities have been reviewed and have found to be adequate in meeting this requirement. The proposed recreational facilities have been designed in accordance with the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines* except for the following exception: per the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*, picnic areas are required to contain three standard picnic tables and one handicap-accessible picnic table. The detailed site plan proposes one standard picnic table and one handicap-accessible picnic table. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section, which would require the addition of two standard picnic tables.

11. **(Continued) The submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFAs) to DRD for its review and approval is required three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA should be recorded among the land records of Prince George’s County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**

Comment: Submission of the recreational facilities agreement (RFA) will be required prior to submission of a final plat. The proposed recreational facilities should be constructed in accordance with the following schedule, which should be incorporated in the RFA:

The two sitting areas in the western portion of the site should be constructed prior to the issuance of the building permit resulting in construction of the 25th dwelling unit for the overall development.

The central recreational area including the plaza area with pergola and gazebo, community garden, open play area, six-station fitness area, picnic area, and open play area, should be constructed prior to the issuance of the building permit resulting in construction of the 40th dwelling unit for the overall development.

11. **(Continued) The submission of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DRD, is required at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.**

The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.

The adjacent parkland shall not be disturbed in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR).

Comment: The detailed site plan proposes a sewer connection to an existing sewer located within an existing 20-foot-wide Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) right-of-way (ROW) along the eastern edge of the property, which extends onto M-NCPPC-owned parkland. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has recommended that the applicant be required to submit final plans and specifications along with a written letter requesting the “right to construct” the sewer extension on the adjacent park property and obtain approval from DPR of the final grading and restoration details prior to issuance of a grading permit for work in this area. A condition has been incorporated below in response to DPR’s recommendations.

12. **Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the staff of DPR shall review and approve the stormwater management plan to assess the impact of stormdrain outfalls on adjacent parkland. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on adjacent parkland. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on land owned by M-NCPPC, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. DPR may require a performance bond prior to issuance of grading permits. Should a revised Stormwater Management Concept Plan be approved which eliminates the outfall on park property, this condition shall be void.**

Comment: According to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), the revised stormwater management plan submitted with this application (11411-2003-02) shows no outfall on the adjacent parkland. Therefore, this condition is not applicable at this time. If, however, the plans are revised in the future and result in an impact to the parkland, the Department of Parks and Recreation requests that the revised plans be reviewed for compliance with this condition.

- 14. Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall have a detailed site plan approved by the Planning Board in accordance with Part 3, Division 9, of the Zoning Ordinance.**

Comment: The subject detailed site plan is being reviewed in order to fulfill this condition.

- 15. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate a right-of-way along Addison Road of 60 feet from the master plan centerline.**

Comment: According to the Transportation Planning Section, the widening of Addison Road to four lanes is a Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) project still in its planning stages (CIP Project FD 666601); however, the applicant has adjusted the right-of-way line in accordance with the Addison Road CIP project and the dedication of 60 feet is shown on the detailed site plan from the existing pavement centerline of Addison Road in accordance with the requirements of this condition.

- 16. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital program, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T.**

Provide for any necessary turn lanes and frontage improvements as required by DPW&T, including turn lanes for deceleration and acceleration of vehicles at the site entrance on northbound Addison Road. Additional right of way dedication to DPW&T may be required for these improvements.

Comment: According to the Transportation Planning Section, these improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 17. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances through either private money or full funding in the county's capital program, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T. Provide a left turn bypass lane on southbound Addison Road at the site access point.**

Comment: According to the Transportation Planning Section, these improvements are enforceable at the time of building permit.

- 18. Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan, the applicant his heirs, successors, and or assignees shall conduct a traffic signal warrant study and submit a sight distance study to DPW&T. The applicant shall be responsible for any safety features**

required by DPW&T including but not limited to a new traffic signal and any other improvements at the site access point.

Comment: DPW&T staff has indicated that a traffic signal is not warranted and also approved the sight distance study with the condition that the applicant completes substantial excavation at the sight entrance to provide the required site distance.

19. Prior to the approval of a final plat of subdivision, the applicant, his heirs, successors, and or assignees shall vacate the portion of right-of-way previously dedicated for public use per recorded plat, NLP 147 @ 81 (Walker Mill Towne).

Comment: According to the Subdivision Section, an existing dedicated public right-of-way exists generally to the north of the proposed entrance drive. That right-of-way, pursuant to this valid condition, is required to be vacated prior to final plat.

9. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed development is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the Landscape Manual. The plans are in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Landscape Manual.

10. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/10/04). The woodland conservation threshold for the site is 2.11 acres and the total requirement shown on the TCP worksheet is 5.31. The TCPII proposes to meet the requirement with 1.14 acres of on-site preservation, .62 acres of on-site reforestation, and 3.55 acres of off-site conservation. The reforestation areas proposed on the plan are appropriate. The proposed TCPII is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Reforestation and associated permanent protection fencing should be installed prior to the issuance of permits for adjacent lots. A certification prepared by a qualified professional should be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section, which would require this information prior to the issuance of building permits.

