



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

Conceptual Site Plan

CSP-88020/02

| Application | General Data |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| Project Name: Glenwood Hills Location: SOUTH SIDE OF CENTRAL AVENUE (MD 214), 4,500 FEET EAST OF ITS INTERSECTION WITH ADDISION ROAD Applicant/Address: Glenwood Hills Venture , LLP c/o Don Franyo 1501 Farm Credit Drive Suite 2500 McLean, VA 22102 | Date Accepted: 10/28/03 |
| | Planning Board Action Limit: Waived |
| | Plan Acreage: 212.08 acres |
| | Zone: M-X-T |
| | Dwelling Units: 597 dwelling units |
| | Square Footage: 203,000 square feet |
| | Planning Area: PA 75A |
| | Tier: Developed |
| | Council District: 6 |
| | Municipality: None |
| 200-Scale Base Map: 201 SE 6 and 7 | |

| Purpose of Application | Notice Dates |
|---|--|
| Review of Conceptual site plan for the approval of 202 single-family detached units, 117 single-family attached units (townhouses), 278 multifamily units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. | Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-12-2003) 9/16/03 |
| | Sign(s) Posted on Site: 6/8/03 |

| Staff Recommendation | | Staff Reviewer: Lareuse | |
|----------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| APPROVAL | APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS | DISAPPROVAL | DISCUSSION |
| | X | | |

June 14, 2004

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board
VIA: Steve Adams, Urban Design Supervisor
FROM: Susan Lareuse, Planner Coordinator
SUBJECT: Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02
Glenwood Hills

The Urban Design Staff has completed its review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions as described in the Recommendation section below.

EVALUATION

This Conceptual Site Plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- a. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance regarding the M-X-T Zone (Mixed-Use Transportation-Oriented Zone).
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance regarding Conceptual Site Plans.
- c. The requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.
- d. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- e. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application proposes a primarily residential development, with an office/retail component. The plans propose 202 single-family detached units, 117 single-family attached units (townhouses), 278 multifamily units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail. The multifamily units are proposed as two products, 134 two-over-two units distributed over 16 buildings and 144 three-story multifamily units distributed over 12 buildings (or 12 units per

building). The office/retail component is proposed as one building with retail on the first floor with office above and a structured parking facility.

2. **Development Data Summary**

| | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
|----------------|-----------------|--|
| Zone | M-X-T | M-X-T |
| Use | Vacant | Mixed Use—202 single family detached, 117 single family attached, 278 multifamily residential and 203,000 of office/retail |
| Acreage | 121.08 acres | 121.08 acres |
| Square footage | 0 | 203,000 sq.ft. of retail |

3. **Location:** The subject site is located on the south side of Central Avenue approximately 4,500 feet east of its intersection with Addison Road. The site is located within Planning Area 75A.

4. **Surroundings and Use:** The adjacent properties are as follows:

North The property is bounded on the north by Central Avenue, MD 214. The site has approximately 1,100 linear feet of frontage on MD 214. Across the arterial is residentially zoned land in the R-80 and the R-55 Zones.

East The property is bound on the east by Parcel A, where an existing structure is located, and by lands owned by PEPCO. Further to the east is an existing townhouse development known as Millwood Towne in the M-NCPPC-owned Millwood Park and a single-family detached development known as Millwood.

South The property directly to the south is the Walker Mill Middle School.

West The properties to the west are primarily existing single-family detached subdivisions and are known as the Rolling Ridge, Coleton Knoll, Wilburn Estates, and Addison Woods.

5. **Previous Approvals:** Glenwood Hills was zoned M-X-T in the Suitland/District Heights and Vicinity (Planning Areas 75A and 75B) Master Plan dated July 1985 and the adopted Sectional Map Amendment dated March 1986. A Conceptual Site Plan, SP-88020, entitled Meridian was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on September 8, 1988 (PGCPB No. 88-303; see attached). That original approval included 2,146,700 square feet of office, 1,794 residential dwelling units, a 300-room hotel, and 85,100 square feet of retail. That plan was revised, renamed Glenwood Hills, and approved by the Planning Board on March 31, 1994 (after a request for reconsideration of the original Planning Board's decision to disapprove the plan). That Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/01, was approved with 785 dwelling units (105 detached units, 310 townhouse units, and 370 multifamily units) and 203,000 square feet of office/retail.

Preliminary Plan 4-94066 was approved on November 10, 1994, and the resolution, PGCPB No. 94-351, was adopted on December 1, 1994. Because of the size of the proposed development, the preliminary plan was valid for six years with the possibility of two 2-year extensions. Two extensions were granted and the preliminary plan continues to be valid through December 1, 2004.

6. **Design Features:** The Conceptual Site Plan is proposing the following:

| | | |
|---|------------------------|--|
| Residential | single-family detached | 202 lots |
| | single-family attached | 117 lots |
| | multifamily units | 278 units |
| Retail | | 30,000 sq. ft. (first story only) |
| Office | | <u>173,000 sq.ft. (second story and above)</u> |
| Total retail/office square footage proposed | | 203,000 square feet |

The proposal is intended to be developed as a mixed-use community to be served by Karen Boulevard extended. The conceptual site plan proposes single-family detached units along the entire length of Karen Boulevard from the intersection of Central Avenue. The applicant has stated that they want the community to appear from the roadway to be primarily a single-family detached development, as viewed from Karen Boulevard extended.

The project, consisting of 597 dwelling units, does not propose any vehicular connections to the adjacent properties. Karen Boulevard serves as the main spine road through the development and roughly dissects the property into two equal halves. Single-family detached units are located on the north side of Karen Boulevard, adjacent to existing single-family detached units. The south side of Karen Boulevard is much denser, which includes townhouses (located behind single-family detached units along Karen Boulevard) and multifamily units. Single-family detached units also appear along Karen Boulevard until multifamily components appear on the south side of the roadway approximately half way toward the southern boundary of the site adjacent to the Walker Mill Middle School.

A small recreational area is centrally located on the south side of Karen Boulevard. The central recreational area includes a clubhouse, pool and multipurpose court as amenities. Additional recreational facilities are scattered throughout the remaining portion of the site. The central recreational area is located adjacent to the wooded hillside, which provides a desirable view into a naturalized area.

A combined retail/office structure is proposed along Central Avenue. The commercial component is proposed as 203,000 square feet with a freestanding parking structure. Throughout the review of the plans, the discussion has centered on the need for a landmark building. Community Planning discouraged large amounts of retail due to the presence of failing or failed retail businesses in the area.

7. The staff has reviewed the three different single-family detached types of units. In the opinion of staff, the applicant's proposed standards need to be modified to avoid a subdivision that appears too compact and too close to the street line, particularly along Karen Boulevard. The type of the single-family detached units is followed by a discussion of each:

Traditional single family detached—The size of the lots is proposed to be 6,000 square feet, which is small, but will not be a problem as long as the front yard setback is increased and the side yard setbacks are increased as well. The staff recommends that the front yard setback and the side yard setbacks reflect a true traditional lot in this county, which requires a 25-foot front yard setback and a minimum side yard setback of 8 feet with a minimum combination of 17 feet. The staff also recommends a minimum 20-foot rear yard setback. In addition the staff also recommends that a minimum finished living area of 2,200 square feet with a two-car garage be established for these lots. Currently the plan shows these types of lots along Road D only.

