


M-NCPPC




MONTGOMERY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF PARK AND PLANNING

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-3760
301-495-4500, www.mncppc.org

ITEM # 15
DATE: 10/28/04



MEMORANDUM

DATE: October 22, 2004

TO: Montgomery County Planning Board

VIA: Richard C. Hawthorne, Acting Chief, *RCH*
Development Review Division
Cathy Conlon, Acting Supervisor, *CC*
Development Review Division

FROM: Richard A. Weaver, Planner Coordinator (301) 495-4544 *RAW*
Development Review Division

REVIEW TYPE: Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 73 one family attached unit
(including 10 MPDU's)

APPLYING FOR: Preliminary Plan Review

PROJECT NAME: Fairland View

CASE NO. 1-05001

REVIEW BASIS: Pursuant to Chapter 59, the Zoning Ordinance and Chapter 50, the
Subdivision Regulations

ZONE: R-60 cluster with MPDU's

LOCATION: In the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Colesville Road
(MD 29) and Fairland Road

MASTER PLAN: Fairland

APPLICANT: Winchester Homes

ENGINEER: Site Solutions, Inc

ATTORNEY: Holland and Knight

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Approval, subject to the following conditions

- 1) Compliance with the conditions of approval for the preliminary forest conservation plan. The Applicant must satisfy all conditions prior to recording of plats or MCDPS issuance of sediment and erosion control permits. Conditions include but are not limited to:
 - a. Detailed afforestation planting plan for the earth berm to create a dense visual screen.
- 2) At site plan, applicant to provide a noise study prepared by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis to demonstrate that proposed units will attenuate projected exterior noise levels to an interior level not to exceed 45 dBA, Ldn. The study must use projected traffic noise levels for the ICC, Rte. 29, and Fairland Rd.
- 3) Mitigation measures for projected traffic noise impacts from the ICC, Rte. 29, and Fairland Road to be addressed at the site plan stage. Noise mitigation measures would include, but are not limited to, measures to reduce interior noise levels recommended in the noise study and changes in the configuration and types of some townhouse units to reduce projected outdoor noise levels to parts of the subdivision.
- 4) Place in reservation the area shown on Attachment 1 of the Transportation Planning memorandum (attached), dated March 17, 2004 ("Reservation Area") until the earlier of (a) September 1, 2005; or (b) a final Record of Decision is issued by the FHWA, and that Record of Decision does not include the Reservation Area, or any portions thereof, within the final Intercounty Connector (ICC) alignment.
- 5) If FHWA issues a final Record of Decision that includes the Reservation Area, the applicant shall submit a revised Preliminary Plan that locates all dwelling units and related infrastructure (e.g., roads, public areas, etc.) outside of the Reservation Area.
- 6) Limit any future development as part of this subject Preliminary Plan on the site to 73 townhouse units.
- 7) Dedicate, and show on final record plat, adequate right-of-way along Fairland Road to provide 50 feet of right-of-way from the roadway centerline.
- 8) Construct Stravinsky Drive extension and its terminus within the property as a 60-foot wide secondary residential street with sidewalks, and with proper termination (with a cul-de-sac).
- 9) Coordinate with the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT), and the Department of Permitting Services on design requirements for the proposed extension and termination of Stravinsky Drive, DPWT recommended parking restrictions along Stravinsky Drive, and on-site/off-site sidewalk, parking requirements.
- 10) Record plat to show delineation of a Category I Conservation Easement over the areas of forest conservation.
- 11) Record plat to reference the Common Open Space Covenant recorded at Liber 28045 Folio 578 ("Covenant"). Applicant shall provide verification to

Commission staff prior to release of final building permit that Applicant's recorded HOA Documents incorporate by reference the Covenant.

