

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Washington Management Development is the owner of a 258.73-acre parcel of land known as Parcels 5, 16, 17, 32 and 48, located on Tax Maps 54A3, B3 and 62 and Grid B-1, said property being in the 7th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned R-A; and

WHEREAS, on November 14, 2003, Washington Management Development filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Staff Exhibit #1) for 126 lots and 4 parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Subdivision Plan, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-03111 for Pleasant Prospect was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on February 5, 2004, for its review and action in accordance with Article 28, Section 7-116, Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, the staff of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommended APPROVAL of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on February 5, 2004, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/72/03), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-03111, for 126 lots and Parcels A-D with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan:
  - a. The 100-foot buffer associated with the Wetlands of Special State Concern shall be correctly shown on the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and the TCPI. The buffer may be modified at the time of detailed site plan review if supported by additional information.
  - b. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/72/03, shall be revised as follows
    - (1) Correct the worksheet to add another column that identifies the extent of the proposed off-site woodland clearing and calculate that clearing as 1:1 replacement. Also revise the worksheet to indicate the amount of off-site Woodland Conservation that will be provided.

- (2) Add labels to each Woodland Conservation Area that provide an identifying letter or number, identifies the type of Woodland Conservation being provided, and lists the acreage for each identified area.
      - (3) Add a note to the TCPI that states “An alternative access road alignment parallel to the west side of the PEPCO power line will be evaluated during the review of the Detailed Site Plan and/or Type II Tree Conservation Plan.”
      - (4) Revise the TCPI to correctly show the limit of disturbance on Lots 21 and 22 and the corresponding Woodland Conservation Areas.
      - (5) Have the revised plans signed and dated by the licensed landscape architect, licensed forester or MD-DNR qualified professional who prepared the plans.
    - c. A stormwater management concept plan shall be approved and the approval number and date shall be added to the plan.
2. A limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board prior to approval of the final plats to address:
  - a. Lots 7 through 13, to address the siting and size of the proposed houses and landscaping buffers for compatibility with the existing homes along Spriggs Request Road in Woodmore.
  - b. All flag-shaped lots.
  - c. The possibility of reducing the length of the cul-de-sac that extends toward Spriggs Request Road and reconfiguring the lots at its end to be more compatible with existing lots along Spriggs Request Road.
  - d. A Phase I Archeological Study, prepared by the applicant, to identify any remnants of slave activity on the property, and to identify any possible slave burials on the site.
  - e. Screening and buffering of the entrance road from the adjoining lots in Woodmore.
3. Prior to final plat approval, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to address:
  - a. The layout, placement and aesthetics of bridges associated with the access road.
  - b. The placement and construction methods to be used for Impact Area #2 (road crossing).
  - c. The possibility of extending one of the three cul-de-sacs to the PEPCO right-of-way to the east to provide a possible second access point for the property.

- d. Any other PMA impacts necessary for the installation of necessary utilities associated with the proposed development.
  - e. Lots 16, and 89 through 91, to address the siting and size of the proposed houses and landscaping buffers for compatibility with the Historic Site. Some Federal-style architectural elements (such as pediment entrances, fanlights, flat-arch brick lintels and shutters) should be incorporated into the design of these houses.
4. A limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee prior to approval of building permits for Lots 27-33 and 46-53 to address noise mitigation measures, including the location and design of the noise barrier along the south side of US 50, and the building shell design shall be approved by the Planning Board. A Phase II Noise Study shall be included as part of the DSP application submittal package and shall include specific noise attenuation measures based on the site's topography and the proposed locations of houses.
  5. Prior to the Planning Board approval of the limited detailed site plan, all species identified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Natural Heritage Program as rare, threatened or endangered that are found to occur on the site shall be surveyed and accurately located according to DNR protocol. The DSP shall be designed to eliminate and/or minimize any impacts to specific habitats and/or populations.
  6. Prior to submittal of the limited detailed site plan, the applicant shall consult with the Maryland Department of the Environment and the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program about the alternative road alignments and the proposed wetland, stream and interior forest habitat impacts. The DSP application submittal shall reflect comments from MDE and DNR with respect to the alternative road alignments.
  7. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all of the Patuxent River Primary Management Area except for areas of approved impacts. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”
  8. The following note shall be placed on the final plat:

“Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans shall be submitted to the M-NCPPC Planning Department.”
  9. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/72/03). The following notes shall be placed on the final plat of

subdivision:

"This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/72/03), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy."

10. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved concurrent with the limited detailed site plan.
11. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate right-of-way along Woodmore Road of 75 feet from the centerline of the existing pavement.
12. The applicant shall provide for any necessary turn lanes and frontage improvements as required by DPW&T. These may include turn lanes for deceleration and acceleration of vehicles at the site as well as left turn lanes and/or bypass lanes on both approaches of Woodmore Road. Additional right-of-way dedication to DPW&T may be required for these improvements.
13. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, one of the following options for road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T:

**Option A:**

- a. Realign the intersections of Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads with Church Road to create a new four-way intersection. This improvement shall also include any signage and pavement marking modifications and additions to be determined by DPW&T.
- b. Install a traffic signal at the new four-way intersection, if warranted, with any needed traffic signal warrant analysis to be submitted at the time of building permit or detailed site plan, if required. (The need for a study may be waived by DPW&T if sufficient studies are available to determine warrants.)
- c. Provide two-lane approaches on each leg of the new four-way intersection.
- d. All of the improvements on Church Road shall also include any additional signal, signage, and pavement markings to be determined by DPW&T.

**Option B:**

- a. Install interconnected traffic signals at the existing Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads intersections with Church Road, if warranted, with any needed traffic signal warrant

analysis to be submitted at the time of building permit or detailed site plan, if required. (The need for a study may be waived by DPW&T if sufficient studies are available to determine warrants.)

- b. Provide upgrades and improvements at both intersections to include:
    - (1) Two lanes along southbound Church Road approaching Mount Oak Road.
    - (2) Two lanes along northbound Church Road approaching Woodmore Road.
    - (3) Two lanes along eastbound Woodmore Road approaching Church Road.
    - (4) Two lanes along westbound Mount Oak Road approaching Church Road.
    - (5) A four-lane section along Church Road between Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads.
  - c. These improvements shall also include any additional signal, signage, and pavement markings to be determined by DPW&T.
14. Prior to the issuance of each building permit, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a fee of \$328.62 per dwelling unit to Prince George's County, which shall serve as a fair share contribution toward the construction of the Proposed Bowie Emergency Services Station and acquisition of an ambulance and a paramedic vehicle. The fee shall be paid at time of the issuance of the building permits. The total fair share fee is \$41,406.12 for the 126 lots proposed.
15. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210.00 to the Department of Public Works and Transportation for the placement of a bikeway sign along Woodmore Road, designated a Class III bikeway. A note shall be placed on the final plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.
16. If the improvements noted in Condition 13 are fully funded in the county's CIP with developer contributions, then the applicant shall pay a pro-rata share of those improvements in lieu of Condition 13. The amount of the pro-rata share shall be determined at the detailed site plan stage.
17. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 7 through 13, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board to address the materials, elevations and architecture of proposed houses on these lots.
18. Prior to the issuance of building permits for Lots 16 and 89 through 91, a limited detailed site plan shall be approved by the Planning Board or its designee to address the materials, elevations and architecture of proposed houses on these lots.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the findings and reasons for the decision of the Prince George's County Planning Board are as follows:

1. The subdivision, as modified, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and of Article 28, Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. The property is located on the south side of US 50 and on the north of Woodmore Road, approximately 2,000 feet east of its intersection with Pleasant Prospect Road.
3. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone	R-A	R-A
Use	Vacant	Single-family detached homes
Acreage	258.73	258.73
Lots	0	126
Parcels	5	4
Detached Dwelling Units	0	126

4. **Environmental**—A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes are found to occur within the limits of this application. John Hanson Highway, US 50, has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator that will impact some of the proposed lots on this site. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey include Bibb silt loam, Collington fine sandy loam, Monmouth fine sandy loam, Mixed alluvial land, and Shrewsbury fine sandy loam. These soils generally have no limitations that would affect the proposed application with the exception of the Mixed alluvial that are associated with the stream and wetland areas. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur on this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. Woodmore Road is a designated scenic and historic road located along the southern boundary of this property. This property is located in the Northeast Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin.