Small Lot single-family detached front load—The size of the lot is proposed to be 4,000 square feet, which is very small. The minimum front yard setback is proposed as 15 feet but should not be less than 20 feet, because it is only reasonable to allow room for a full-sized vehicle to be parked in the driveway without it hanging over the sidewalk. The side yard setback, proposed as three feet, is also too small and should be increased to a minimum of six feet. The minimum front building line is proposed as 45 feet; with the added side yard setback, the staff recommends an increase to 50 feet at the street line. Rear yard setbacks should be no less than 20 feet. In addition the staff also recommends that a minimum finished living area of 2,000 square feet with a two-car garage be established for these lots. Currently the plan shows these types of lots along Roads F, G, H, I, J and K.

Small lot single-family detached rear load—These lots are shown on the site plan to be served by alleys for this type of unit. The proposed size of the lot of 3,600 square feet is unacceptable for a detached dwelling. These units are conceptually shown with a garage that is detached and to the rear of the dwelling unit. The minimum front yard setback should not be less than 30 feet along Karen Boulevard. The side yard setback, proposed as three feet, is also too small and should be increased to a minimum of five feet. The minimum front building line is proposed as 40 feet; with the added side yard setback, the staff recommends an increase to 45 feet at the street line. Rear yard setbacks should be no less than 20 feet. In addition, the staff also recommends that a minimum finished living area of 1,800 square feet with a two-car garage be established for these lots. Currently the plan shows these types of lots along Karen Boulevard and I street.

TOWNHOUSES:

The applicant submitted development standards for the townhouses, but the development of all townhouses in the M-X-T Zone is subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance.

OFFICE/RETAIL:

No development standards submitted for review.

MULTIFAMILY:

No development standards submitted for review.

Comment: The staff recommends that the 12-plex and the two over two multifamily developments include the following standards for development:

12-plex multifamily units:

- Minimum distance between two buildings—30 feet
- Minimum distance from a building to a property line—20 feet
- Minimum distance from a building to a parking lot—15 feet
- Minimum green space (minimum percent of net lot area)—60%
- Minimum of 60% of all facades shall be brick

Two over two units:

- Not more than six ground-level units in a row
- Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 16 feet wide

Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet.
Minimum of 60% of the front façade shall be brick

Comment: As of the writing of this staff report, the creation of development standards are under way, and the final proposal will be presented at the Planning Board hearing.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. **Zoning Ordinance:** The proposed mixed-use development is a permitted use in the M-X-T Zone. The Conceptual Site Plan must comply with the following findings listed in Section 27-546(d), Site Plans, of the Zoning Ordinance

(1) **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division:**

(1) **To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, and major transit stops, so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;**

The proposed development in Glenwood Hills will be in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of the M-X-T Zone if the conditions of approval are adopted. It will promote the orderly development of land in the vicinity of the Addison Road Metro Station and will maximize the private development potential of the Glenwood Hills site with a site plan that is realistic and in conformance with the master plan. The proposed mix of residential uses on the subject property will provide additional diversity in the housing choices in the area. The proposed retail and office uses will provide an expanding source of desirable employment.

(2) **To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;**

The value of the land has been conserved by maximizing the floor area ratio of the development pods on the site and preserving the areas of natural features on the site.

(3) **To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and other major transportation systems;**

Vehicular and pedestrian connections from the proposed development to the Addison Road Metro Station have been a concern throughout the review of the plans. The project will have access to existing Central Avenue for the most effective vehicular route to the Metro. Crosswalks will be necessary for pedestrian access at the main entrance to the development. Conditions of approval have been added to show the location of the future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks at the time of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Detailed Site Plans.

- (4) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;**

The proposed mix of uses may encourage a 24-hour environment in the ultimate development of the project. The residential units will generate activity on the site from 6:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The office tenants are anticipated to operate on regular 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. business hours. The retail component is expected to generate activity all day, including anticipated service retail uses open from 7 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.

- (5) To encourage diverse land uses which blend together harmoniously;**

The residential and commercial land uses as shown on the plan are completely separated from one another by land owned by PEPCO. The commercial development is concentrated along MD 214 on a parcel separated from the residential development by the public utility and floodplain. However, the recommended architectural standards and development standards will create a visually harmonious development.

- (6) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;**

The residents in the development will patronize the proposed retail/office uses, particularly if the retail uses include convenience products and services. The subject project could create a dynamic, functional relationship between the residential and the commercial development within a distinctive visual character and identity if some additional development standards, sign design, and architectural standards were added to the plan. A distinctive visual character and identity for the project will be created by the use of quality architectural, landscape and design features.

- (7) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale and savings in energy beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;**

Development of a project of this size would promote optimum land planning, which would permit the use of economies of scale and a flexible response to the market.

The proposed Conceptual Site Plan should be improved to provide pedestrian connections among internal uses, thereby reducing trips generated from the site, and to encourage pedestrian and vehicular connections with adjacent properties. Therefore, the staff recommends the plans be revised prior to signature approval to provide a vehicular and pedestrian connection to Quarry Avenue and a pedestrian connection to Quarry Place.

- (8) To permit a flexible response to the market; and**

The applicant proposes to take full advantage of the current advantageous housing market in the county by proposing to build the entire residential component prior to any of the retail/office component until the end of the project, claiming little or no demand for

commercial or retail. The staff is concerned that this proposal will not fulfill the mixed use requirement of Section 27-547(d), which states the following:

(d) At least two out of the following three categories shall be included on the Conceptual Site Plan and ultimately present in every development in the M-X-T Zone. In a Transit District Overlay Zone, a Conceptual Site Plan may include only one of the following categories, provided that, in conjunction with an existing use on abutting property in the M-X-T Zone, the requirement for two out of the three categories is fulfilled. The Site Plan shall show the location of the existing use and the way that it will be integrated in terms of access and design with the proposed development. The amount of square footage devoted to each use shall be in sufficient quantity to serve the purposes of the zone:

- (1) Retail business;**
- (2) Office, research, or industrial uses;**
- (3) Dwellings, hotel, or motel.**

Therefore, to ensure that the mix of uses required in the M-X-T Zone is achieved, the staff recommends the phasing schedule should also stipulate that the retail/office component should be constructed and at least 25 percent occupied (based on gross floor area) prior to release of any residential building permits in Phase 4 (see phasing schedule below). A similar condition was applied to the previously approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/01.

(9) To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.

The plan does not yet show evidence of taking full advantage of the freedom of architectural design allowed in the M-X-T Zone, which allows the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning. The proposed landscaping, signage, seating, sidewalks, and architectural design of the buildings should blend the various uses visually and functionally. The use of superior design and quality building materials will result in an overall architectural design that should exemplify excellence in physical, social, and economic planning. Therefore the staff recommends the following architectural design elements be demonstrated at the time of Detailed Site Plan:

- (1) Brick fronts should be standard for 60 percent of all single-family detached fronting on Karen Boulevard.
- (2) Single-family detached units whose endwalls are visible from Karen Boulevard should incorporate one of the following:
 - (a) Side-entry garage.
 - (b) Bay window at the first floor level plus two additional features.
 - (c) Equivalent endwall detail and visual interest.

(3) The clubhouse building and office/retail buildings should be designed with special attention to architectural quality, with 60 percent of all facades as brick, and as focal points for the community.

(2) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

The proposed Glenwood Hills development will have an outward orientation and would be physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development if street connections were provided with existing neighborhood streets on the east (Quarry Avenue) and on the south (Karen Boulevard).

