

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed Zoning Map Amendment Application No. 9968, requesting a rezoning from the E-I-A and R-A Zones to the R-S (Residential Suburban, 1.6–2.6) Comprehensive Design Zone in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, the Technical Staff Report recommends denial of the R-S Zone; with the further recommendation of approval of the R-L (Residential Low Development, 1.0-1.5); and

WHEREAS, the applicant submitted a revised basic plan on July 21, 2005 in response to the staff recommendation; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on July 28, 2005, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- A. **Location and Field Inspection:** The subject property is a large, wooded and undeveloped tract of land, located on the north side of Leeland Road approximately 3,250 feet west of US 301. It is described as part of Parcel 30 Tax Map 77, and it measures 427 acres in size.
- B. **History:** The site was rezoned from the R-A to the E-I-A Zone during the 1991 Bowie-Collington Sectional Map Amendment. The rezoning was contained in ZMA Application A-9829.
- C. **Master Plan Recommendation:**
- 2002 General Plan: This application is located in the Developing Tier. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable.
- Master Plan: *The Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) for Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and Vicinity (Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, and 74B (1991) recommends employment and institutional uses.*
- D. **Request:** The existing E-I-A Zone is a Comprehensive Design Zone, which permits a mix of industrial/employment, commercial and public uses, to which a residential component was added in 2002, pursuant to CB-133-2002. This request is to rezone 425 acres of E-I-A-zoned property and a two-acre tract of land in the R-A Zone to the R-S (Residential-Suburban) Comprehensive Design Zone at a dwelling unit density range of 1.6 to 2.6 dwellings per acre. The two-acre site is separated from the rest of Parcel 30 by the Popes Creek Railroad tracks.

An update of the Bowie-Collington Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment has been initiated, and final adoption is expected by the end of 2005. The applicant is requesting that this rezoning take place as part of the new master plan and sectional map amendment process,

pursuant to Section 27-226 of the Zoning Ordinance.

A 15-acre parcel owned by the applicant and contained within the original basic plan can be developed in either the E-I-A or I-1 Zones, and will be further addressed through the Sectional Map Amendment.

The basic plan submitted on June 24, 2005 reflects the following land use types and quantities:

Total area:	427± acres
Land in the 100-year floodplain:	77.7± acres
Adjusted Gross Area:	(427 less half the floodplain)=388± acres
Mixed Retirement:	27± Acres
Adjusted Gross Area less Mixed Retirement:	361± acres
Density Permitted under the R-S Zone:	1.6–2.6 du/ac
Permitted Dwelling Unit Range (excluding mixed retirement):	577–938 du

Proposed Land Use Types and Quantities:

Residential: 361 acres @ 1.5 du/ac	104 acres—460 single-family detached units 9 acres—85 townhouse units 545 total units
Mixed Retirement: 27+ Acres @ 5.74 du/ac	31 single-family detached units 54 townhouse units 70 multifamily units 155 total units
Private Active Open Space:	9 acres
Public Active Open Space:	22 acres
Passive Open Space	223 acres

A revised plan was submitted on July 21, 2005, after the release of the Technical Staff Report. The revised plan shows 600 dwelling units (an increase of 35 townhouses) and 216 Mixed Retirement units (an increase of 61 multifamily units) for a total of 816 units compared to 700 total dwelling units reviewed in the Technical Staff Report. This request reflects a density of 1.6 units per acre for the 361 residential acres and 8 dwellings per acre for the mixed-use retirement component.

E. **Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses:** The neighborhood boundaries for this case are:

North—Central Avenue (MD 214)  
East—Crain Highway (US 301)

South—Leeland Road  
West—Church Road

There are several neighborhood density variations among the properties adjacent to or near Willowbrook. The area north of the property, which is east of Church Road and south of Central Avenue, includes the developed subdivisions of Collington and The Hamptons in the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone. To the northeast of the property is the Collington Center, a 920-acre site in the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone, which is developed with offices, research, laboratories, and specialty manufacturing. It should be noted that a stream valley, which is 100± feet wide at its most narrow point, provides a buffer between Willowbrook and the Collington Business Center. Beyond the Collington Business Center is the Karington development, which is located near the intersection of Central Avenue and US301. Karington consists of 362 acres in the E-I-A, with 650,000 square feet of office use, 343,000 square feet of retail use, and 1,239 dwelling units (including 490 multifamily apartments, 210 multifamily condominium units, 20 live-work units, 120 multifamily senior units, 245 townhouse units and 154 single-family detached units).