11. **Referral Comments:** The subject applications were referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. Detailed Site Plan DSP-08070 & Variance VD-08070

Transportation: The Transportation Planning Section provided the following analysis of the subject application:

Site Access Evaluation—This is addressed by Conditions 16 and 18 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098. There will be one site access point on Addison Road as shown on the DSP, this is consistent with the preliminary plan. The revised DSP provides additional pavement at the site entrance to allow both left turns and right turns, this will reduce queues and delays for exiting vehicles.

Geometric Evaluation—Street layout, circulation, and sidewalks are consistent with the preliminary plan. Pavement width is 26 feet for the private street. Sidewalks are shown on both sides of the private street as required.

Master Plan Rights-of-Way to be dedicated, considered for placement in reservation, or otherwise preserved or shown on the plan: The area of dedication along Addison Road, A-33, must be 60 feet from the master plan centerline of Addison Road, as required by Condition 15 of PGCPB Resolution No.07-31 for the preliminary plan. Preliminary plan note says “proposed R/W dedication 60’ from C/L of ultimate Addison Rd R/W.” The dedication shall be as shown on the plan unless an objection is raised by DPW&T. The applicant adjusted the right-of-way line in accordance with the Addison Road CIP Project per recommendations of DPW&T. This is shown correctly on the revised DSP.

Trails: The Transportation Planning Section’s Trails Planner provided a detailed analysis of the sidewalks proposed in conjunction with this application. This analysis is discussed in Finding 8 above. In addition, the Trails Planner indicated that the applicant has provided frontage for the master-planned widening of Addison Road to implement bike lanes in the future and also provided the following analysis of the proposed 12-foot-wide trail connection to the adjacent unimproved parkland:

The staff recommended trail access to the adjacent M-NCPPC park property is shown on the revised plan. This future connection will provide access to the master-planned trail system shown in the 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*. The plan clearly indicates the location of this access for a 12-foot-wide trail. In the future, the connection should be asphalt. Staff recommends that this access remain unobstructed and unencumbered by utilities. The plan should be revised to show that the trail is to be asphalt and will not be constructed on top of utilities.

Comment: A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section, which would ensure that the plans are revised prior to certification to show an unencumbered future trail connection to be constructed with asphalt at such time as there is a master plan trail on the park land to connect to.

Subdivision: The Subdivision Planner provided an analysis of the conditions of approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098 that are applicable to the subject detailed site plan. The Subdivision Planner’s applicable comments are discussed in Finding 8 above. Two additional plan comments were provided, one of which indicated that information regarding the existing lots and parcels and proposed parcels should be added to the general notes. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section which would require this information prior to certification of the detailed site plan.

Permits: The Permit Review Section offered several comments, which are either not applicable at this time, have been addressed through revisions to the plans, or are addressed through proposed conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.

Environmental Planning: The Environmental Planning Section provided the following analysis of the subject application:

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the subject property as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04007 in conjunction with Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/010/04 that was later withdrawn. The subject property was again reviewed as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04173, which was denied. The subject property was later reviewed as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-05131, which was also denied. The site was also previously reviewed for a Detailed Site Plan DSP-95067 in conjunction with Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/127/95. No permits were issued for that plan. Detailed Site Plan DSP-03029 was also reviewed for this site but was withdrawn. The most recent review of this site was with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098, that was approved by the Planning Board and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/010/04 has received signature approval. The conditions of approval can be found in PGCPB Resolution No. 07-31.

This 10.56-acre property, zoned R-T and R-18, is located south of Central Avenue (MD 214) on Addison Road, approximately 2,300 feet northeast of Walker Mill Road. The surrounding properties are residentially zoned, except the property to the north which is zoned C-O. The site is characterized with terrain sloping toward the north of the property, and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Lower Beaverdam Creek watershed in the Anacostia River basin. The predominant soil types on the site are Collington and Sassafras. The site is undeveloped and fully wooded. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this site. There are no floodplains, streams, Waters of the U.S., or wetlands associated with the site. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. The subject property is located on Addison Road, an arterial that carries traffic volumes that result in exterior noise levels that are above the state standard of 65 dBA Ldn for residential uses. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*.

The site has a signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/011/06) dated March 1, 2006. The TCPII and the site plan show the required information correctly. No revisions are required for conformation to the NRI.

The subject property has a Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter and Plan CSD 11411-2003-02 dated June 3, 2008. The plan as submitted currently shows one stormwater management pond on-site. Requirements for stormwater management compliance will be met through technical review by the Department of Public Works and Transportation.

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section's evaluation of noise impacts to the property and conformance with the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance are discussed above in Findings 8 and 10 respectively.