**Woodland Conservation**

The Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD), date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004, was found to address the requirements for a Forest Stand Delineation in accordance with the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

The Subdivision Ordinance provides for the protection of streams, 50-foot stream buffers,

wetlands, 25-foot wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, adjacent areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent, adjacent areas of slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils, and areas of rare or sensitive habitat. These features comprise the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA), which is not shown correctly on the plans date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004. The buffer associated with wetlands of special state concern should be 100 feet, not the typical 25 feet associated with normal wetlands. Therefore, it will be necessary to correctly reflect this information on the preliminary plan of subdivision and the TCPI prior to signature approval of those plans.

This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation 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 on-site, and there are previously approved Tree Conservation Plans for a portion of this site. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/72/03, date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004, has been found to address the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance as revised.

This 261.19-acre property in the R-A Zone has a net tract area of 232.56 acres, a Woodland Conservation Threshold of 50 percent that has been reduced to 20 percent, or 46.51 acres, because the area of existing woodlands on the net tract is less than the 20 percent Afforestation Threshold. In addition, there is a 2:1 replacement requirement of 6.28 acres for clearing woodlands below the WCT and a 1:1 replacement requirement of 1.90 acres for woodland clearing in the 100-year floodplain. The overall site requirement of 54.69 acres is proposed to be satisfied by a combination of on-site preservation in priority retention areas, on-site afforestation, and off-site mitigation totaling 54.69 acres. TCPI/72/03 is recommended for approval subject to several conditions included in the Recommendation section of this report.

### **Patuxent River Primary Management Area**

The preliminary plan and TCPI show five distinct areas of PMA impacts that are generally associated with road construction, stormwater management or sewer connections. The Environmental Planning Section is in general agreement with the need for each of the proposed impacts but believes that the impacts could be further reduced once final site grading has been examined.

Proposed impact #1 is associated with the proposed access road serving this site. As currently proposed, the road (Alternative #1 in the Letter of Justification received January 13, 2004) would require significant impacts to the existing stream which the American brook lamprey (*Lampeta appendix*), a state-listed threatened species, is known to be present according to the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program. The habitat for this species could be significantly impacted by the proposed access road alignment that would either pipe or divert approximately 600 linear feet of the stream. An alternative road alignment along the eastern property line would significantly reduce the extent of the proposed stream impact, but would result in approximately 0.16 acre of additional PMA impacts. It should also be noted that the

eastern road alignment would result in additional impacts to interior forest habitat as well. The proposed impacts need further study; sufficient detail is not available at the present time to allow for a complete evaluation of alternatives. In addition, input from permitting agencies at the state and federal levels will affect the final design to be selected.

The concept of allowing access to the property from this location despite the environmental impacts is in keeping with the intent of the Subdivision Ordinance; however, the magnitude and placement of the impacts need further study. In any case, the access road should be bridged over the streams to reduce the overall temporary and permanent impacts to the stream systems. The construction of a bridge or bridges in this location will also result in lower maintenance costs than using pipes under the road. Pipes clog with debris and require periodic clearing. Bridge structures, if properly designed and constructed, result in fewer maintenance problems related to the stream than the use of culverts and result in environmental benefits including easier wildlife passage, more constant stream temperatures, and better maintenance of stream flows.

Proposed impact area #2 is necessary for the construction of a roadway to connect to a portion of the property. The placement of this road crossing is not necessarily shown in the location of the least impact. Sufficient detail has not been provided regarding the placement of the roadway at the point of least impact. While the concept of the impacts to this area is in keeping with the intent of the Subdivision Ordinance, the minimization of impacts needs further study.

Impact area #3 is for two stormwater management outfalls. The placement of outfalls in this location is appropriate and is in keeping with the intent of the Subdivision Ordinance requirements for stream and buffer preservation.

Impact area #4 is for compensatory storage for floodplain impacts associated with the construction of the access road. These are proposed impacts that may or may not be needed and could possibly be met in other locations that are already disturbed. Staff does not support the impacts proposed for the creation of compensatory storage in a location that is not already disturbed for other construction purposes.