On the eastern edge of Willowbrook is a stream valley that buffers the subject property from the Safeway Distribution Center, which is southeast of Willowbrook. Willowbrook is further buffered from Safeway by a 15±-acre parcel that is also owned by the applicant. Further southeast of Willowbrook is the Beechtree development, which is located on the west side of Robert Crain Highway (US 301), and bounded on the north by Leeland Road. Beechtree is an R-S-zoned property with a density level of approximately 3.0 dwelling units per acre. Just south of Willowbrook is Locust Hill, a parcel in the R-E Zone.

The Popes Creek Railroad tracks are located on the western border of Willowbrook. Beyond these tracks, further west of Willowbrook, is Oak Grove Road and Church Road. Church Road runs in a north/south direction, perpendicular to Oak Grove Road. Northwest of the property is the Oak Creek residential development, an 890-acre development in the R-L Zone. Oak Creek is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Oak Grove and Church Roads. Oak Creek's residential development consists of 1,148 dwelling units, with a density level of 1.3 dwelling units per acre.

**F. Zoning Requirements: Section 27-195(b) provides that prior to the approval of the application and the Basic Plan, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the District Council, that the entire development meets the following criteria:**

**(A) The proposed Basic Plan shall either conform to:**

- (i) The specific recommendation of a General Plan map, Area Master Plan map, or urban renewal plan map; or the principles and guidelines of the plan text which address the design and physical development of the property, the public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties; or**

**(ii) The principles and guidelines described in the Plan (including the text) with respect to land use, the number of dwelling units, intensity of nonresidential buildings, and the location of land uses.**

1. Although this application is being reviewed through the master plan process and will be decided through the adoption of a revised sectional map amendment, the policies of the pending master plan revision have not yet been approved. Nevertheless, in reviewing this application, the District Council may rely upon the planning studies and rationales that provide the basis for the recommendations of the proposed preliminary master plan.

2. 2002 GENERAL PLAN

This application is located in the Developing Tier of the 2002 General Plan. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable. The plan designates employment uses in Centers and Corridors where the employment is most appropriate. The subject property is not located in such a Center or Corridor.

3. THE CURRENT MASTER PLAN

The Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan (1991) recommends employment and institutional uses. This property is within “Employment Area 6” known as the Collington Expansion Area. The approved development is also known as the Willowbrook Business Park. The 1991 master plan provides recommendations for this property on pages 137-138. The following are some of the relevant recommendations for this property:

- “This employment expansion area is not expected to realize its development potential in the foreseeable future because of its location, the opportunities and commitments within other employment areas, and the dependence on substantial road improvements prior to major development. However, if development proceeds in the near future, it should occur only after market sector and absorption studies are done to show the viability of large-scale development. Such approvals should not be granted until studies show that proposed uses are supportable in the market and that adequate land and building intensity exists to establish an identifiable and functional development.
- “Depending on the timing of development in this area, employment absorption trends, market opportunities, and public facility constraints, this employment expansion area, in particular, should be reevaluated during the next Master Plan/Sectional Map Amendment revision cycle in terms of employment alternatives and implementation techniques.”

4. PLANNING ANALYSIS

The 1991 master plan envisioned that the development of this property would occur after market studies were done to show viability. No market studies have been carried out, but the lack of development proposals for this site since 1991 suggest that employment uses for the site are far less viable now than when contemplated 14 years ago. Also, the development of this property was predicated on the development of certain public facilities including the construction of

Arterial A-44. A-44 is on the 1991 master plan, but County Council Resolution CR-19-2003, which initiated the restudy of the Bowie–Collington plan, stipulated that there would be no further analysis or evaluation of this roadway in future plans. In addition, the approval of the Karington development, located in the northern portion of Employment Area 6, for a mix of office/retail and dwelling units indicates that it is appropriate to consider residential development within this neighborhood.

Planning studies undertaken to develop recommendations for the proposed preliminary Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan found that most of this site is not suitable for employment use, as previously planned, given the property’s substantial environmental constraints. There are streams, wetlands and 100-year floodplains and associated areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils and areas of severe slopes on the property. These conditions severely restrict the potential for the development of employment-related uses due to the difficulty of assembling large enough buildable sites. By comparison, low-density residential development in the 1.0 to 1.5 dwelling units per acre range provides lot layout flexibility while protecting environmentally sensitive areas. It provides an appropriate pattern of single-family development that conforms to the 2002 General Plan goals and policies for the Developing Tier. It provides a compatible transition from 1.3 dwelling units per acre found on the Oak Creek development, west of this site. In addition, lower intensity land use would reduce the number of vehicle trips on nearby roads. Low-density residential development will have less adverse impact on available public facilities, including schools and public safety.

## 5. MIXED RETIREMENT DEVELOPMENT

The applicant proposes to build 155 to 216 dwelling units restricted to active adults. Mixed retirement development is defined by the Zoning Ordinance as “A residential community for retirement-aged persons developed under a uniform scheme of development, containing a mix of attached, detached, or multifamily dwelling units, nursing or care homes, or assisted living facilities. Each community shall be developed with not less than two (2) types of dwelling units.” (Section 27-107.01(151)).

