

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Conceptual Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 29, , 2005 regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 for Woodmore Towne Centre (Inglewood Northe), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application proposes a mixed residential development with office/retail and hotel/conference center components. The plans propose 215 single-family detached units, 84 single-family attached units (townhouses), 360 multifamily units, 140 stacked condominiums (stacked townhouses), 180,000–200,000 square feet of office, 200,000–220,000 square feet of hotel/conference center, and 575,000–700,000 square feet of retail. The multifamily units are proposed as four products: 140 two-over-two units distributed over 8 buildings; 84 townhouse units distributed over 11 buildings; 360 units distributed over two 10-story, high-rise buildings with retail at the street level; and 108 units distributed over two 6-story, mid-rise buildings with retail at the street level. The office component is proposed as three 12-story, high-rise buildings with adjoining multilevel parking structures and one 6-story, mid-rise building with an adjoining multilevel parking structure.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use	Vacant	Mixed Use—215 single-family detached, 84 single-family attached, 360 multifamily units, 140 stacked condominiums (stacked townhouses), 180,000–200,000 square feet office, 200,000–220,000 square feet hotel/conference center, and 575,000–700,000 square feet of retail
Acreage	244.67 acres	244.67 acres
Square footage	0	4,000,000 sq. ft.

3. **Location:** The subject site is located on the north side of Landover Road (MD 202), approximately 550 feet northwest of its intersection with Saint Josephs Drive. The site is located within Planning Area 73.

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

North The property is bounded on the north by existing single-family detached subdivisions that are known as Glenarden Heights and La Dova Heights. Several existing streets terminate into the northern edge of the subject property. They are 7th Street, 9th Street, 10th Street and 11th Street.

East The property is bounded on the east by a new single-family detached subdivision that is know as Balk Hill and undeveloped woodland soon to be developed for a single-family detached subdivision. The Balk Hill subdivision and future subdivision are dissected by a new extension of Campus Way North that will terminate at the eastern edge of the subject property.

South The property directly to the south is the Saint Joseph Roman Catholic Parish Center. Also, along the southern edge of the subject property is the end of Saint Josephs Drive and vacant property that has been partially cleared of the existing woodland.

West The property is bounded to the west by Landover Road (MD 202) and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95).

5. **Previous Approvals:** The zoning map for the Maryland-Washington Regional District in Prince George’s County, Maryland, was amended in March 1988 by rezoning the subject property from the R-R Zone to the M-X-T Zone with conditions.

6. **Design Features:** The conceptual site plan is proposing the following:

Residential	215 single-family detached units
	84 single-family attached units (townhouses),
	360 multifamily units
	140 stacked condominiums (stacked townhouses)
Hotel/Conference Center (120-150 Rooms)	100,000–110,000 square feet
Hotel B (240-260 Rooms)	100,000–110,000 square feet
Retail	575,000–700,000 square feet
Office	950,000–1,100,000 square feet office
Total retail/office square footage proposed	1,525,000–1,800,000 square feet

The proposal is intended to be developed as a mixed-use community to be served by Saint Josephs Drive, Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, and Campus Way North extended. The conceptual site plan proposes to develop a composition of hotel, hotel-conference center, single-family detached, attached, and condominium residences oriented around a town center office and retail complex through the creation of various pods within the site at different construction phases of the development.

The community is located at a major highway interchange approximately five miles from the District of Columbia and is within a two-mile radius from the New Carrollton Metro Station and a one- mile radius from the new Largo Town Center Metro Station extension of the Blue Line.

Within the heart of the site, the components will all be centered around a “main street” corridor with plazas throughout the complex. In the residential area, a pool and two tennis courts will form the focal point along with additional amenities to be located throughout the residential area. An

extensive pedestrian trail/sidewalk system will connect the two areas together. In addition, 13 acres are set aside for a potential public park site and will be developed with a variety of ball fields. A variety of lot sizes is proposed throughout the single-family detached and attached areas of the residential Pod F to accommodate a variety of products.

Development Standards Review

No development standards were submitted for review by staff.

Comment: The staff recommends that the following multifamily and the two-over-two multifamily dwelling units include the following standards for development:

Multifamily units:

Minimum of 60 percent 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 18 feet wide

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

Minimum of 60 percent of the front facade shall be brick

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **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;**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that the proposed development in the Woodmore Towne Centre will be in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of the M-X-T Zone if the conditions of approval are adopted. Woodmore Towne Centre furthers the purpose of the M-X-T Zone due to its proximity to the major interchange of I-95 and MD 202 and the new transit stop at Largo Town Center. It is also near the Inglewood Business Community Office Park as well as the Boulevard at the Capital Centre new retail center. The proposed development will create a destination and focal point for the northeastern quadrant of the interchange by implementation of a new town center with a main street corridor enhanced by

a 24-hour environment created by the integration of retail, commercial and residential components along the main street.