The proposed mix of uses is integrated visually by the use of similar landscaping, streetscape, and architectural materials. The proposed architectural materials are also compatible with the architecture of the adjacent properties. The mix of uses is physically integrated by pedestrian connections and shared vehicular access.

(3) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

The mix of single-family detached units, townhouses, and multifamily dwellings is generally compatible with the mix of housing types in the vicinity. If the architectural conditions of approval are adopted, the superior architectural design will ensure visual compatibility with the existing and proposed surrounding uses.

(4) The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

The mix of uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements would be certain to reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality if the following were achieved:

- a. If the proposed design standards (shown in their entirety below) were supplemented in regard to materials, architectural detailing of the buildings, control of rooflines, window fenestration, garage design, etc.; if standards for entrance features, freestanding and building-mounted signs in the retail/office area were required to be approved by the Planning Board or its designee.
- b. If a streetscape elements such as light fixtures, paving materials, street trees, etc., were proposed by the Conceptual Site Plan.
- c. If the proposed architectural standards were supplemented in regard to standards for the office, retail and recreational buildings; and if significantly more stringent requirements regarding the appearance of single-family detached units were incorporated into the standards.

Comment: If the plans were revised prior to signature approval to incorporate the points above, the mix of uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements

would reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

(5) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

The applicant has proposed the following phasing schedule:

PROPOSED PHASING SCHEDULE

- Phase 1: 26 single-family detached lots, 117 townhouses.
- Phase 2: 87 single-family detached lots.
- Phase 3: 134 condos (2 over 2 units) in 16 total buildings, 44 single-family detached lots, community center/pool/multipurpose court.
- Phase 4: 144 condo multifamily units in 12 total buildings, 45 single-family detached lots.
- Phase 5: 203,000 square feet commercial/retail.

The retail/office component is proposed to be constructed after all of the residential development has occurred. The staff disagrees with the applicant's phasing schedule because it does not achieve a mixed-use development character until such time as the applicant has built out all of the residential development of the project, and it will leave the commercial component fallow until such time as the market demands are most profitable. This is unfortunate for the applicant if market conditions are such that the demand for commercial development will not yield a profit, but the intent of the M-X-T Zone is mixed use. Without a commitment by the applicant to develop the commercial site, the property could become an eyesore along one of the most important corridors from Prince George's County leading to the District of Columbia. The staff is of the opinion that through a creative, thorough marketing scheme and commitment by the applicant, an appropriate development scheme would serve the future residents and provide a pleasing appearance to the Central Avenue corridor with a high quality retail/office development prior to build-out of the residential component. The retail portion of the site could include an indoor/outdoor dining plaza or other unique retail feature that will be able to operate independently, until the residential street is completed. Therefore, the staff recommends that 25 percent of the total retail/office component be constructed prior to the release of any building permits in Phase Four of the development.

(6) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

The pedestrian system would be more convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development if the recommendations of the trails coordinator were followed. The following comments were taken from the trails coordinator's memo dated June 28, 2004, Shaffer to Lareuse:

“The Adopted and Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan

recommends two master plan trails that impact the subject site. These trails are identified on Map 16 as the Eastern Trail along the Karen Boulevard corridor and the Railroad Trail along the Chesapeake Beach Railroad right-of-way.

“The Railroad Trail is currently being studied by the Town of Seat Pleasant to the west of the subject site and has been constructed through several development projects to the south and east of the site. This trail will provide an active recreational opportunity in the vicinity of the subject application, as well as provide the opportunity for pedestrian and bicycle trips in the area. On the subject site, the railroad/trail corridor is within the PEPSCO right-of-way. Due to liability concerns, it appears unlikely that a trail will be possible within the right-of-way in the near future. However, this east-west connection can be accommodated through the provision of an improved, wide sidewalk along the subject site’s frontage of MD 214. This is consistent with the Adopted and Approved Landover and Vicinity Master Plan that designates MD 214 as a major sidewalk corridor, and the Sector Plan, which recommends standard or wide sidewalks along all major roads due to their ability to facilitate continuous pedestrian movement to Metro and the town center, as well as through local communities. There is an existing sidewalk along the subject site’s frontage of MD 214. However, it is narrow (four feet wide) and directly behind the curb, which makes it an unattractive and unpleasant route for pedestrians. Staff recommends that the existing sidewalk be replaced with a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip, unless modified by SHA. This landscape strip, in addition to adding some needed green space to the corridor, will also provide a buffer between pedestrians using the sidewalk and high-speed automobile traffic in the adjacent travel lanes.

“The Eastern Trail is proposed to follow Pepper Mill Drive and Karen Boulevard to form a continuous north-south trail for walkers and bikers, connecting Seat Pleasant Drive with Walker Mill Road. This trail will ultimately link Peppermill Village and the proposed Glenwood Hills development to the Peppermill Community Center, Walker Mill Middle School, Baynes Elementary School, and the town center.

“Staff also feels that a small number of internal, HOA trail connections will greatly enhance the walkability of the subject site and surrounding community. Central High School, an existing ball field, and the Addison Road Metro Station are west of the subject site. Staff recommends a trail connection from the end of Road “G” to Quarry Place. This trail connection should also be extended to Fawncrest Drive, if feasible. It is possible that this trail may be developed in conjunction with a stormwater management pond access road necessary for SWM Facility #3. Another trail connection is recommended from Road “J” to Quarry Avenue. These short trail connections will provide a direct pedestrian access from the subject site to these nearby facilities. The exact location of the trail connections should be determined at the time of DSP. The communities to the west of the subject site include sidewalks along both sides of most internal roads. These sidewalks accommodate pedestrians to the ball field, high school, and elementary school. The addition of these trail connections will link residents of the subject application to these sidewalks and to these nearby public facilities.

“The subdivisions immediately to the west of the subject site include standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads. Sidewalks are an integral part of the overall trail and pedestrian network and are necessary to facilitate safe pedestrian movement through the community and to nearby destinations such as Central High School, Walker Mill

Middle School, Saint Margarets Elementary School, and local parks. Due to this and the density of the submitted CSP, staff recommends that standard sidewalks be provided along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.

“RECOMMENDATIONS/COMMENTS:

“In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Addison Road Metro Town Center and Vicinity Sector Plan, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:

- “1. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide trail along the subject property’s entire frontage of Karen Boulevard. This trail will accommodate north-south pedestrian and bicycle movement through the site as envisioned by the sector plan.
- “2. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip along the subject site’s entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.
- “3. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.
- “4. Provide a trail connection from the end of Road “G” to Quarry Place and Fawncrest Drive. The exact location of this trail connection should be determined at the time of DSP.
- “5. Provide a sidewalk or trail connection from Road “J” to Quarry Avenue.
- “6. A more detailed analysis of pedestrian and trail connections will be made at the time of preliminary plan and detailed site plan. Additional trail connections, sidewalks, and pedestrian safety measures may be warranted.”

The recommendations above have been included in the recommendation section.

(8) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.

The Transportation Planning Section has determined that the subject property is located within the Developed 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) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, is permitted at signalized

intersections 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.