The preliminary master plan provides the following guidelines for senior housing:

- Development should be located within one-half mile of the edge of Bowie Regional Center or mixed-use activity centers to enhance its pedestrian orientation;
- Development should include pedestrian linkages to shopping and services in the adjacent Bowie Regional Center or mixed-use activity centers;
- Development should be of sufficient size to provide amenities, such as indoor parking or garages, gardens, plazas, swimming pools, or common eating areas;
- Development should have direct access to a collector road or greater to allow easy access for emergency medical services;
- Development should be served by public transit or shuttle buses to shopping and services in the Bowie Regional Center or mixed-use activity centers;

- Prior to approval of new development, a market analysis should be conducted that evaluates and satisfactorily demonstrates the need for senior housing.’

The applicant submitted a market analysis on July 21, 2005. The analysis was reviewed by the staff of the M-NCPPC Research Section, which agreed with the study conclusion that a market exists to support the requested number of units. The study also concludes that active seniors prefer to drive to destinations such as shopping and medical appointments. Additionally, the applicant proposes to provide a shuttle bus service, should the residents desire one, thereby satisfying the master plan intent to make the shopping and other facilities accessible to all residents.

**(B) The economic analysis submitted for a proposed retail commercial area adequately justifies an area of the size and scope shown on the Basic Plan.**

There are no retail commercial uses proposed for this site.

**(C) Transportation facilities (including streets and public transit) (i) which are existing, (ii) which are under construction, or (iii) for which 100 percent of the construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. The uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plan, or urban renewal plans.**

In a rezoning application, a comparison is generally made between the trip generating potential of the subject property, based on the highest and best use of its current zoning category, versus the highest and best use permitted in the zoning category being sought. Section 27-515 of the County Code of Prince George’s County lists a wide array of permitted uses within the E-I-A zone. However, the approved 1991 Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and vicinity master plan assumed the subject property (A-9829) could potentially be developed with 3,900,000–5,000,000 square feet of light manufacturing and warehouse/distribution (including ancillary office and retail commercial), based on a F.A.R. of 0.30–0.38.

<b>Estimated Trip Generation (Existing Zoning)</b>		
<b>Zoning/Use (existing)</b>	<b>Units/Square Feet</b>	<b>Daily Trips</b>
E-I-A—Light Manufacturing	2,500,000 square feet	2,500 x 4.8*=12,000
E-I-A—Warehouse/Distribution	2,500,000 square feet	2,500 x 3.1*= 7,750
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,000,000 square feet</b>	<b>19,750 trips</b>
* Based of trip rates from the guidelines.		

<b>Estimated Trip Generation (Subject Application)</b>		
<b>Zoning/Use (proposed)</b>	<b>Units/Square Feet</b>	<b>Daily Trips</b>
R-S: 1.6–2.6 (425 acres)	425 x 2.6=1,105	1105 x 9*=9,945
<b>Total</b>	<b>1,105 dwelling units</b>	<b>9,945 trips</b>

\* Based of trip rates from the guidelines.

The subject application is seeking a rezoning to the R-S (1.6–2.6) Zone. On the basis of the information presented in the application and its supported documents, staff concludes that if this application were approved, the maximum number of trips that could be generated would be 9,945 daily trips. In contrast, based on its current E-I-A zoning, the property could potentially generate 19,750 daily trips, significantly higher than what is current being proposed.

Based on the above review, the trip generating potential of the proposed development will not lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan.

### **Traffic Circulation/Capacity**

Since the master plan analyses typically address capacity of roadway links and not intersections, it has not been determined at this time what the impact of this rezoning would have on individual intersections. To that end, the applicant will be required to provide a traffic study at the time of the filing of a comprehensive design plan as well as a preliminary plan of subdivision. The traffic shall address capacity issues at the following intersections:

- US 301/MD 725
- US 301/Village Drive
- US 301/Leeland Road
- US 301/Trade Zone Avenue
- Leeland Road/Safeway Access
- Oak Grove Road/Church Road
- Oak Grove Road/MD 193
- MD 202/MD 193

### **Master Plan**

The subject property is located along the southern boundary of the area covered by the 1991 approved Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan. The existing Bowie master plan was approved with a highway network which included A-44, a planned six-lane arterial that runs across the northern portion of the subject property, and I-2, a planned two-lane (north/south) industrial road that is east of the subject property, to connect A-44 with Leeland Road (MC-600) to the south. Since the Bowie plan was approved in 1991, the Collington South (parcel I-3) property (Safeway, Inc.) to the east of the subject site filed a preliminary plan of subdivision (4-97044). The Safeway property was subsequently approved (PGCPB 97-214), but without the required dedication for the I-2 master plan facility. Without the required dedication from Safeway, Inc., it now appears unlikely that the I-2 roadway can be built on the original master planned alignment.