Community Planning: The Community Planning South Division provided the following analysis of the proposal:

This application is consistent with the 2002 Approved General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier. This application supports the General Plan goal to "encourage appropriate infill" and to "capitalize on investments in transportation and other infrastructure."

This application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1985 and 1986 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B*. It should be noted that this site also is within the boundaries of the 2000 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity*.

The property is located in the Suitland-Districts Heights Planning Area as well as the *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Addison Metro Town Center and Vicinity*. This site lies just outside the Town Center subareas on the east side of Addison Road—one mile from the Addison Road Metro station. Although, much of the plan's land use recommendations focus on the design guidelines within the town center, both the Town Center and Community Improvement Action plans has as one of its goals to capitalize on unrealized development potential in proximity to the Metro station for the purposes of strengthening the town center and providing for upgraded facilities and amenities in the Addison Road Community.

The Suitland Master Plan provides the following guidelines for living areas (p. 105-107):

“Multi-family development should have direct access to arterial or collector roads and should not have primary access through single-family residential streets.”

Comment: The proposed multifamily development will be accessed from Addison Road, an arterial, via the proposed internal street, which is not a single-family residential street.

“Wherever possible, living areas should be linked to community facilities, transportation facilities, employment areas, and other living areas by a continuous system of pedestrian walkways, and bike trails utilizing the open space and conservation network.”

Comment: The proposed residential development will be linked via a network of internal sidewalks to the on-site recreational facilities. In addition, a future trail connection to the adjacent Suitland District Heights Community Park property is shown on the plans. A wide sidewalk will also be provided along the site's Addison Road frontage to connect to adjacent properties.

“Housing shall be prohibited in unsafe areas such as wetlands, floodplains and unstable soils, and should be designed and constructed to minimize storm-water runoff, erosion, and sedimentation.”

Comment: Housing is not proposed in wetlands, floodplains or on unstable soils. The site has an approved stormwater management concept plan, which will ensure that runoff, erosion and sedimentation are minimized.

“Developers should be encouraged to preserve natural amenities (streams, floodplains, wooded areas and to incorporate these natural features into the environmental pattern of residential areas to serve as open space and to define and/or link together the living areas...through pedestrian trails).”

On September 9, 2009, the District Council and the Planning Board will hold a public hearing on the Preliminary Subregion 4 Master Plan and Proposed Sectional Map

Amendment. This application is located within “Living Area D” of the plan, which promotes single-family and townhouse development, and has a land use recommendation of medium-density residential.

Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR): The Department of Parks and Recreation provided a detailed analysis of the detailed site plan’s conformance with Conditions 11 and 12 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098, which is discussed in Finding 8 above.

Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T): DPW&T offered several comments, which warrant further discussion:

DPW&T indicated that the centerline of the ultimate Addison Road South right-of-way should be revised to comply with the Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) for Addison Road South. According to the Transportation Planning Section, the plans have been revised in accordance with the Addison Road CIP project.

DPW&T indicated that the detailed site plan is not consistent with the approved Site Concept Plan (Stormwater Management Concept Plan 11411-2003-02) because the ultimate right-of-way for Addison Road is not shown correctly. As noted above, the plan has been revised in accordance with the Addison Road CIP project.

DPW&T indicated that a sight distance analysis must be conducted along Addison Road at the proposed access point to the property. In subsequent email comments dated July 7, 2009 (Armen Abrahamian to Jenkins), DPW&T indicated that a sight distance study was reviewed and found to be acceptable subject to excavation in 2005.

DPW&T indicated that a left-turn lane on southbound Addison Road at the site entrance and acceleration and deceleration lanes on northbound Addison Road at the site entrance will be required. These requirements are memorialized by Conditions 16 and 17 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06098 and are enforceable at the time of building permit.

Prince George’s County Fire Department: At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from the Prince George’s County Fire Department.

Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO): At the time of the writing of the staff report, comments have not been received from PEPCO.

Verizon: Verizon indicated that stormdrain, sidewalks and catch basins that need to be removed from the public utility easement (PUE) and that additional easements were needed to service all units. A condition has been incorporated in the Recommendation Section which would require the applicant to submit verification from the public utility companies that the public utility easements provided on the plans are adequate prior to certification of the detailed site plan.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC): WSSC indicated that comments were not provided because the review fee was not paid.

b. Departure from Design Standards DDS-595

Transportation Planning Section: The Transportation Planning Section provided the following analysis of the proposed departure from design standards:

The applicant seeks a departure to provide required parking spaces as tandem spaces. This would provide for the second required parking space for each of the approved dwelling units behind the garage spaces for each of the proposed dwelling units. Two spaces are required per unit. The applicant meets the required number of parking spaces. It does not reduce the required number of spaces but only their location behind the garage units.