- 12) Compliance with the conditions of approval of the MCDPS stormwater management approval letter dated, July 6, 2005.
- 13) Compliance with conditions of MCDPWT letter dated, October 22, 2005, unless otherwise amended.
- 14) No clearing, grading or recording of plats prior to site plan.
- 15) Final approval of the number and location of buildings, dwelling units, on-site parking, site circulation, sidewalks, and bikepaths will be determined at site plan.
- 16) Final number of MPDU's to be determined at site plan
- 17) A landscape and lighting plan must be submitted as part of the site plan application for review and approval by technical staff.
- 18) This preliminary plan will remain valid for thirty-seven (37) months from the date of mailing of the Planning Board opinion. Prior to this date, a final record plat must be recorded for all property delineated on the approved preliminary plan, or a request for an extension must be filed.
- 19) Other necessary easements.

BACKGROUND:

Prior Regulatory Actions

On Thursday, May 20, 2004, the Planning Board considered pre-preliminary plan application No. 7-04059 for the same subject property (Fairland View). This plan was presented to the Planning Board as a non-binding pre-preliminary plan. The Board considered testimony from the staff, applicant and citizens. Staff sought direction from the Board regarding the finding, pursuant to section 59-C-1.621 of the Zoning Ordinance (see attachment 2) that the plan can propose 100% townhomes. This finding is based on the application proving that it provides an environmental and compatibility benefit over what could be achieved with 60% townhomes and 40% single family detached.

Environmental Planning supported the plan as shown indicating that it provided a tighter clustering of lots away from the existing road network and the proposed Inter County Connector (ICC) right-of-way. The plan provided for a 50 ft. wide strip along the northern boundary of the site that can be used to accommodate a berm and dense landscaping to buffer the effects of the ICC. Staff believe that these benefits could not be achieved with a mix including single family detached homes. Staff also supported the use of 100% townhomes to provide compatibility with the adjacent townhome subdivision. The Board generally agreed with the findings of staff, but elected to make this finding at the time of preliminary plan.

The issue of parking was raised by residents in the adjacent townhouse community who cited concerns about the potential for loss of parking along Stravinsky Drive to accommodate traffic flow. The Board felt that additional visitor parking should be designed into the proposal to counter any loss of parking on Stravinsky Drive.

The Planning Board did not object to the submission of a preliminary plan and advised the applicant to address parking issues.

SITE DESCRIPTION

This 12.08 acre parcel is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection Colesville Road and Fairland Road. The approved Natural Resource Inventory/Forest Stand Delineation indicates that the property is mostly open field with two existing houses with associated buildings. There are no streams, wetlands or steep slopes on this property.

The site is directly impacted by the master plan alignment for the Intercounty Connector (ICC). The master planned U.S.29/Fairland Road interchange is to the southwest corner of the property.

The plan shows an open strip on the northern boundary that is to be used for screening and a potential berm to visually screen the units from any ICC improvements.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Preliminary Plan proposes seventy-three single-family attached residential dwelling units to be situated on the middle and southern portion of the property. The subdivision will be accessed by an extension of Stravinsky Drive. Proper termination of Stravinsky Drive has been addressed by MCDPWT in their memorandum. Access to Fairland Road and U.S. 29 has been denied by reviewing agencies. A private street network provides internal circulation to the individual units. Site plan staff and DPS will further review details of the site circulation and parking at the time of site plan.

PARKING

At the Pre-Preliminary Plan hearing, the Planning Board heard testimony from the adjacent subdivision regarding their contention that parking for the application was inadequate. The residents were also responding to a statement that MCDPWT may need to restrict parking on one side of Stravinsky Drive to accommodate two way traffic movement. This would seemingly impact the existing neighborhood more so than the proposed subdivision since parking on Stravinsky Drive is more accessible to the existing community.

A final decision on the need to restrict the parking by MCDPWT has not been made, however, the applicant has provided MCDPWT with a requested study that indicates 18 spaces may be lost on Stravinsky if parking is restricted. The applicant has attempted to address this and respond to the Planning Board's concerns about visitor parking internal to the site by increasing parking by 20 visitor spaces.

The parking requirements for this project are 2 spaces per unit. The Pre-Preliminary Plan was at a rate of 2.48 spaces per unit, above the minimum and consistent with other approvals. By providing an additional 20 spaces, the application is now at 2.8 spaces per unit. The 20 space increase is also in excess of the potential loss of 18 spaces on Stravinsky Drive if enforced by MCDPWT at a later date. Staff believes that the additional parking spaces should be sufficient for the proposed subdivision.