The update to the existing (1991) Bowie–Collington–Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan has been underway for almost two years. One of the update recommendations in the preliminary Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan is the removal of the A-44 facility. While the proposed Bowie and Vicinity plan is still in the preliminary phase, it appears that A-44 will not be included in the updated master plan. With the impending removal of A-44, along with its interchange at US 301

(F-10), staff is now recommending an interchange to be built at the intersection of Leeland Road and US 301 (F-10). Should such an interchange be built, it would provide properties on the west side of US 301 with indirect access to the F-10 freeway. In order to complete this circulation on the west side of F-10, a new location for the I-2 roadway will need to be identified. The staff analysis considered an alignment through the 427 acres subject to this application. However, the alternative, to be partially located in the 15-acre parcel owned by the applicant and part of the current E-I-A basic plan, is the most logical and least disruptive solution.

- (D) Other existing or planned private and public facilities which are existing, under construction, or for which construction funds are contained in the first six years of the adopted County Capital Improvement Program (such as schools, recreation areas, water and sewerage systems, libraries and fire stations) will be adequate for the uses proposed.**

Other public facilities are considered to be adequate for the uses proposed as indicated below:

#### **Parks and Recreation**

The *Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville* and Vicinity Master Plan designates a Collington Branch Stream as a public stream valley park. The Collington Branch Stream Valley Park, owned by M-NCPPC, adjoins the northern property line and continues on the south of Leeland Road in the Beechtree development. The stream valley within the Willowbrook property is one of two missing links in providing continuous public parkland along the Collington Branch between US 50 and the Buck Property in Upper Marlboro. The master plan also recommends a hiker/biker trail along the Collington Branch. The master planned trail along Collington Branch will be constructed in the Oak Creek Club, Beechtree, Buck Property, and Karrington developments.

The applicant's proposal indicates that 621 residential dwelling units will be constructed on 427 acres of property. Using current occupancy statistics for single-family dwelling units, one would predict that the proposed development would result in a population of 2,045 additional residents in the community.

The applicant proposes private recreation facilities on the site including a clubhouse with an outdoor pool and three small private park parcels. It is the opinion of DPR staff that these recreation facilities will not adequately serve the residents of this subdivision.

National and state standards for the provision of parkland call for 15 acres of local parkland for every thousand residents. These standards also recommend an additional 20 acres of regional parkland for every thousand residents. The existing level of service measurement for public parkland and outdoor recreational facilities for Planning Area 74A indicates a high need for both public parkland and recreational facilities. Application of standards for local parkland indicate that an additional nine acres of parkland per one thousand residents are currently needed in Planning Area 74A. By applying the same standards for projected population in a new community (2,045 residents), staff has determined that a minimum of 30 acres of additional public parkland suitable for active recreation would be required for a community of this size.



The demand for public parkland and recreation facilities will only grow with the extensive residential development, which is anticipated in this region of Prince George's County. Plans for the development of Oak Creek, Beechtree, the Buck Property, and Karrington subdivisions are already in the pipeline. While these developments committed to contribute parkland and/or a combination of public and private recreational facilities, Planning Area 74A is still in high need for public parkland and for public recreational facilities such as football, soccer and baseball fields.

The 1991 preliminary master plan and sectional map amendment for Bowie and Vicinity recommends a 20-acre community park in the project area. Section 24-134 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations will require the mandatory dedication of 22 acres of parkland suitable for active and passive recreation at the time of subdivision.

In addressing the compliance with the requirements of the Comprehensive Design Zone, the applicant mentions that future development of the subject property will include amenities and provide public facilities as required by the state and the county. The Willowbrook proposal includes specific recreational amenities such as a clubhouse with outdoor pool, small private park parcels, and trails in the project area. The revised basic plan shows a public park and the applicant has agreed to dedicate approximately 22 acres of developable land for a community park, dedicate the stream valley along the Collington Branch, and construct the master planned hiker/biker trail along the stream (including the connector trails to the residential neighborhoods of the subject development) in accordance with the recommendations of the Parks Department.

The 22 acres of space usable for active recreational uses would have been required as part of mandatory dedication at the time of subdivision. In order to receive density increments for public benefit features at the comprehensive design plan phase of this process, the applicant will need to provide amenities above and beyond those normally required. The construction of the ten-foot-wide master plan hiker/biker trail in the Collington Branch stream valley and six-foot-wide feeder trails to the development pods are an example of a public benefit feature.