The justifications and comments on the departure by the applicant are reasonable. The applicant is providing twenty five additional surface parking spaces for visitors on the site.

Therefore there is no objection to the granting of the departure allowing tandem spaces.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T): DPW&T indicated that it has no objection to the departure from design standards.

- 12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, 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.

RECOMMENDATION

Detailed Site Plan DSP-08070 & VD-08070

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-08070, Variance VD-08070 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/127/95-01 for Quincy Commons, with the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Provide construction details for the proposed pergola and community garden fencing.
 - b. Provide two additional standard picnic tables within the proposed picnic area.
 - c. Replace the proposed benches with a more decorative model appropriate for a high-quality residential context.
 - d. Provide verification from the public utility companies that the public utility easements (PUE) shown on the detailed site plan are adequate.
 - e. Revise the architectural elevations as follows:
 - (1) Indicate that architectural shingles will be used on all roofs including the roofs of

the proposed attached parking structures.

- (2) Indicate that 60 percent of the proposed buildings (2 units arranged vertically) shall feature a full brick front and that each stick or building group shall feature an overall total of a minimum of 75 percent brick on all façades (front, sides and rear).
- (3) Indicate that all highly visible side elevations will feature a 100 percent brick façade and all optional windows as standard features. The following elevations shall be considered highly visible:

Building	Elevation
1, 7 & 10	East & West
2-5	South
6	North & South
8 & 9	North

- (4) Provide a note on the plans indicating that sticks containing six or seven buildings (two units arranged vertically) shall have no more than two units without gables or dormers, and sticks containing five buildings (two units arranged vertically) or less shall have no more than one.
- f. Replace the composite fencing proposed as part of the individual parking structure design with four-foot-high brick walls matching the side walls proposed on the end structures.
 - g. Provide information regarding the number of existing lots and parcels with reference to the record plat and the number of proposed parcels in the general notes.
 - h. Provide details for the proposed sidewalks and handicap ramps.
 - i. Revise the plans to indicate that the proposed 12-foot-wide future trail connection to the adjacent parkland will be asphalt and will not be constructed over proposed utilities.
 - j. Provide the correct required setback information for the R-18-zoned portion of the site on the plans.
 - k. Revise the plans to indicate that a deck will be a standard feature for each unit and add notes to the plan clearly stating as much.
 - l. Provide additional construction details for the proposed decks indicating a standard depth and high-quality, low-maintenance construction materials to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. Decks shall not feature exposed wood left to weather naturally.
 - m. Revise the plans to indicate that the three northernmost buildings (two units arranged vertically) in the stick that is bisected by the zoning line (Building 9) will feature attached parking structures to match those proposed on the multifamily buildings.

2. Provide an eight-foot-wide sidewalk with ramping along the site's entire Addison Road frontage that is separated from the road by a three-foot-wide grass strip, unless modified by Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).
3. Prior to the approval of the final plat, the applicant shall submit an executed deed of conveyance (signed by all parties) of Outlot A to the property owner of the Addison Arms Apartments and shall submit a recorded deed of the conveyance prior to the approval of a grading permit. If the applicant is unable to submit a copy of the executed deed of conveyance of Outlot A to the property owner of the Addison Arms Apartments, prior to approval of the final plat, Outlot A shall be incorporated into Parcel A and the final plat shall reflect the existing non-exclusive easement for parking (Liber 3854 Folio 777), which is to the benefit of the Addison Arms Apartments.
4. Applications for building permits for any units occurring within the projected 65 dBA Ldn contour shall contain a certification, to be submitted to M-NCPPC, prepared by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis using the certification template. The certification shall state that the interior noise levels have been reduced through the proposed building materials to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
5. Reforestation and associated permanent protection fencing shall be installed prior to the issuance of permits for adjacent lots. A certification prepared by a qualified professional shall be used to provide verification that the afforestation has been completed. It must include, at a minimum, photos of the afforestation areas and the associated fencing for each lot, with labels on the photos identifying the locations and a plan showing the locations where the photos were taken.
6. The applicant shall submit final grading plans, specifications and restoration details for the sewer extension along with a request for "Right to Construct on M-NCPPC Parkland" to the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for review and approval. Upon approval of the plans by DPR, a restoration bond shall be posted prior to the issuance of the grading permit.
7. The proposed recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the following schedule, which shall be incorporated in the recreational facilities agreement (RFA):
 - a. The two sitting areas in the western portion of the site shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the building permit resulting in construction of the 25th dwelling unit for the overall development.
 - b. The central recreational area including the plaza area with pergola and gazebo, community garden, open play area, six-station fitness area, picnic area, and open play area, shall be constructed prior to the issuance of the building permit resulting in construction of the 40th dwelling unit for the overall development.

Departure from Design Standards DDS-595

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Departure from Design Standards, DDS-595 for Quincy Commons.