Impact area #5 is for the installation of a sanitary sewer line and could be eliminated with the realignment of the property lines on the adjacent lots. The Letter of Justification does not provide sufficient detail with regard to the necessity of the placement of the proposed sewer line in the location shown. A slight modification of the design would result in no impacts for this necessary connection.

Given this discussion, the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) has been preserved to the fullest extent possible, subject to conditions requiring changes to the plans and additional information regarding rare, threatened and endangered species. Staff also recommends that approval be subject to a condition requiring that the access road configuration contain bridge structures in order to meet the Subdivision Ordinance requirement that the PMA be preserved to the fullest extent possible and to protect the habitat of a state-designated threatened species.

## **Noise**



John Hanson Highway, US 50, has been identified as a transportation-related noise generator. The Environmental Planning Section Noise Model was used to calculate the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for the road using the 2001 Average Daily Traffic (or ADT, projected 10 years in the future) volumes provided by the Maryland State Highway Administration for the roads. The calculated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for US 50 is 855 feet from the centerline of the road.

The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision shows the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour to be located at 600 feet from the centerline of US 50 and the mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour to be approximately 260 feet from the centerline of US 50 as determined by a Phase I Noise Study prepared for the applicant and date stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section on January 8, 2004. The Environmental Planning Section generally agrees with the findings and conclusions of the Phase I Noise Study. That study identifies a need for the provision of noise mitigation measures at the property line and for the building shells of the houses on proposed Lots 27-33 and 46-53. In order to address the design criteria for the proposed noise barrier and the building shells a limited detailed site plan is recommended.

### **Water and Sewer Categories**

The property is in Water Category W-3 and Sewer Category S-3; it will be served by public systems.

5. **Community Planning**—The property is in Planning Area 74A/Community VII. It is located in the Developing Tier in the 2002 General Plan. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial Centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable. This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier.

The Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville & Vicinity Master Plan (1991) recommends large-lot/alternative low-density residential land use at up to 1.5 dwelling units per acre. With 261 acres, the density of 1.5 dwelling units per acre could allow 388 lots on the property the Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville & Vicinity Sectional Map Amendment (1991) retained in the R-A Zone.

The proposed preliminary subdivision for 126 lots in the R-A Zone conforms to the recommendations of the master plan for large-lot residential land use.

6. **Parks and Recreation**—The proposed subdivision is exempt from the mandatory park dedication requirements of Section 24-134 of the Subdivision Regulations because all proposed lots are greater than one acre in size.
7. **Trails**—The Adopted and Approved Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan includes two master plan trails impacting the subject site. A trail facility is recommended along proposed PT-1. This facility will be completed as part of PT-1 if this facility is ever constructed.

There are no recommendations regarding this proposal for the subject application. Woodmore Road is designated as a Class III bikeway. This facility can be accommodated by the provision of bikeway signage and, if road frontage improvements are required, wide asphalt shoulders to accommodate bicyclists.

8. **Transportation**—The applicant submitted a traffic study dated December 12, 2003. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.

#### **Growth Policy – Service Level Standards**

The subject property is located within the Developing Tier, as defined in the General Plan for Prince George’s County. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

**Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-Service (LOS) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, is permitted at signalized intersections within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the *Guidelines*.

**Unsignalized intersections:** The Highway Capacity Manual procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

#### **Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts**

The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study in support of the application using new counts taken during December 2003. With the development of the subject property, the traffic consultant concluded that the signalized intersections within the study area would operate within acceptable standards; LOS D with a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better. However, one unsignalized intersection was identified that would have side street vehicle delays exceeding 50.0 seconds, an unacceptable operating condition. This is the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road.

The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections during weekday peak hours:

- MD 193/Woodmore Road (signalized)

- Woodmore Road/W. Pleasant Prospect Road (unsignalized)
- Woodmore Road/E. Pleasant Prospect Road (unsignalized)
- Woodmore Road/Site Access Road (unsignalized)
- Woodmore Road/Church Road (unsignalized)

The following conditions exist at the critical intersections:

<b>EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193 (Enterprise Road)/Woodmore Road	1,239	1,228	C	C
Woodmore Road/W. Pleasant Prospect Road	19.9*	28.6*	--	--
Woodmore Road/E. Pleasant Prospect Road	17.0*	15.0*	--	--
Woodmore Road/Site Access Road	--	--	--	--
Woodmore Road/Church Road	41.7*	54.5*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

Staff field checked lane configurations at the intersections within the study area and made minor adjustments to the average vehicle delay at the unsignalized intersections. The minor adjustments are shown under existing conditions and subsequent tables.