Analysis of Traffic Impacts

The traffic study for this site examined the site impact at seven intersections; these intersections are listed below and mapped with their locations in comparison to the site on an attached map (all studied intersections are signalized or proposed for signalization):

- MD 214/Addison Road
- MD 214/Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard
- MD 214/Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive
- MD 214/Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road
- Walker Mill Road/Addison Road
- Walker Mill Road/Karen Boulevard
- Walker Mill Road/Shady Glen Drive

The existing conditions at the study intersections are summarized below:

| EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|---|
| Intersection | Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM) | | Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM) | |
| MD 214 and Addison Road | 1,102 | 1,262 | B | C |
| MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard | 751 | 635 | A | A |
| MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive | 1,092 | 1,046 | B | B |
| MD 214 and Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road | 1,169 | 1,595 | C | E |
| Walker Mill Road and Addison Road | 1,513 | 1,480 | E | E |
| Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard | 571 | 641 | A | A |
| Walker Mill Road and Shady Glen Drive | 615 | 707 | A | A |

It should be noted that the traffic study was started far in advance of the current review. The study was discussed with the applicant in late 2002, and the counts were done in early 2003. The counts were less than one year old at the time of submittal of the application, in accordance with the guidelines. While the application was under review for acceptance, the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange was opened. Under background conditions, the counts have been adjusted to account for this opening.

The area of background development includes seven properties in the vicinity of the subject property. Background conditions also assume through traffic growth of 1.0

percent annually along MD 214. There are programmed improvements in the area Capital Improvement Program (CIP) involving Walker Mill Road and Addison Road. Neither of these projects is fully funded within the CIP for construction within the next six years, and therefore they are not included as a part of background traffic. Background conditions are summarized below:

| BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|
| Intersection | Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM) | | Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM) |
| MD 214 and Addison Road | 1,255 | 1,691 | C F |
| MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard | 940 | 817 | A A |
| MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive | 1,303 | 1,306 | D D |
| MD 214 and Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road | 1,375 | 1,886 | D F |
| Walker Mill Road and Addison Road | 1,744 | 1,657 | F F |
| Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard | 646 | 717 | A A |
| Walker Mill Road and Shady Glen Drive | 682 | 799 | A A |

The site is proposed for development as a mixed-use development. This is the point at which the request initially became vague because there are a number of conflicting statements on plans and documents that have been submitted for review. Nonetheless, the traffic study as currently prepared is based upon 30,000 square feet of retail space, 173,000 square feet of office space, and 612 residential units. The current plan has reduced the number of residential units to 597. The site trip generation rates shown in the traffic study are determined to be acceptable. There is no rate of internal trip satisfaction assumed, but pass-by trips for retail are assumed. The site trip generation is 780 AM peak-hour trips (409 in, 371 out) and 933 PM peak-hour trips (439 in, 494 out). With the uses proposed on the final plan and within the final version of the traffic study, the following results are obtained under total traffic:

| TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | |
|--|-----------------------------------|-------|------------------------------------|
| Intersection | Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM) | | Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM) |
| MD 214 and Addison Road | 1,324 | 1,793 | D F |
| MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard | 1,187 | 1,294 | C C |
| MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive | 1,414 | 1,437 | D D |
| MD 214 and Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road | 1,444 | 1,987 | D F |
| Walker Mill Road and Addison Road | 1,755 | 1,706 | F F |
| Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard | 648 | 744 | A A |
| Walker Mill Road and Shady Glen Drive | 762 | 838 | A A |

Given these analyses, several intersections within the study area would operate

unacceptably in one or both peak hours. Each of these intersections is discussed in a separate section below.

MD 214/Addison Road

In response to the inadequacy at the MD 214/Addison Road intersection, the applicant has proffered two options for improvements. The first option would provide a northbound free right-turn lane along Addison Road, and this option provides LOS E operations or better in each peak hour. The second option would provide a right-turn lane along the eastbound MD 214 approach. This improvement is proposed as mitigation in accordance with the Guidelines for Mitigation Action and the requirements of that portion of Section 24-124. The applicant proposes to employ mitigation by means of criterion (1) in the Guidelines for Mitigation Action, which were approved by the District Council as CR-29-1994 (the site also meets criterion (3), and may also meet criterion (2)). The impact of the applicant’s second option for mitigation at this intersection is summarized as follows:

| IMPACT OF MITIGATION | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|------|
| Intersection | LOS and CLV (AM & PM) | | CLV Difference (AM & PM) | |
| MD 214/Addison Road | | | | |
| Background Conditions | C/1255 | E/1691 | | |
| Total Traffic Conditions | D/1324 | F/1793 | +69 | +102 |
| Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation | D/1324 | F/1615 | N/A | -178 |

As the CLV at MD 214/Addison Road is between 1,450 and 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 150 percent of the trips generated by the subject property, according to the guidelines. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate 174 percent of site-generated trips during the PM peak hour, and it would provide LOS D during the AM peak hour. Therefore, the proposed mitigation at MD 214 and Addison Road meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.

The mitigation plan was reviewed by DPW&T and SHA. DPW&T had no comments. SHA did review the options at MD 214/Addison Road and indicated that the feasibility of one option versus the other would require further review.

As previously noted, the applicant has identified an improvement that would provide LOS E operations in both peak hours. While mitigation could certainly be rejected in favor of the improvement that provides the policy LOS, SHA has indicated that the feasibility of each option needs further review, and for that reason both options will be carried forward into the recommendation.

MD 214/Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road

In response to the inadequacy at the MD 214/Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road intersection, the applicant has proffered two options for improvements. The first option would provide a second left-turn lane along westbound MD 214, and this modification would involve a lane shift so that the rightmost lane westbound would become a shared

through/right-turn. The second option would provide an exclusive left-turn lane along the eastbound MD 214 approach, which would involve the loss of one of the left-turn lanes, along with dual exclusive left-turn lanes on the northbound Ritchie Road approach. Both improvements are proposed as mitigation in accordance with the Guidelines for Mitigation Action and the requirements of that portion of Section 24-124. The applicant proposes to employ mitigation by means of criterion (1) in the Guidelines for Mitigation Action, which were approved by the District Council as CR-29-1994 (the site also meets criterion (3), and may also meet criterion (2)). The impact of the applicant's first option for mitigation at this intersection is summarized as follows:

| IMPACT OF MITIGATION | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------|--------------------------|------|
| ----- OPTION 1 ----- | | | | |
| Intersection | LOS and CLV (AM & PM) | | CLV Difference (AM & PM) | |
| MD 214/Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road | | | | |
| Background Conditions | D/1375 | F/1886 | | |
| Total Traffic Conditions | D/1444 | F/1987 | +69 | +101 |
| Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation Option 1 | D/1481 | F/1755 | N/A | -232 |

As the CLV at MD 214/Morgan/Ritchie is greater than 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 100 percent of the trips generated by the subject property and bring the CLV to 1,813 or less, according to the guidelines. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate 229 percent of site-generated trips during the PM peak hour while bringing the CLV to less than 1,813, and it would provide LOS E during the AM peak hour. Therefore, the first option for proposed mitigation at MD 214 and Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.

The impact of the applicant's second option for mitigation at this intersection is summarized as follows:

| IMPACT OF MITIGATION | | | | |
|--|-----------------------|--------|--------------------------|------|
| ----- OPTION 2 ----- | | | | |
| Intersection | LOS and CLV (AM & PM) | | CLV Difference (AM & PM) | |
| MD 214/Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road | | | | |
| Background Conditions | D/1375 | F/1886 | | |
| Total Traffic Conditions | D/1444 | F/1987 | +69 | +101 |
| Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation Option 2 | D/1461 | F/1804 | N/A | -183 |

As the CLV at MD 214/Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road is greater than 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 100 percent of the trips generated by the subject property and bring the CLV to 1,813 or less, according to

the guidelines. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate 181 percent of site-generated trips during the PM peak hour while bringing the CLV to less than 1,813, and it would provide LOS E during the AM peak hour. Therefore, the second option for proposed mitigation at MD 214 and Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.