Private recreational facilities will also be required in accordance with the above-referenced guidelines. We note that three "community centers" are identified in the basic plan. The text references a clubhouse with an outdoor pool and three small private park parcels. Again, these are *not* considered public benefit features. In order to obtain full credit for public benefit features, the applicant must provide for the development of ball fields and other recreational facilities on the proposed park site as well as the recommended trails.

### **Other Community Facilities**

#### **Fire and Rescue**

The existing fire engine service at Upper Marlboro Fire Station, Company 20, has a service travel time of 3.78 minutes, which is within the 5.25-minute travel time guideline. The facility also provides ambulance and paramedic service within response time standards.

The above findings are in conformance with the *Approved Public Safety Master Plan (1990)* and the "Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities."

The subject site is approximately one-half mile from a proposed Leeland Road fire station site (CIP No. LK 510423). The proposed \$3,320,000 fire station is scheduled for completion in 2010.

### **Police Facilities**

The proposed development is within the service area for Police District II-Bowie. The Planning Board's current test for police adequacy is based on a standard complement of officers. As of 1/2/05, the county had 1,302 sworn officers and 43 student officers in the academy for a total of 1,345 personnel, which is within the standard of 1,278 officers. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed suburban density residential complex.

### **Schools**

Students in the subject area are assigned to attend Kingsford Elementary, Kettering Middle School, and Largo High School. County Council bill CB-31-2003 establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amount of \$7,161 per dwelling if a building is located between I-495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,161 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority; or \$12,276 per dwelling for all other buildings.

The school surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section staff finds that this project meets the adequate public facilities policies for school facilities contained in Section 24-122.02, CB-30-2003 and CB-31-2003 and CR-23-2003. An adequate public facility schools test will be conducted at the time of subdivision application.

- (E) Environmental relationships reflect compatibility between the proposed general land use types, or if identified, the specific land use types, and surrounding land uses, so as to promote the health, safety and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.**

### **Natural Environment**

1. The site has extensive areas of regulated environmental features including wetlands, streams and 100-year floodplain. Associated with these features are areas of steep and severe slopes. Collington Branch, one of the major north/south stream systems in the county, is located on the western portion of the site. The Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan shows this property as containing extensive areas of regulated features and shows the entire property to be within the evaluation areas of the plan. Within the evaluation areas, attention is to be paid to the layout and design of proposed development so as to minimize impacts to the regulated features and reduce overall forest fragmentation.

The Bowie and Vicinity Preliminary Master Plan designates Collington Branch as one of two primary corridors, the other being the Patuxent River. The text states: "Protect Primary Corridors (Patuxent River and Collington Branch) during the development

review process to ensure the highest level of preservation and restoration possible, with limited impacts for essential development elements.” As configured, the parcels have sufficient access onto Leeland Road so as to allow for the development of the parcels with no impacts to the regulated areas of the corridors. As such, the proposal should be conditioned so that it is developed without impacts to the regulated features.

The environmental information submitted is insufficient to fully evaluate the exact delineation of the regulated areas. The plan that contains the proposed delineation of regulated areas does not identify areas of steep and severe slopes and does not have labeled topography lines and a wetland study was not provided. The regulated areas, designated as Patuxent River Primary Management Areas (PMA) due to the property’s location within the Patuxent River watershed, have not been correctly shown on the plans because the areas of severe and steep slopes have not been properly included in the PMA delineations; however, it is possible to generally note that the property has contiguous areas of developable land throughout.

It should be noted that the forest stand delineation and other environmental information submitted were not reviewed in detail as part of this basic plan review application. When a conceptual development plan is submitted for review, all appropriate environmental information will be reviewed.

2. The site contains extensive areas of steep and severe slopes throughout the developable as well as the regulated areas. As such, this type of topography makes the construction of large pad sites for the development of industrial-style buildings difficult. The change of the zoning from the E-I-A Zone to a residential zone is appropriate given the topography and the other environmental constraints on the site.
3. Extensive areas of Marlboro clay exist on the site. The elevation of the Marlboro clay layer could influence the location of various proposed structures. Information regarding the location of the Marlboro clay layer is necessary early in the process in order to ensure that the development proposal approved is feasible to construct.
4. Areas of sensitive wildlife habitat exist on the site and rare, threatened and endangered species have been identified in the Collington Branch stream system. These resources have generally been confined to the wetland areas; however, surveys of the locations of rare, threatened and endangered plants are needed to ensure that the proposed development does not cause undue impacts.