Background developments included 246 single-family units. Additional background development was also included. This included approved housing units from Rodenhauer, Collingbrook, and Oak Creek Club. Background traffic along the study area roads was increased by one percent each year to account for overall growth up to the design year 2007. This is the expected year of full build-out. There are no funded capital improvements in the area, so the resulting transportation network is the same as was assumed under existing traffic. Given these

assumptions, background conditions are summarized below:

<b>BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193 (Enterprise Road)/Woodmore Road	1,349	1,356	D	D
Woodmore Road/W. Pleasant Prospect Road	24.3*	39.9*	--	--
Woodmore Road/E. Pleasant Prospect Road	19.7*	17.7*	--	--
Woodmore Road/Site Access Road	--	--	--	--
Woodmore Road/Church Road	244.5*	352.1*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

Under background traffic conditions the average vehicle delay exceeds 50.0 seconds at the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road. The level of service is acceptable at the signalized intersection within the study area.

The site is proposed for development as a residential subdivision, with 126 single-family dwellings. The trip rates were obtained from the guidelines. The resulting site trip generation would be 95 AM peak-hour trips (19 in, 76 out), and 113 PM peak-hour trips (73 in, 40 out). With site traffic, the following operating conditions were determined:

<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193 (Enterprise Road)/Woodmore Road	1,357	1,368	D	D
Woodmore Road/W. Pleasant Prospect Road	26.8*	48.1*	--	--
Woodmore Road/E. Pleasant Prospect Road	21.7*	19.6*	--	--
Woodmore Road/Site Access Road	20.4*	19.8*	--	--
Woodmore Road/Church Road	281.2*	382.7*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

Staff notes that under total traffic, one of the three unsignalized intersections within the study area operates unacceptably. This is the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road. Although not included in the traffic study, an additional approach lane on eastbound Woodmore Road has been constructed at its intersection with Church Road. The approach delays shown in the tables above include this improvement.

The applicant proposed an improvement to provide adequacy at Woodmore Road and Church Road by providing improvements for the reconstruction and re-alignment of Woodmore Road and Mount Oak Road. This improvement would provide a four-leg signalized intersection. The intersections of Woodmore Road with Church Road and Mount Oak Road with Church Road are offset by approximately 400 feet.

Based on the estimated expense of this improvement, \$2,000,000, the applicant proposed making a contribution to fund a portion of it. They cite previously collected pro-rata share fees from other developers in the area.

In a related traffic study, the traffic consultant utilized Synchro analysis software to evaluate the operations of the two intersections cited above. The consultant recommended the installation of signal interconnect equipment between the intersections so that traffic flows between them would be coordinated and optimized. This optimization and installation of two traffic signals improved the level of service at the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road to LOS B during

both peak hours.

Staff notes that there are no current construction projects for the intersections of Woodmore Road and Church Road and Woodmore Road and Mount Oak Road in the Prince George's County FY 2004-2009 Approved Capital Improvement Program. The traffic study predicts the build-out of this residential development by 2007.

DPW&T has not provided comments at the time of this memorandum. A copy of the traffic study was forwarded to DPW&T. However, DPW&T comments and recommendations from recent approvals and developments in the area are included and cited below.

The State Highway Administration has not provided any comments on the traffic study. SHA did provide comments on the proposed reservation of land for PT-1. These are included in the file.

#### **Plan Comments**

Only one access point is proposed to serve the site. This is west of the PEPCO transmission line. Internal streets are proposed with a 50-foot right-of-way, which is acceptable. Street A, which intersects Woodmore Road, will have an entrance right-of-way of 80 feet, then 60 feet within the property. The northern edge of the property borders US 50. There will be no access to US 50. Streets A to H are adequate to serve the proposed development, although the layout of cul-de-sac streets appears to be excessive.

Woodmore Road will eventually be widened to four to six lanes. Dedication of 75 feet from the center line of Woodmore Road will be required to accommodate any future widening of the roadway. This roadway is also proposed as a possible alignment for PT-1, which is cited below.