TRANSPORTATION

Proposed Intercounty Connector

SHA is currently developing detailed mapping as part of its preparation of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed ICC (a limited-access east-west highway intended to link areas between I-270 and I-95/US 1, through central/eastern Montgomery County and western Prince George's County).

The ICC planning process has concurrence on two alternative alignments, selected through the Alternatives Retained for Detailed Study (ARDS) process, called Corridor 1 and Corridor 2. Corridor 1 is the southern alignment that generally follows the alignment incorporated in the area master plans for the ICC, and Corridor 2 is the alignment to the north that is not represented in any area master plans. Of the above two alternative roadway alignments, based on the most current information provided by the SHA, the proposed Corridor 1 alignment interchange with Columbia Pike (US 29) would physically impact the proposed Fairland View development as shown on Attachment 1.

Master Plan Roadways and Pedestrian/Bikeway Facilities

The 1997 Approved and Adopted *Fairland Master Plan* describes the nearby master-planned roadways, pedestrian and bikeway facilities as follows:

1. Columbia Pike (US 29), to the west of the property, as a six-lane divided Major Highway (CM-10) between Northwest Branch to the southwest and MD 198 to the northeast. A minimum right-of-way width of 100 to 200 feet is recommended for this section of US 29. The master plan also recommends a commuter bikeway for US 29.
2. Fairland Road, to the south of the property, as a two- to four-lane divided, east-west Arterial (A-75) between Paint Branch to the west and Prince George's County Line to the east, with a minimum 80-foot right-of-way, and sidewalks. A Class I bikeway (PB-50) is recommended in the master plan for Fairland Road from Old Columbia Pike to Prince George's County Line along the south side of the roadway.
3. Musgrove Road, between Old Columbia Pike (P-25b) to the southwest and Fairland Road (A-75) to the northeast, is a two-lane Arterial (A-100), with

a minimum right-of-way width of 80 feet. The Master Plan also recommends sidewalks and a Class II/III bikeway (PB-43) along Musgrove Road/US 29 between Cherry Hill Road and Fairland Road. Additionally, Marlow Road to the east of Musgrove Road to Galway Elementary School is recommended as a Class III bikeway (PB-56) in the Fairland Master Plan.

4. Brahms Avenue, between Schubert Drive to the north and Fairland Road to the south, as a two-lane Primary (P-33), with a minimum right-of-way width of 70 feet.
5. Intercounty Connector (ICC), as a Freeway (F-9) within the *Fairland Master Plan* area, to the north of the property.

Nearby Transportation Improvement Projects

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP), and the Montgomery County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPWT) Capital Improvement Program (CIP) includes the following nearby projects:

1. Fairland Road: This DPWT project involves reconstruction of Fairland Road from US 29 to Prince George's County line, including widening to 3 lanes, a sidewalk on the north side of the road, a Class I bikeway on the south side of the road, etc. The project is in final design and is anticipated to start construction in late 2006.
2. US 29/Briggs Chaney Road Interchange: The above interchange is currently under construction by SHA and is approximately 14% complete as of September 2004. The estimated completion date for the project is October 2007.
3. US 29/Musgrove Road/Fairland Road Interchange: SHA is currently in the process of preparing preliminary design plans for the interchange. The project is fully funded for Preliminary Engineering and has funding for partial right-of-way.
4. The Intercounty Connector (ICC): Planning studies for this SHA project are currently ongoing.

Local Area Transportation Review

A traffic study was required for the subject Preliminary Plan per the *Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) Guidelines* since the subject development was estimated to generate 30 or more peak-hour trips during the typical weekday morning (6:30 – 9:30 a.m.) and evening (4:00 – 7:00 p.m.) peak periods.

The consultant for the applicant submitted a traffic study (dated June 11, 2004) that determined the traffic-related impacts of 74 townhouses on the nearby roadway

intersections during weekday morning and evening peak periods. Staff review of the above traffic study indicated that the study complied with the requirements of the *LATR Guidelines* and the traffic study scope provided by the staff.