### **Archeological Resources**

The proposed development may also have some impacts on archeological resources. The M-NCPPC Planning Department’s staff archeologist recommends a Phase I archeological investigation for the property. Collington Branch and an unnamed branch of Collington run through portions of the subject property. Six prehistoric and historic archeological sites are located just to the south of the subject property. These are: 18PR564 (19<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup>-century farmstead), 18PR565 (prehistoric), 18PR566 (17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup>-century domestic site with possible structure; prehistoric Late Archaic period), 18PR567 (18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup>-century domestic site; prehistoric Late Archaic Period), 18PR568 (19<sup>th</sup>-century cemetery), and 18PR569 (18<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> century domestic farmstead; prehistoric Late

Archaic Period). In addition, the residence of Daniel Clark (no longer standing) is shown on the 1861 Martenet map as appearing within the eastern part of the property. Therefore, a Phase I (identification) archeological study of the site is recommended, prior to the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision.

### **Surrounding Development**

1. The master plan recognizes Leeland Road as the most relevant boundary in establishing densities, with densities up to 3.0 per acre south of Leeland Road and densities of up to 1.5 dwelling units per acre to the northwest.
2. Additionally, the overall character of this portion of Leeland Road presents as rural-residential in character. For example, the property that has the most extensive frontage opposite the subject site on the south side of Leeland Road is in the R-A Zone with a dwelling unit density of one dwelling per every two acres. Although the Beechtree subdivision, also located south of Leeland Road, has a dwelling unit density of 3.0 du/acre, the small portion that fronts on Leeland Road opposite the subject site is approved for a small cluster of single-family detached houses. Higher density development in Beechtree is located interior to the site and at some distance from the subject property. A proposal for residential development on the subject property with a density of approximately 1.5 dwellings per acre could be compatible with this character. This is consistent with the upper end of the R-L Zone, rather than the R-S Zone.
3. It must be kept in mind that large areas of the site are not suitable for development. This means that the appearance of the development will reflect the net densities far more than the gross densities. The development of 700 residential units on the roughly 140 acres devoted to residential use would result in a net density of just over five dwelling units per acre. While certainly consistent with interior portions of Beechtree, this is not consistent with the character of the development along Leeland Road.
4. Because comprehensive design zones are intended to create a superior environment through the use of public benefit features, it is also important to note that the applicant will have few, if any, incentives to provide public benefit features if the development is approved at or below the base density of the R-S Zone. Approval near the upper end of the R-L Zone will allow the requested density, but only with the provision of the public benefit features for which these zones were created.
5. The applicant's revised basic plan date July 21, 2005 partially responds to the staff comment to move the proposed townhouse development closer to the interior of the site, by moving the community center and a recreation area to the area near the Leeland Road frontage. The location of the proposed senior housing near the entrance has not been addressed. The basic plan should show a buffer area between Leeland Road and the location of any townhouse or multifamily development sufficient to fully screen these units from views from the roadway to retain the current wooded character of the frontage.
6. The proposal includes a two-acre portion of land separated from the rest of the 245 acres of land by the railroad tracks. The inclusion of the property appears to be for the purpose

of maximizing the land on the other side of the tracks. The revised plan indicates that this parcel is a potential church site. The location of this proposed is unlikely to function as a resource for the future residents of the project due to its inaccessibility to pedestrian access due to the railroad tracks.

7. The extension of Prince George's Boulevard to Leeland Road will create a major intersection. The appearance of the development from the intersection will be analyzed at the time of the Comprehensive Design and Specific Design Plans.
8. The natural aesthetic qualities of the site should be accentuated by a design that is in part determined by the environmental constraints of the site. Streets should not be uniformly double loaded. Single loaded streets and/or breaks between lots should be strategically placed to provide visual relief and afford views into open space.
9. Recreational facilities should be dispersed throughout the subdivision so as to provide nearby recreational facilities for all residents. The type of recreational facilities shall be determined at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan. They should accommodate all age residents and should include such elements as a pool, tot lots, preteen lots, tennis courts and trails, and passive recreational facilities.
10. The proposed project is largely compatible with its surrounding area. Railroad tracks, which form part of the western border of the project, are distant from the residential portion of the Willowbrook Property. However, E-I-A zoning and industrial development, located north and east of the proposed project, within the Collington Center Industrial Park, are directly adjacent to proposed residential pods. It seems appropriate to incorporate a buffer in this area and the basic plan revised on July 21, 2005 appears to provide that buffer. The existing floodplain and woodland should be studied to determine its quality as an effective buffer. Existing woodland could be augmented by additional plantings so that the project is sufficiently protected from the adjacent area that is zoned E-I-A (other than parkland). The combination of R-S, R-A and R-R zoning, partially developed with rural residential single-family homes, to the south of the proposed project across Leeland Road, do not present land use conflicts with residential development in low-suburban density ranges.
11. It should be specified on the plan which of the residential use is to be multifamily. If active adult residential is the multifamily use proposed on the site, it should be identified as such.

**Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C) and (D) above, where the application anticipates a construction schedule of more than six years (Section 27-179), public facilities (existing or scheduled for construction within the first six years) will be adequate to serve the development proposed to occur within the first six years. The Council shall also find that public facilities probably will be adequately supplied for the remainder of the project. In considering the probability of future public facilities construction, the Council may consider such things as existing plans for construction, budgetary constraints on providing public facilities, the public interest and public need for the particular development, the relationship of the development to public transportation, or any other matter that indicates that public or private funds will likely be expended for the necessary facilities.**

Not applicable.

**G. Conformance with the Purposes of the R-S and R-L Zones:**

The purposes of the R-S and R-L Zones are found in Sections 27-511 and 27-514.08, respectively. The first six purposes of both zones are identical and are listed as follows:

- (1) Establish (in the public interest) a plan implementation zone, in which (among other things):**
  - (A) Permissible residential density is dependent upon providing public benefit features and related density increment factors; and**
  - (B) The location of the zone must be in accordance with the adopted and approved General Plan, Master Plan, or public urban renewal plan;**
- (2) Establish regulations through which adopted and approved public plans and policies (such as the General Plan, Master Plans, and public urban renewal plans) can serve as the criteria for judging individual development proposals;**
- (3) Assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with existing and proposed surrounding land uses, and existing and proposed public facilities and services, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District;**
- (4) Encourage amenities and public facilities to be provided in conjunction with residential development;**
- (5) Encourage and stimulate balanced land development; and**
- (6) Improve the overall quality and variety of residential environments in the Regional District.**

The development of the subject property in the R-L Zone will more nearly satisfy these purposes than developing the site in the R-S Zone. The provision of public benefit features is a major reason for the creation of these zones, and with the development of the site in the R-L Zone the applicant has far greater incentives to provide the public benefit features needed to create a superior development. The location of the R-L Zone conforms to the recommendations of the Community Planning Division, which concluded that the same environmental constraints that lessen the suitability of the site for employment uses, requires the flexibility and sensitivity to the environment of a lot layout provided by a lower density residential zone. Moreover, a dwelling unit density ranging from 1.0 to 1.5 dwellings per acre is more consistent with the character of the current and approved development and the zoning along this portion of Leeland Road.

The R-L Zone adds the following three additional purposes:

- (7) Encourage low-density residential development, which provides for a variety of one-**

**family dwelling types, including a large lot component, in a planned development;**

- (8) Protect significant natural, cultural, historical, or environmental features and create substantial open space areas in concert with a unique living environment; and**
- (9) Protect viewsheds and landscape/woodland buffers along the primary roadways and woodlands, open fields, and other natural amenities within the Zone.**

These additional purposes of the R-L Zone are appropriate to the subject site and suggest again the suitability of the R-L Zone at this location. The emphasis of the R-L Zone is on maintaining a rural, low-density character, yet it permits up to 20 percent of units to be townhouses and includes the possibility of mixed-retirement development, should the decision ultimately be made to include an active senior housing component at this site. The zone also specifies the importance of viewsheds and landscape/woodland buffers along primary roadways; an element we believe is missing from the proposed basic plan.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the above analysis we conclude that the requested R-S Zone is not appropriate at this location, and, therefore, recommend DENIAL of the R-S Zone. We furthermore find that the R-L Zone can provide for a development that is both harmonious with the surrounding area and responsive to the applicant's goals for the development of this property. We, therefore, recommend APPROVAL of the R-L Zone with the following basic plan revisions and conditions of approval listed below.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and recommends to the District Council for Prince George's County, Maryland that the above-noted application be DENIED; with the further recommendation of APPROVAL for the R-L Zone, subject to the following conditions:

The Basic Plan shall be revised to show the following revisions:

1. Land use types and quantities:

- Total area: 427 acres
- Land in the 100-year floodplain: 77.7 acres
- Adjusted Gross Area (427 less half the floodplain): 388± acres
- Land devoted to mixed retirement development: 27 acres
- Adjusted Gross Area (388 less 27 acres): 361± acres

Market Rate Development

- 361 acres @ 1.0 to 1.36 du/ac = 361 to 490 dwellings
- Approximately 84 percent single-family detached and 16 percent townhouse units

Mixed Retirement Development

- 27 acres @ 2.2 to 5.55 du/ac = 60 – 150 dwellings
- Approximately 20 percent single-family detached, 35 percent townhouse, and 45 percent

multifamily units

Open Space

- Public Active Open Space: 20± acres, as shown on DPR Exhibit A
  - Private Active Open Space: 10 – 12 ± acres
  - Passive Open Space: 220± acres
2. The location of a ten-foot-wide master plan hiker/biker trail in the Collington Branch Stream Valley and the six-foot-wide feeder trails to the development pods.
  3. A buffer area between Leeland Road and the location of any townhouse or multifamily development sufficient to fully screen these units from views from the roadway to retain the current wooded character of the frontage.
  4. The addition of a small active recreation area centrally located to the proposed development as was shown on the basic plan submitted in May, 2005.
  5. The amenities proposed for the mixed retirement development shall be listed on the face of the plan.