The applicant may be required to provide frontage and/or safety improvements along Woodmore Road, if required by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation. The applicant may also be required to provide any necessary acceleration and deceleration lanes at the site entrance if required by DPW&T.

#### **Master Plan Comments**

The Bowie Collington Mitchellville & Vicinity Master Plan (1991) designates Woodmore Road and Mount Oak Road as A-26, a four- to six-lane arterial roadway with a 150-foot right-of-way and up to a 170-foot right-of-way to allow for PT-1. The Bowie Master Plan recommends several geometric/engineering for major intersections within the study area. It shows the two off-set intersections realigned, with A-26 running along the Mount Oak Road alignment. The existing section of Woodmore Road at Church Road would no longer be an arterial roadway. A new four-way intersection would be created at Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads. "These improvements at arterial highway intersections will eventually be needed to improve levels of service and increase capacity as traffic volumes increase over time. Some are presently scheduled as part of other projects while others will be improved as required."

PT-1 is recommended in the Bowie Master Plan as a public transportation or transit facility to be extended from Largo to the Bowie Town Center vicinity. The alignment for PT-1 runs along Woodmore Road from MD 193 and then turns north at the PEPCO transmission line.

The plan was referred out for potential reservation for the PT-1 alignment. The Bowie Master Plan shows PT-1 running along the north side of Woodmore Road and then turning to the north along the east edge of the proposed development, crossing the PEPCO transmission line approximately 2,000 feet north of Woodmore Road (A-26). None of the agencies expressed a willingness to pursue purchase of the proposed right-of-way. The City of Bowie is supportive of PT-1, but has not provided evidence that either the city or any other agency is willing to work to complete a purchase. Therefore, staff finds that the requirements for placement of a property in reservation under Section 24 have not been met.

### **Transportation Conclusions**

Based on previous approved plans in the study area, the conclusions and recommendations of the applicant's traffic consultant, comments from the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, site visits/field checks, and the recommendations listed in the Bowie Master Plan, the two off-set intersections of Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads along Church Road need to be improved.

Although the intersection of Mount Oak Road and Church Road was not included in the traffic study, it should be noted that the intersections of Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads on Church Road are in close proximity to each another. DPW&T has previously suggested that considerable money should not be invested in signalization of two "T" intersections when the intent is to realign the "T" intersection to create a single four-way intersection. At this point the realignment of the intersections is not funded for construction in the Prince George's County FY 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Program.

Given that signalization may be needed at the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road, DPW&T has previously advised that considerable physical improvements will be needed to have signalization implemented successfully. Two out of three of the approaches at Woodmore Road and Church Road have single-lane approaches and will need to be upgraded. A short right turn lane on eastbound Woodmore Road has recently been constructed. The upgrades include:

- Two lanes along southbound Church Road approaching Mount Oak Road.
- Two lanes along northbound Church Road approaching Woodmore Road.
- Two lanes along eastbound Woodmore Road approaching Church Road.
- Two lanes along westbound Mount Oak Road approaching Church Road.

- A four-lane section along Church Road between Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads.

These improvements are needed to have interconnected signals at the existing Woodmore and Mount Oak Roads' intersections with Church Road. The applicant has shown, through Synchro analysis, that the optimization and installation of two traffic signals improved the level of service at the intersection of Woodmore Road and Church Road to LOS B during both peak hours. This would provide adequacy.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with the three transportation-related conditions included in this report.

9. **Schools**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and CB-30-2003 and CR-23-2003.

Impact on Affected Public School Clusters

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 3	Middle School Cluster 2	High School Cluster 2
Dwelling Units	126 sfd	126 sfd	126 sfd
Pupil Yield Factor	0.24	0.06	0.12
Subdivision Enrollment	30.24	7.56	15.12
Actual Enrollment	6,141	5,131	10,098
Completion Enrollment	198.24	217.62	398.97
Cumulative Enrollment	0	39.24	78.48
Total Enrollment	6,369.48	5,395.42	10,590.57
State Rated Capacity	5,858	4,688	8,770
Percent Capacity	108.73%	115.09%	120.76%

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, December 2003

County Council bill CB-31-2003 establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between I-495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts on existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings.