The mitigation plan was reviewed by DPW&T and SHA. DPW&T had no comments. SHA did review the options at MD 214/Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road and indicated that the feasibility of one option versus the other would require further review.

At this location, the applicant has not identified improvements that would provide LOS E operations in both peak hours. The sector plan for this area does identify the possibility of operating a fourth through lane eastbound and westbound through this intersection. Furthermore, that possibility is included in SHA's *Addison Road to Largo Town Center Metrorail Extension Access Study* (December 2001) as a year 2020 improvement at a cost estimated in 2001 of \$6.055 million. SHA, once again, has indicated that the feasibility of each of the options proposed needs further review, and for that reason both options will be carried forward into the recommendation.

Walker Mill Road/Addison Road

The traffic study recommends modification of the westbound Walker Mill Road approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/left-turn lane. With this modification in place, the intersection would operate at LOS E, with a CLV of 1,509 during the AM peak hour. Similarly, the intersection would operate at LOS D, with a CLV of 1,404 during the PM peak hour. This is acceptable.

MD 214/Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard

This intersection is proposed to become the primary access point into the site. The traffic study proffers signalization with split phasing on the north-south approaches at this location, along with a lane configuration that includes two northbound approach lanes, an exclusive left-turn lane into the site on the westbound approach of MD 214, and a shared right-turn/through lane into the site on the eastbound approach of MD 214. The traffic study also suggests that the southbound approach of Pepper Mill Road be converted to an exclusive left-turn and a shared through/right-turn lane. With a signal in place and the lane configuration in place, the intersection would operate acceptably in both peak hours.

Walker Mill Road/Karen Boulevard

This intersection is not currently signalized, but is analyzed as an unsignalized intersection in the traffic study. During review of the preliminary plan of subdivision for Lincolnshire, 4-03084, it was determined that this intersection would fail as an unsignalized intersection, and that application was approved with a condition to study signalization at this location and install a traffic signal if warranted. The traffic study for this case does not proffer signalization at this location. Nonetheless, staff would observe that findings have been made that this intersection would fail as an unsignalized intersection and would propose that the subject application be approved with the same condition as that placed on Lincolnshire.

Comments – Operating Agencies

Both DPW&T and SHA have provided comments on the traffic study, and the comments are attached. SHA provided comments that expressed general agreement with the recommendations. DPW&T had concerns, however, and these concerns are discussed below:

- a. DPW&T was concerned that the submitted traffic study was based upon traffic counts done prior to the opening of the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. It is noted that the counts were less than one year old at the time of plan submittal, and the schedule for eventual opening of the interchange was somewhat fluid at the time that the counts were done. This is a legitimate concern, however, and it is suggested that a revised traffic study, with new counts, be required at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision.
- b. DPW&T suggested that the assignment of traffic onto Shady Glen Drive was unjustified. Staff agrees that once Karen Boulevard is opened between the site and Walker Mill Drive, there will be little need for more than a minimal assignment from the site onto Shady Glen Drive and propose that this could also be corrected at the time of preliminary plan with a revised traffic study.
- c. DPW&T indicated a concern about angle parking along Karen Boulevard. The overall concept has been changed since the time of the comments, and there is no longer a plan to incorporate angle parking along Karen Boulevard or any other proposed public street within the site.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed development as required under Section 27-546(d)(8) of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with the transportation conditions as found in the Recommendation section of this report.

- 8. Section 27-548 (a) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance provides for the following:

(a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):

(1) Without the use of the optional method of development – 0.40 FAR

The subject application does not propose a FAR above 0.40, so the use of the optional method of development is not needed. The following FAR is proposed:

All residential uses (minimum)—1,596,000 square feet
Office (maximum)—173,000 square feet
Retail (maximum)—30,000 square feet
Total GFA proposed—1,799,000 square feet
FAR ratio proposed—0.36-0.40 maximum

Comment: The staff recommends that a condition be added to the plans that requires a minimum of 25 percent of each of the total retail and office gross floor area will be constructed prior to Phase Four of the residential development.

9. **Required Findings of Section 27-276(b) for a Conceptual Site Plan**

4. The proposed Conceptual Site Plan would represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use if the conceptual design of the areas identified below were refined as indicated:
- a. The townhouse enclave of the development—in order to improve the views into the adjacent wooded open space and to improve the connection to the woodland preservation area in the adjacent of open space tract, the entire south side of the development pod should be opened to the woodland. The central pocket park could become a linear park along the ridgeline and form a transition into the townhouse development into the woodland area. This approach would create a feeling of openness to the development, which is currently very tightly designed. The applicant may recoup the loss of units where the tot-lot is currently shown on the plans.
 - b. The multifamily 12-plex pod of development located in the southeast section of the site should be required to provide a minimum amount of green space, similar to the requirements of a comparable Euclidian zone. In this case, the similar comparable zone is the R-18 Zone, which requires 70 percent green area and 30 percent lot coverage. The staff recommends that based on the proposed lot layout shown on the Conceptual Site Plan, that prior to the approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision the applicant demonstrate a similar ratio.
 - c. The multifamily (two over two units) pod of development should increase the number of units fronting onto Karen Boulevard and to ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.

10. **Conceptual Site Plan:** The conditions of the previous revision to the Conceptual Site Plan, as they relate to the subject application are discussed below:

- 1. **Prior to certificate approval, the plans shall be revised as follows or the indicated information shall be supplied:**
 - b. **Phasing lines shall be shown on the plan and the phasing schedule shall be shown on the plan. A stipulation shall be added to the phasing schedule that the Retail Area (Area A) shall be constructed and at least 25 percent occupied (based on gross floor area) prior to release of any residential building permits in Phase 3.**

Comment: This condition in concept will be carried over as a recommendation in this plan.

- c. **The Recreation Area (Area G) shall be included in Phase 2 of the phasing schedule with the following additional stipulations regarding construction:**
 - (1) **Construction of the facilities in the Recreation Area shall commence prior to release of any residential building permits beyond 50 percent of the total number of residential permits.**

(2) Construction of the facilities shall be completed prior to release of any residential building permits in Phase 3.

Comment: A similar condition will be carried over based on the new phasing schedule.

- f. Revise the plan to show the trail symbol on the east side of Karen Boulevard for its entire length and label this trail "8-foot wide hard surface trail." Also, revise the plan to show the trail symbol crossing the site in the vicinity of the powerlines just south of Central Avenue and label this trail "8-foot wide hard surface trail."**

Comment: A similar condition will be required to provide an eight-foot-wide concrete sidewalk on the east side of Karen Boulevard and an eight-foot-wide trail or sidewalk along the south side of Central Avenue.

- h. Standards shall be submitted for the architectural appearance (size, massing, character, materials, details) of the office, retail, and recreational buildings.**

Comment: A similar condition will be carried over in the Recommendation section.

- j. Label all the facilities in the Recreation Area (Area G) and indicate on the plan the main elements in the Community Building (meeting room, lounge, kitchen, toilets and bathhouse).**

Comment: A similar condition will be carried over in the Recommendation section of this report.

- k. A more attractive typical light fixture shall be selected and information shall be supplied on the plan regarding standards and design, height, and luminosity of luminaires. The luminaires selected shall not emit orange or yellow-orange-tinted light typical of sodium vapor lamps.**

Comment: A similar condition will be carried over in the Recommendation section.