The following conditions and considerations of approval shall be printed on the face of the basic plan prior to signature approval:

CONDITIONS:

1. At the time of the submission of a Comprehensive Design Plan/Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the applicant (or his heir, successors or assignees) shall provide a traffic study that analyzes the following intersections:
  - a. US 301/MD 725
  - b. US 301/Village Drive
  - c. US 301/Leeland Road
  - d. US 301/Trade Zone Avenue
  - e. Leeland Road/Safeway Access
  - f. Oak Grove Road/Church Road
  - g. Oak Grove Road/MD 193
  - h. MD 202/MD 193
2. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide the dedication for one-half of the 100 feet of dedication required to build Leeland Road (MC-600) to its ultimate cross section per DPW&T standards.
3. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall dedicate 100± acres of parkland to M-NCPPC including the Collington Branch stream valley and 20 acres of developable land for active recreation as shown on DPR Exhibit A.
4. The land to be conveyed to M-NCPPC shall be subject to the conditions of Exhibit B, attached to



the June 21, 2005 memorandum from the Parks Department.

5. The applicant shall construct a ten-foot-wide master plan hiker/biker trail in the Collington Branch stream valley and 6-foot wide feeder trails to the development pods.
6. Prior to signature approval of the subject application, a revised plan showing parkland dedication and master planned trail shall be reviewed and approved by the DPR staff.
7. The applicant shall provide adequate private recreational facilities to meet the future subdivision requirements for the proposed development. The private recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
8. The applicant shall construct recreational facilities typical for a 20-acre community park, such as ball fields, a playground, tennis or basketball courts, shelters and restroom facilities. The list of recreational facilities shall be determined at the preliminary plan of subdivision and specific design plan stage. The construction of park facilities shall be eligible for the award of density increments based upon the regulations of the R-L Zone.
9. The submission package of the comprehensive design plan shall contain a signed natural resources inventory (NRI). The NRI shall be used by the designers to prepare a site layout that minimizes impacts to the regulated areas of the site.
10. A geotechnical study that identifies the location and elevation of the Marlboro clay layer throughout the site shall be submitted as part of the CDP application package.
11. A protocol for surveying the locations of all rare, threatened and endangered species within the subject property shall be obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources prior to acceptance of the CDP and this protocol shall be part of the submittal package. The completed surveys and required reports shall be submitted as part of any application for preliminary plans.
12. Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision, a Phase I archeological investigation shall be conducted according to Maryland Historical Trust (MHT) guidelines, *Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Shaffer and Cole 1994); and a report shall be submitted according to the MHT guidelines and the American Antiquity or Society of Historical Archaeology style guide. Archeological excavations shall be spaced along a regular 20-meter or 50-foot grid and excavations should be clearly identified on a map to be submitted as part of the report.

#### COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN PLAN CONSIDERATIONS:

1. The proposal includes a two-acre portion of land separated from the rest of the 245 acres of land by the railroad tracks. The revised plan indicates that this parcel is a potential church site. The location of this proposed is unlikely to function as a resource for the future residents of the project due to its inaccessibility to pedestrian access due to the railroad tracks.
2. The extension of Prince George's Boulevard to Leeland Road will create a major intersection. The appearance of the development from the intersection will be analyzed at the time of the

Comprehensive Design and Specific Design Plans.

3. The natural aesthetic qualities of the site should be accentuated by a design that is in part determined by the environmental constraints of the site. Streets should not be uniformly double loaded. Single loaded streets and/or breaks between lots should be strategically placed to provide visual relief and afford views into open space.
4. Recreational facilities should be dispersed throughout the subdivision so as to provide nearby recreational facilities for all residents. The type of recreational facilities shall be determined at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan. They should accommodate all age residents and should include such elements as a pool, tot lots, preteen lots, tennis courts and trails, and passive recreational facilities.
5. A 200-foot buffer shall be maintained between the residential lots and adjacent land other than parkland that is in the E-I-A Zone. The existing woodland may be augmented by additional plantings so that the project is sufficiently protected from the impacts of the adjacent development.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Chairman Hewlett, with Commissioners Squire, Hewlett, Eley and Vaughns voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 28, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 28th day of July, 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:cw:gr

(Revised 8/9/01)