This project meets the adequate public facilities policies for school facilities contained in Section



24-122.02, CB-30-2003 and CB-31-2003, and CR-23-2003. The school surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

10. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision plans for adequacy of public fire and rescue facilities.
- a. The existing fire engine service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 43, located at 16400 Pointer Ridge Drive, has a service travel time of 8.52 minutes, which is beyond the 5.25-minute travel time guideline.
  - b. The existing ambulance service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 43, has a service travel time of 8.52 minutes, which is beyond the 6.25-minute travel time guideline.
  - c. The existing paramedic service at Bowie Fire Station, Company 43, has a service travel time of 8.52 minutes, which is beyond the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

These findings are in conformance with the standards and guidelines contained in the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

To alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service discussed, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/ EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has concluded that the entire development is beyond the recommended response times from existing facilities which provide ambulance and paramedic service. This finding is based on using the existing road system and existing stations. The staff also found that the planned Bowie New Town Emergency Services Facility, which is shown in the Capital Improvement Program item No. CIP#LK510650, will be the first due station that will provide ambulance and paramedic service to this development.

To mitigate the ambulance and paramedic response time deficiencies, the staff recommends that the applicant participate in providing a fair-share contribution toward the construction of the Bowie New Town Emergency Services Facility.

The fee amount is based upon the total cost of the facility, \$2,600,000 plus ambulance (\$131,000) and paramedic unit (\$131,000) divided by the total amount of residential and employment population within the service area in 2006. The service areas include those areas that will be served by the planned facility. The fair share fee is \$328.62 per dwelling unit for paramedic and ambulance service.

$$\text{Cost} = 2,600,000 + 131,000 (\text{ambulance}) + 131,000 (\text{paramedic ambulance}) = \$2,862,000$$

2006 Service Area Population/Employees = 26,998

$2,862,000 / 26,998 = \$106.00$  per resident/employee

$\$106.00 / \text{Person} \times 3.10 \text{ Planning Area Household Size} = \$328.62$  per Dwelling Unit

Number of Dwellings (126)  $\times 328.62 = \$41,406.12$

11. **Police Facilities**—The proposed development is within the service area for Police District II-Bowie. The Planning Board’s current test for police adequacy is based on a standard for square footage in police stations relative to the number of sworn duty staff assigned. The standard is 115 square feet per officer. As of June 30, 2002, the county had 874 sworn staff and a total of 101,303 square feet of station space. Based on available space, there is capacity for an additional 69 sworn personnel. Therefore, in accordance with Section 24-122.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Pleasant Prospect development.
12. **Health Department**—The Health Department reviewed the application and noted that a raze permit will be required prior to demolition of any structure on the site. Also, existing wells and septic systems that will be abandoned need to be pumped, backfilled and sealed in accordance with COMAR 26.04.04.
13. **Stormwater Management**—The Department of Environmental Resources (DER), Development Services Division, has determined that on-site stormwater management is required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan has not yet been approved. To ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding, a Stormwater Management Concept Plan must be approved prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan, or any revisions thereto.
14. **Cemeteries**—There are no known cemeteries on or adjoining the property. However, the applicant should be aware that if burials are uncovered during the construction process, state law requires that all activity stop. Development may only proceed then under state direction.
15. **Public Utility Easement**—The preliminary plan correctly includes the required ten-foot-wide public utility easement. This easement will be shown on the final plat.
16. **Historic Preservation**—Pleasant Prospect is a 2 ½-story, brick plantation house built in 1798 for Dr. Isaac Duckett. The walls of the building are laid in Flemish bond, and there is a side passage and kitchen wing. The interior exhibits particularly fine Federal-style decorative detail. A pyramidal-roof log meat house stands on the immediate grounds. After the Civil War, Pleasant Prospect became the property of Jonathan T. Walker, who undertook major Victorian renovations. The Walker family farm was divided during the twentieth century, creating and setting apart a five-acre lot for the historic house and immediate grounds. The house has recently

been restored to its original appearance and is an outstanding and important example of Federal-style domestic architecture. Pleasant Prospect is listed in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Environmental Setting of the Pleasant Prospect Historic Site is the 5.001-acre Parcel 10 on which the historic buildings stand. Although there are mature trees on the immediate grounds of Pleasant Prospect, the grounds are essentially open, and there is a clear view both to and from the Historic Site.