- m. The site data on the plan shall be revised to indicate that the total amount of office and retail combined shall not exceed 203,000 square feet, and that neither the office nor the retail may fall below 10 percent of the total.**

Comment: A similar condition will be carried over in the Recommendation section. However, the staff recognizes that completion of the entire residential component will not result in a mixed-use development. At this time, the staff recommends a timing element be incorporated into the condition to assure completion of at least a portion of the office/retail component. See Condition 26 in the Recommendation section of this report.

- 7. Prior to submission of any Detailed Site Plan for any development parcel, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall submit for approval by the Planning Board a Detailed Site Plan for signage to provide the Planning Board and the community with a concrete idea of the exact appearance of all the signs in the development.**

Comment: A condition relating to the submission of entrance features and other signage is contained in the Recommendation section.

11. **Preliminary Plan:** The Conceptual Site Plan (CSP) proposes fewer lots overall, and the same office and retail component as approved at the time of the preliminary plan. However, the proposed CSP represents a lotting pattern and road configuration very different than that approved at the preliminary plan stage in 1994. Lots for single-family detached housing are shown where lots for townhouses were approved, townhouse lots and multifamily parcels have been switched, and roads appear on the CSP where none were approved at the preliminary plan stage. Given the proposed major changes to the plan, approval of a new preliminary plan will be required. The proposed CSP is not in conformance with the approved preliminary plan. The Orders of Approval spelled out in the Zoning Ordinance Section 27-270 require the conceptual site plan to be approved prior to the preliminary plan; therefore, the Subdivision Section recommends the following condition be attached to any approval of the subject CSP:
 - a. Prior to approval of any Detailed Site Plan, a new preliminary plan application shall be approved.
12. **Landscape Manual:** The proposal is subject to the requirements of Section 4.2 (Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip), Section 4.3 (Parking Requirements), and Section 4.7 (Buffering Incompatible Uses) of the *Landscape Manual*. Compliance with the *Landscape Manual* will be reviewed in detail at the Detailed Site Plan stage.
13. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** 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 in size and it has a previously approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/66/94).

This 121.08-acre property in the M-X-T Zone has a 15 percent Woodland Conservation Threshold of 17.43 acres. In addition, there is a ¼:1 replacement requirement of approximately 21.02 acres due to the proposed clearing of approximately 93.94 acres of existing woodland and a 1:1 replacement requirement of 1.03 acres due to the proposed clearing of forested floodplain. This results in a total woodland conservation requirement of 39.54 acres. The revised TCPI proposes to satisfy the woodland conservation requirement through the preservation of 30.87 acres on-site and 1.93 acres of on-site reforestation, with the remainder of the 6.74-acre requirement being met through off-site mitigation at a location to be determined prior to the issuance of any permits. The plan was found to require minor revisions that include the provision of the correct TCPI notes (the notes on the plan are a partial listing of the notes for a TCPII) and the correction of the amount of existing woodland. In addition, the plan needs a note to indicate that it is a conceptual plan that will be revised with the review of the preliminary plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCP/66/94-01) shall be revised as follows.

- a. Add to the plan all of the standard notes as required exclusively for a TCPI.
- b. Have the total existing woodlands adjusted, if necessary, once the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined.

- c. Add a note as the first TCPI note that states: “This TCPI does not define the final limits of disturbance and does not approve the limits shown. Impacts to regulated environmental features are also not approved by this plan.”
- d. The plans shall be signed and dated by the licensed landscape architect, licensed forester or other qualified professional who prepared the plans.

14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are as follows:

- a. **The Community Planning Division** stated that the property is located on a General Plan-designated Corridor (Central Avenue). It is also located conveniently between two Centers designated by the General Plan (Addison Road Metro Station, a Community Center, and the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station, a Regional Center). The General Plan’s vision for Corridors and Centers is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. The General Plan supports this intensive, mixed-use development at local Centers and at other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections of transit stops along the Corridor. The subject property is not a designated node. The existing zoning approved in 1986 allows for mixed-use development at this site and at intensities envisioned by the General Plan for selected locations along the Corridor.

The applicant has made changes to the conceptual site plan, (relocating the community pool to a central location, adding a third house type [two-over-two] alleys, and agreeing to one signature professional building instead of the previously proposed five commercial pad sites along Central Avenue), which are an improvement over the original proposal.

A mixed-use development should have pedestrian connections within and between uses. Pedestrian connections are especially important to the commercial area, transit routes, focal points, and other public places. The General Plan emphasizes walkability for developments in the Developed Tier and along Corridors.

- b. **The Department of Environmental Resources** has stated that the proposal is consistent with approved stormwater concept plan #39362-2002.
- c. **The Environmental Planning Section** has reviewed the above-referenced revised Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-88020/02, stamped as received on May 7, 2004. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 and TCPI/66/94-01, subject to the conditions listed at the end of this memorandum.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the subject property as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-94066 in conjunction with Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/66/94, which were approved with conditions. This Conceptual Site Plan seeks the approval to substantially revise the previous layout for residential, office and retail areas. The site has an approved stormwater management concept plan approval letter (#39362-2002-00) dated October 10, 2003.

A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain,

erodible soils, and Waters of the U.S. do occur on the subject property. Transportation-related noise impacts have been found to impact this site in areas adjacent to Central Avenue, a noise generator and generally regulated for noise impacts. The soils found to occur on-site according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey includes Adelphia, Collington, Sassafrass, Howell clay and Westphalia. Some of these existing soils have limitations that will have an impact during the building phase of the development. 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," dated December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. This property is located in the Beaverdam Creek watershed of the Anacostia River basin. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the adopted General Plan.

Environmental Review

- (1) The Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) submitted to the Environmental Planning Section dated October 31, 2003, was found to require minor revisions to comply with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A revised FSD plan and text were submitted June 8, 2004. The text and the plan show 119.83 acres of existing woodland. The TCPI states that there are 120.64 acres of existing woodland.

Recommended Conditions: Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan the FSD shall be revised as follows:

- (a) Revise the FSD plan notes under site analysis to reflect the correct acreage of existing forest on-site, if necessary, after the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined.
 - (b) Have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- (2) Central Avenue is classified as an arterial roadway with a noise impact zone 65 dBA Ldn contour extending approximately 247 feet from the centerline of the roadway as calculated using the Environmental Planning Section Noise Model. This contour must be shown on these plans and future plans, or a Phase I noise study can be prepared and submitted for review.

This approximate location of the noise contour does not result in impacts to the currently proposed residential portion of the subject property. If residential uses are proposed in the area currently proposed for commercial uses within the area of noise impacts, then noise mitigation measures will be required.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the CSP, the CSP shall be revised to show the projected 65 dBA Ldn at 247 feet from the centerline of Central Avenue or provide a Phase I Noise Study to verify a revised location of the 65 dBA Ldn contour.

Recommended Condition: If residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.

- (3) The Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter dated October 10, 2003, includes conditions of approval. The requirement for stormwater management concept approval will be met through subsequent reviews by the Department of Environmental Resources. No further information is required at this time with regard to stormwater management.
- (4) The Subdivision Ordinance requires the preservation of the expanded stream buffer in a natural state (Section 24-130 (b)(6) and (7)) unless the Planning Board approves a variation request. The conceptual TCPI approved with the CSP does not approve the limits of disturbance shown and does not approve any of the proposed impacts to the sensitive environmental features. During the review of the preliminary plan, impacts to sensitive environmental features will be evaluated and variation requests will be required.

d. **The Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation** recommends to the Planning Board that the applicant provide adequate private recreational facilities. The applicant, his successors and/or assignees shall be subject to the following conditions of approval:

- (1) The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
- (2) A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD), which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
- (3) The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.
- (4) Submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
- (5) Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
- (6) 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.
- (7) The land to be conveyed to a homeowners association shall be subject to the applicable conditions in attached Exhibit A.