The proposed Fairland View development was estimated to generate approximately 36 peak-hour trips during the weekday morning peak-period, and approximately 61 peak-hour trips during the weekday evening peak-period. A summary of the above is provided in Table 1.

**TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF SITE TRIP GENERATION
FAIRLAND VIEW – 74 TOWNHOUSES**

Time Period	Trip Generation		
	In	Out	Total
Weekday Morning Peak-Hour	6	30	36
Weekday Evening Peak-Hour	41	20	61

Note: Based on M-NCPPC trip generation rates for townhouses.

A summary of the capacity analysis/Critical Lane Volume (CLV) analysis results for the study intersections for the weekday morning and evening peak hours within the respective peak periods from the traffic study is presented in Table 2.

**TABLE 2
SUMMARY OF CAPACITY CALCULATIONS (CLV)
FAIRLAND VIEW – 74 TOWNHOUSES**

Intersection	Traffic Conditions							
	Existing		Background		Total		Total w/Applicant Funded Imps	
	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM	AM	PM
US 29/Fairland Rd	1,541	1,485	1,560	1,491	1,569	1,504	1,544	1,459
Fairland Rd/Brahms Ave/Verizon Access ¹	823	727	832	733	5.1	6.5	--	--
Fairland Rd/Musgrove Rd/Marlow Farm Rd ¹	765	605	774	620	9.0	7.9	--	--
Schubert Dr/Stravinsky Dr/Access Dr	117	117	117	117	153	179	--	--
Schubert Dr/Brahms Ave	256	275	256	275	291	331	--	--

Source: Fairland View Traffic Study. The Traffic Group, Inc. June 11, 2004.
FY 2005 Congestion Standard for Fairland/White Oak Policy Area: 1,500

¹ Background and Total Traffic Conditions reflect proposed DPWT improvements along Fairland Road. Total traffic conditions reflect operation of the intersection with a roundabout/traffic circle.

As shown in Table 2, under Total traffic conditions, CLV values at the study intersections were either below the FY 2005 Fairland/White Oak congestion standard of 1,500, or with an applicant identified roadway improvement (lane designation changes to the eastbound Fairland Road approach to US 29) did not exceed the respective CLV under Background traffic conditions. It is noted that the above mitigation improvement is being utilized by another pending Development Plan Amendment (DPA-04-2), and is acceptable to both the M-NCPPC staff and Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) (see Attachment 2).

Per Section III.A of the *LATR Guidelines* (see Attachment 3), "An intersection improvement may be used by two or more developments if construction of the improvement has not been completed and open to the public. In order to be considered, the program or improvement must provide sufficient capacity to:

- result in a calculated CLV in the total traffic condition that is less than the congestion standard for that policy area, or
- mitigate the traffic impact if the calculated CLV in the total traffic condition exceeds the intersection congestion standard for the applicable policy area. Mitigation is achieved when the CLV in the total traffic condition that includes traffic from each contributing development *with* the improvement is equal to or less than the CLV in the background traffic condition without the improvement."

Based on the review of the analysis presented in the traffic study, staff concludes that the proposed improvement to the eastbound Fairland Road approach to its intersection with US 29 will create adequate capacity to accommodate traffic associated with both the subject development as well as the pending DPA.

Staff has also reviewed a parking survey/parking demand analysis presented by the applicant (dated August 30, 2004), performed at the request of DPWT staff. Based on the findings contained in the study, staff support DPWT recommended parking restriction to one side of Stravinsky Drive.

ENVIRONMENT

As stated in the Site Description, the site is generally open field with no associated streams, wetlands, or steep slopes. The focus on the environmental review was related to noise impacts from the local road network, both existing and proposed. Conditions No. 1, 2 and 3 address the need to screen the proposed units from the existing and proposed roads and to provide the necessary noise studies that will project the noise impact to the proposed units. Adjustments to the unit layout and/or noise attenuation may be recommended as part of the site plan review.