The proposed residential development will have enormous impact on the setting of Pleasant Prospect. Several houses have recently been built on large lots in Woodmore immediately to the south and southwest, but the area to east and north presently consists of open pastureland, and farm buildings are still standing directly west of the historic property. Access to Pleasant Prospect is presently by an unpaved lane from Woodmore Road (more than one-half mile to the south). Future access to Pleasant Prospect, assuming development of this proposed large subdivision, would depend upon one of the subdivision roads.

Access to the Historic Site will be through Parcel C, to be conveyed by the applicant to the Historic Site owners. Actual construction of any new access drive should be the responsibility of the applicant; details should be negotiated between these two parties, and an agreement in writing should be prepared.

With the development of this subdivision, the Environmental Setting of Pleasant Prospect will be adjoined on all sides by developing lots. Buffering will be required, according to the Prince George's County *Landscape Manual*, on all lots that adjoin the boundaries of the Environmental Setting, i.e., Lots 7 through 13 and the HOA parcel immediately south of the Historic Site.

Houses on Lots 89 through 91 will be visible from the Historic Site. A limited detailed site plan should be required for these lots as well as for Lots 7 through 13. The site plans should show the siting, size, materials, elevations and architectural elements of the proposed houses. The site plans should be approved by the Planning Board or its designee, with referral to the Historic Preservation staff, prior to issuance of building permits.

The historic house at Pleasant Prospect is an outstanding and important example of Federal-style domestic architecture. At the time of its construction in the 1790s, it was one of the most substantial brick plantation houses in central Prince George's County, and its prominence, materials and decorative features should be reflected in the buildings that will be built around it.

17. **Varying Lot Sizes**— The applicant is proposing to use varying lot sizes as permitted by the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. Unlike the provision for the use of Lot Size Averaging (R-55, R-80, R-R and R-E Zones), the use of varying lot sizes in the R-A and O-S Zones does not require specific findings for approval. Only the minimum standards outlined in the Zoning Ordinance must be met.

Section 27-442(b) (Table I) of the Zoning Ordinance sets the minimum standards for varying lot

sizes. In the R-A Zone, the creation of varying lot sizes is permitted as long as the total tract being subdivided is at least 25 acres in size. In this case the total tract area is 258.73 acres. Further, at least 60 percent of the lots created using varying lot sizes must meet or exceed the minimum lot size in the zone: two acres in the R-A Zone. This requirement has been met with the submitted preliminary plan: 76 of the 126 lots (or 60.3 percent) are a minimum of two acres on this subdivision.

The Zoning Ordinance allows one 1-acre lot for every 25 acres of land in the tract. With 258.73 acres of land in the R-A tract, a maximum of ten 1-acre lots is permitted. The remaining lots are required to exceed 50,000 square feet. The submitted preliminary plan includes nine lots between one acre and 50,000 square feet in size, with the remaining 41 lots exceeding 50,000 square feet. This arrangement meets the minimum standards set forth in Section 27-442(b) (Table I) of the Zoning Ordinance for the use of varying lot sizes.

18. **Issues Raised at the Hearing**—Citizens from the Woodmore community attended the hearing and raised several concerns regarding the proposal's impact on Woodmore. First, the citizens asked that there be no direct connection from the property into Woodmore. Second, the citizens asked that the limited detailed site plan include the review of lots along Spriggs Request Road for compatibility with homes in Woodmore. Third, they raised concerns about buffering and screening from the entrance road.

The Planning Board raised concerns about the flag lots. Though these are not technically flag lots, the Planning Board is concerned that flag lots impact individual privacy and will look at these more closely at the time of detailed site plan review.

Finally, the Planning Board raised concerns that there may be remnants of slave quarters and possibly slave burials on the property because it is part of a larger property that was once a plantation. Given this, the applicant proffered to conduct a Phase I Archeological Study prior to site plan approval, to search for evidence of slave life on the property.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with Circuit Court for Prince George's County, Maryland within thirty (30) days following the adoption of this Resolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Harley, with Commissioners Eley, Harley, Vaughns, Squire and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 5, 2004, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 25th day of March 2004.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JD:meg