- (8) The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the conceptual site plan by the Planning Board.

Comment: The provision of recreational facilities in one central location provides for the most convenient, safest, and least impacting alternative to recreational design for the future community. The standard procedure for determining adequate recreational facilities for projects is to determine the projected population and multiply by a predetermined standard value for facilities. In this case, the staff recommends that tots and pre-teenage children be accommodated with age-appropriate facilities within the townhouse and the multifamily development pods and the remaining facilities for the development be concentrated in a central recreational area. The plans somewhat reflect this concept, but have scattered some of the facilities in areas of open space unassociated with the central recreational areas. The staff opposes this scattering of recreational facilities because it does not allow for the convenience of members within one particular family unit to go to one location and participate in activities suited for their age group. Therefore the staff recommends the following breakdown of recreational facilities:

Townhouse pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination).

Multifamily pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.

Central recreational area—clubhouse with meeting room large enough to accommodate seating for 100 persons, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), 1,000-square-foot fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons, and:

- 25 meter swimming pool
- One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)
- Possible trail connection from the townhouse development along the stream to the central recreational area
- One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)
- One single tennis court
- Appropriately sized parking facility for the residents only

The location of the central recreational area as shown on the plan is appropriate because it is easily accessible and located adjacent to the scenic woodland knoll. The size as shown on the plans, however, is unreasonably squeezed by adjacent units. Some units will need to be removed in order to provide adequate room for the facilities as well as providing a clear, distinctive sense of place for the community activities. The staff believes that 3.5 to 4 acres of developable land will be required to accommodate the central recreational area. The architecture of the clubhouse should be designed as an architectural focal point for the community and appropriate measures to limit the use of the facilities to the future residents should be designed into the final plans for development.

The applicant proposes to build the clubhouse and central recreational facilities in Phase Three of the project. The staff agrees with the applicant; however, the staff

suggests that the time of bonding and completion be more specific. The staff recommends that, prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities. Prior to the issuance of the 300th building permit, the applicant shall complete the recreational facilities. Further, the bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each, and the completion of those facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each corresponding pod of development.

e. **The State Highway Administration** stated the following in memo dated June 25, 2004:

“This is reference to our ongoing review of the above captioned development and Conceptual Site Plan. Previously SHA offered comments regarding the appropriateness of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 with respect to Maryland State Highway (SHA) requirements for access to MD 214.

“I discussed with Bo Ward, Assistant Division Chief, the concept plan showing proposed Karen Boulevard connecting with MD 214, which was received on June 25th . We have carefully considered the applicant's proposed improvements and generally , agree with the alignment of Karen Boulevard at MD 214 (Central Avenue). At this time a ‘Conditional Approval’ of Conceptual Site Plan 88020/02 is granted. Please be advise, [sic] the applicant may be subject to further requirements as determined by the Maryland State Highway Access Manual guidelines.

“Specific improvements at MD 214/Karen Boulevard/ Peppermill RD intersection must be provided by the applicant and not be limited to the following:

- “1. Provide a diagram that demonstrates stopping and intersection site distance.
- “2. Provide an adequate left-turn lane along westbound MD 214 approach to Karen Boulevard.
- “3. Provide adequate turning lanes along eastbound MD 214 approach and departure at Karen Boulevard.
- “4. Provide a full movement traffic signal.

“We request that you disregard our November 14, 2003 letter and include the above comments in your staff report to the Planning Board. Please be advise that SHA reserves that right to revisit conditions and requirements for site access improvements.”

Comment: The conditions above are included in the Recommendation section of this report and will be required to be demonstrated prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan.

f. **The Transportation Planning Section** provided the additional following comments regarding the plan:

The Conceptual Site Plan does not provide large-scale plans on which future rights-of-way can be noted and determined. MD 214 is a master plan arterial with a future right-of-way of 150 feet. The preliminary plan will be required to provide for dedication of 75 feet from centerline along MD 214. Also, Karen Boulevard is a proposed collector within an 80-foot right-of-way, and the plan shows sufficient right-of-way through the subject property.

It is strongly recommended that the applicant be required to construct Karen Boulevard as part of this development. The site plan accurately demonstrates the existing 80-foot right-of-way that was recommended in the Suitland-District Heights master plan. This roadway, when completed, will provide a parallel route and option to Shady Glen Road and Addison Road. The extension of Karen Boulevard through this site is an important link. It will provide an additional point of access to neighborhoods to the south and especially to the Walker Mill Middle School and Walker Mill Road.

Aside from the completion of Karen Boulevard to the south, the plan shows no connection to any of the streets which stub into the subject property. Environmental constraints may make connections to Quarry Place, Fawncrest Drive, and Cappy Avenue unsuitable. However, on several occasions requests have been made to show a connection between the site and Quarry Avenue. This is desirable for three reasons:

- (1) Quarry Avenue and Wilburn Drive are both primary residential streets.
- (2) The street connection will allow future residents of the Glenwood Hills community improved access to school, park, and other community facilities.
- (3) The street connection will allow existing residents of the Wilburn Estates community improved access to MD 214 and the services along that roadway.

The street connection would provide some relief to the MD 214/Addison Road intersection, which will perform poorly during the afternoon with the development of the subject property.

The commercial section of the site is shown with access solely via a driveway onto MD 214. The plan must be revised to indicate the possibility for access internal to the site. Platting a lot with driveway access solely via an arterial facility is in violation of Section 24-121(a)(3), which limits individual lot access onto arterial facilities. Access can be granted by the Planning Board by means of a variation request at the time of subdivision, but the subject plan should not force this decision. Furthermore, SHA clearly has not reviewed or approved a specific access request at this location; therefore, the CSP must be modified to account for the possibility that SHA approval of access and/or Planning Board approval of a variation might not occur.

Otherwise, the general circulation plan is acceptable. The proposed traffic circle shown on the submitted plan must be reviewed in detail by DPW&T prior to preliminary plan approval.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020/02 and TCPI/66/94-01 with the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for MD 214 at Addison Road shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
 - a. Option 1: The construction of a northbound free right-turn lane along Addison Road
 - b. Option 2: The construction of an eastbound right-turn lane along MD 214.

The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 would be implemented shall be made at the time of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review.

2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for MD 214 at Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
 - a. Option 1: The modification of westbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.
 - b. Option 2: The modification of eastbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane; and the modification of northbound Ritchie Road to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.

The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 would be implemented shall be made at the time of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review.

3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for Walker Mill Road at Addison Road shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
 - a. The modification of westbound Walker Mill Road to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a left-turn/right-turn lane.

4. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary, DPW&T for a possible signal at the intersection of MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen Boulevard. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the responsible agency. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when

directed by the responsible permitting agency. Also, prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. The provision of an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MD 214.
- b. The addition of a westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.
- c. The construction of the northbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.
- d. The modification of the southbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.

The scope of access improvements may be modified at the time of preliminary plan review at the direction of SHA if the alternative improvement(s) provide an acceptable service level that meets the requirements of Subtitles 27 and 24.

5. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T for the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The performance of a new study may be waived by DPW&T in writing if DPW&T determines that an acceptable recent study has been conducted. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T.
6. Prior to signature approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, the subject plan shall be modified as follows:
 - a. Inclusion of vehicular and pedestrian access between the subject property and Quarry Avenue.
 - b. Inclusion of vehicular and pedestrian internal access between the residential and the commercial components of the site.
7. The traffic circle shown on the subject plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPW&T prior to approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision.
8. Total development within the subject property under this Conceptual Site Plan shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 780 AM and 933 PM peak-hour vehicle trips, in consideration of the rates of trip generation, internal satisfaction, and pass-by travel that are consistent with assumptions in the traffic study.
9. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for Karen Boulevard shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

- a. Construct Karen Boulevard as a four-lane collector roadway between MD 214 and the southern end of the site.
10. Prior to the first Detailed Site Plan submission for the property, the applicant shall demonstrate the following have been or will be fulfilled to the satisfaction of the State Highway Administration:
 - a. Provide a diagram that demonstrates stopping and intersection site distance.
 - b. Provide an adequate left-turn lane along westbound MD 214 approach to Karen Boulevard.
 - c. Provide adequate turning lanes along eastbound MD 214 approach and departure at Karen Boulevard.
 - d. Provide a full movement traffic signal.
11. Prior to signature approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, the following revisions shall be made:
 - a. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject property's entire east side of Karen Boulevard.
 - b. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.
 - c. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - d. Revise the Conceptual Site Plan to provide a trail connection from the end of Road "G" to Quarry Place and, if possible, Fawncrest Drive. The exact location of this trail connection should be determined at the time of DSP.
12. A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Board which complies with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
13. The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.
14. Submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
15. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.

16. 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.
17. The land to be conveyed to a homeowners association shall be subject to the applicable conditions in attached Exhibit "A."
18. The following private recreational facilities shall be provided within the development and shall be deemed adequate:

Townhouse pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)

Multifamily pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.

Central recreational area on a minimum of 3.5 acres of land (excluding woodland preservation area), including the following:

- Clubhouse with meeting room large enough to accommodate seating for 100 persons, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), 1,000-square-foot fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons
- 25-meter swimming pool
- One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)
- Possible trail connection from the townhouse development along the stream to the central recreational area.
- One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)
- One tennis court
- Appropriately sized parking facility for the residents only

19. The following schedule shall govern bonding and construction of recreational facilities and shall be included in the recreational facilities agreement(s):
 - a. Prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of the 300th building permit in the development, the applicant shall complete the central recreational facilities.
 - c. The bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development pods shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each pod

respectively, and the completion of the same facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each pod of development.

20. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan:
 - a. The TCPI/44/96-01 shall be revised to show the following:
 - (1) Proposed building footprint locations, parking lots, and easements in the new design for the office/retail component.
 - (2) Revisions signed and dated by a qualified professional.
 - (3) The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour from I-95/495.
 - b. The applicant shall submit a copy of the approved/proposed stormwater management concept plan for Phase II.
21. Prior to approval of any Detailed Site Plan, a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision application shall be approved.
22. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the following revisions to the plans shall be made:
 - a. The FSD shall be revised as follows: revise the FSD plan notes under site analysis to reflect the correct acreage of existing forest on-site, if necessary, after the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined and have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
 - b. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/66/94-01) shall be revised as follows.
 - (1) Add to the plan all of the standard notes as required exclusively for a TCPI.
 - (2) Have the total existing woodlands adjusted, if necessary, once the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined.
 - (3) Add a note as the first TCPI note that states: "This TCPI does not define the final limits of disturbance and does not approve the limits shown. Impacts to regulated environmental features are also not approved by this plan."
 - (4) Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plans.
 - c. The CSP shall be revised to show the projected 65 dBA Ldn at 247 feet from the centerline of Central Avenue or provide a Phase I Noise Study to verify a revised location of the 65 dBA Ldn contour.
23. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review, if residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.

24. The following development standards apply and shall be demonstrated throughout the review of future plans:

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED:

Traditional SFD

- Minimum Net Lot area—6,000 square feet
- Minimum finished living area—2,200 square feet
- Two car garage—yes
- Maximum lot coverage—30%
- Minimum lot frontage at the street line—60 feet
- Front yard setback—25 feet
- Side yard setback—8/17 combined feet
- Rear yard setback—20
- Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet
- Maximum height of building—40 feet
- Deck standards—to be determined at DSP

Small Lot SFD Front Load

- Minimum Net Lot area—5,000 square feet
- Minimum finished living area—2,000 square feet
- Two car garage—yes
- Maximum lot coverage—50%
- Minimum lot frontage at the street line—55 feet
- Front yard setback—20 feet
- Side yard setback—6 feet
- Rear yard setback—20
- Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Small Lot SFD Rear Load

Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet

Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—60%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—50 feet

Front yard setback—25 feet, 30 feet along Karen Boulevard

Side yard setback—5 feet

Rear yard setback—20

Accessory building rear yard setback—three feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

TOWNHOUSES:

All townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance.

MULTIFAMILY:

12-plex multifamily units:

Minimum distance between two buildings—30 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a property line—20 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a parking lot—15 feet

Minimum green space (minimum percent of net lot area)—60%

Minimum of 60% of all front facades shall be brick

Two over two units:

Not more than six ground level units in a row

Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 16 feet wide

Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet.

Minimum of 60% of the front façade shall be brick

25. Prior to the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following shall be fulfilled:
 - a. Based on the proposed lot layout as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan for the multifamily 12-plex pod of development, the applicant shall demonstrate a minimum of 60 percent green area and a maximum of 40 percent lot coverage.
26. Prior to signature approval of the Conceptual Site Plan the following revisions shall be made:
 - a. Prior to the issuance of any building permits in Phase Four, the applicant shall construct a minimum of 50,750 square feet (25 percent of the total) of the office retail GFA.
 - b. The central pocket park shown within the townhouse section shall be eliminated and a linear park along the entire south side of the woodland edge shall be provided.
27. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan, the following issues shall be addressed:
 - a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for 60 percent of all single-family detached units fronting on Karen Boulevard.
 - b. Sixty percent of all facades of the clubhouse shall be brick, and the building shall be placed in a visually prominent location.
 - c. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.
 - d. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.
 - e. Pole-mounted freestanding signs shall be prohibited for the office/retail component of the development. Freestanding and building-mounted signage shall not be internally lit.
 - f. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design.
 - g. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate areas such as the entrance to the subdivision off of Central Avenue, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily 12-plex development, and the office/retail development.
 - h. A double row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along Karen Boulevard on both sides of the sidewalks. The inside row of trees are allowed to be located in the yard, and may be used to fulfill Section 4.1 of the *Landscape Manual*.
 - i. The multifamily (two over two units) pod of the development shall increase the number of units fronting onto Karen Boulevard and ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.
 - j. The location of future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks shall be shown on the plans.

28. Prior to the approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Detailed Site Plans, the plans shall reflect the following:
- a. The minimum number of traditional single-family detached lots (60-foot frontages) shall be not less than 40 percent of the development.
 - b. The maximum number of small-lot, single-family detached front load lots and small-lot, single-family detached rear load lots shall be no more than 30 percent each.
 - c. All lots fronting on Karen Boulevard shall be a minimum of 5,000 square feet in size, set back a minimum distance of 30 feet, and have side yards a minimum of 5 feet in width, regardless of the unit type.