Attachment 1 –Transportation Planning memorandum

Attachment 2 – Letter requesting finding for 100% townhomes





General Notes
 1. Boundary, ownership, utility and surface feature information indicated on this drawing is from a survey by Gentry Associates, Inc., Rockville, Maryland, dated April, 2001.

SITE DATA

1. Gross Tract Area: 12.38 Acres
2. Existing Building Footprint: 40,000 sq. ft. (approx.)
3. Number of Units Proposed: 21
4. Type of Units Proposed: 211 units with 3 car integral garages & 18' minimum driveway length on lot
5. Approximate of Maryland S.D.A. Right-of-Way: 2.3 Acres
6. Approximate of Maryland S.D.A. Right-of-Way: 2.0 Acres per unit or 420 spaces
7. Approximate of Maryland S.D.A. Right-of-Way: 2.0 Acres per unit or 420 spaces
8. Approximate of Maryland S.D.A. Right-of-Way: 2.0 Acres per unit or 420 spaces
9. Off-Street Parking Proposed: 211 additional spaces in lots + 202 spaces
10. Substantially Priced Building (MHI) Number proposed: 210 (11/26/01)
11. Proposed Building Coverage: 11.5% of Gross Tract (14,000 sq. ft. of lot)
12. Proposed Building Coverage: 11.5% of Gross Tract (14,000 sq. ft. of lot)
13. Proposed Building Coverage: 11.5% of Gross Tract (14,000 sq. ft. of lot)
14. Proposed Building Coverage: 11.5% of Gross Tract (14,000 sq. ft. of lot)
15. This project will be constructed in a single phase.



Siting Area "A" Layout
 2-7-01



85 SITE SELECTED BY: [Name] DATE: [Date] PROJECT NO: [Number]	
86 PREPARED BY: [Name] DATE: [Date]	
87 CHECKED BY: [Name] DATE: [Date]	
88 APPROVED BY: [Name] DATE: [Date]	
89 TITLE: [Title]	
90 SCALE: [Scale]	
91 SHEET NO: [Number]	
92 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
93 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
94 SHEET NO: [Number]	
95 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
96 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
97 SHEET NO: [Number]	
98 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
99 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
100 SHEET NO: [Number]	
101 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
102 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
103 SHEET NO: [Number]	
104 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
105 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
106 SHEET NO: [Number]	
107 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
108 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
109 SHEET NO: [Number]	
110 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
111 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
112 SHEET NO: [Number]	
113 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
114 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
115 SHEET NO: [Number]	
116 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
117 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
118 SHEET NO: [Number]	
119 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
120 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
121 SHEET NO: [Number]	
122 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
123 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
124 SHEET NO: [Number]	
125 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
126 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
127 SHEET NO: [Number]	
128 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
129 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
130 SHEET NO: [Number]	
131 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
132 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
133 SHEET NO: [Number]	
134 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
135 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
136 SHEET NO: [Number]	
137 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
138 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
139 SHEET NO: [Number]	
140 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
141 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
142 SHEET NO: [Number]	
143 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
144 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
145 SHEET NO: [Number]	
146 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
147 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
148 SHEET NO: [Number]	
149 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
150 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
151 SHEET NO: [Number]	
152 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
153 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
154 SHEET NO: [Number]	
155 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
156 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
157 SHEET NO: [Number]	
158 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
159 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
160 SHEET NO: [Number]	
161 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
162 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
163 SHEET NO: [Number]	
164 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
165 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
166 SHEET NO: [Number]	
167 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
168 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
169 SHEET NO: [Number]	
170 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
171 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
172 SHEET NO: [Number]	
173 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
174 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
175 SHEET NO: [Number]	
176 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
177 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
178 SHEET NO: [Number]	
179 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
180 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
181 SHEET NO: [Number]	
182 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
183 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
184 SHEET NO: [Number]	
185 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
186 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
187 SHEET NO: [Number]	
188 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
189 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
190 SHEET NO: [Number]	
191 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
192 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
193 SHEET NO: [Number]	
194 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
195 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
196 SHEET NO: [Number]	
197 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	
198 PROJECT NO: [Number]	
199 SHEET NO: [Number]	
200 TOTAL SHEETS: [Number]	