- (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;**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that Woodmore Towne Center is proposed as a compact, mixed-use, transit-oriented development with integrated commercial and residential uses in a high-density format including buildings of 8–12 stories in height. The location of the plan is within walking distance of the public transit system and other major commercial and retail facilities

Comment: Maximizing the development potential for the proposed project has been a concern as a result of an attempt to develop a “main street” retail component in the project. As developed, the staff believes that the town center main street can better serve the four to five pods surrounding the town center. The majority of the buildings should have their main entrance opening onto a street or square. Pedestrian circulation within the center is paramount. Visitors will park their cars in shared surface lots or parking structures. The proposed concept of the Pod D-Town Center doesn’t identify the proposed retail uses other than the large-tenant, freestanding buildings. It is unclear if the Pod D-Town Center will accommodate tenant spaces for retail uses such as restaurants and general retail (basic clothing stores, book/music stores, dry cleaners, etc.). The large-scale tenants (greater than 50,000 square feet) should be limited in the Pod D-Town Center. The retail commercial development in the Pod D-Town Center should account for/comprise at least 50 percent of the total square footage. Other uses may include service, office and/or residential uses.

Another concern of the staff regarding the programming of the Pod D-Town Center is the limited integration of apartments, townhouses and lofts within the center capable of providing 20 dwelling units per acre in the center and decreasing in density as the distance from the center increases. The goal should be a smooth transition from high-density multifamily residential to low-density single-family. The staff encourages residential units above most of the commercial activities.

Office use may also be better utilized in the Pod D-Town Center, but should remain within 2,000 to 10,000 square feet in size, each. Offices can account for 20 percent of all the development of the Pod D-Town Center.

The value of existing woodland and wetland on the site ultimately has been taken into consideration in the Pod D-Town Center. Land use efficiency should be maximized. New buildings, which do not fully utilize their sites, should be designed to permit future expansion.

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

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that Woodmore Towne Center furthers the purpose of the M-X-T Zone due to its proximity to a major interchange and newly opened transit stop.

Comment: Vehicular and pedestrian connections from the proposed development to the Landover and Largo Town Center Metro Stations have been a concern throughout the review of the plans. The project will have access to existing Landover Road (MD 202) for the most effective vehicular route to the Metro stations. 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;**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that the combination of commercial office, retail and residential uses on the main street corridor will meet this objective and provide the 24-hour environment intended by this zone.

Comment: The Pod D-Town Center should be developed as a pedestrian-friendly place where people will go to gather, shop, and be entertained. The staff is concerned that, with the absence of any entertainment, cultural or recreation components within the Pod D-Town Centers program, a 24-hour environment may not be achievable. The Pod D-Town Center would ideally develop some form of nightlife to make it viable after work hours.

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

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that the land uses delineated on the conceptual site plan are gently blended and transitioned from the core area to the perimeter of the site.

Comment: The staff is concerned that the “development pods” that are strategically placed are not designed harmoniously but placed in a way to distinctly allow development phasing that will not complement or encourage growth from one another. The land uses do not overlap well enough to promote development of adjacent land uses that could be simultaneously developed. In addition, civic, cultural and entertainment land uses are not designated as land uses in the program of the Pod D-Town Center. Their absence discourages the need to blend various areas harmoniously.

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

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that each area (pod) will be developed unto itself to create neighborhoods of a single-family detached, single-family attached, condominium use, and core commercial areas. These individual areas will be linked together via roadways and pedestrian systems to the recreation areas, green areas, community center, town center, and off-site transit systems.

Comment: Buildings and associated open spaces should be designed to enhance the larger compositions created by groups of buildings and landscapes. Buildings should be organized on the site to make new functions and circulation routes compatible with those of neighboring buildings and open spaces. Depending on their locations, some but not all buildings should be designed as landmarks to identify strategic locations within the development. The design of all buildings should support the general fabric of the development. The distinction between landmark and other buildings refers to their urban roles rather than their architectural quality—all buildings should demonstrate the highest standards of planning and design.

Buildings and associated open spaces should reinforce the predominant development patterns that distinguish various parts of the development:

The Office Pod (Pods A & E)—Buildings should be independent pavilions set within the forest and forest gardens; open spaces should be treated as glades within the forest.

The Residential Pod (Pod F)—Buildings: Single-family homes should be articulated and stepped to reflect the area's topography; open spaces and pedestrian routes should be fine-grained and clearly defined by buildings; roof profiles should reinforce the tumbling sense of the topography of the site.

The Hotel/Conference Pod (Pod B)—Buildings should be larger with a horizontal and vertical mass and should define regular and relatively expansive courtyards.

The Town Centre Pod (Pod D)—Buildings should strongly relate to and define the street, which is itself the primary open space.

Focal Points—Buildings around primary focal points (community center, office buildings, hotels, conference center, town centre, residential towers) should contain, define and animate the space.

- (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;**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that this objective is being accomplished through techniques such as a clustering of buildings along the main street and integration of the residential component along the main street corridor rather than on an isolated parcel of land.

Comment: If the Pod D-Town Center is intended to promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency, the staff recommends that the project should feature more extensive use of retail and residential uses in a vertical setting. Building scale should be oriented to the pedestrian user. The town center should possibly look and feel more like a city street than a shopping center, featuring a rich mix of entertainment and shopping venues. New buildings should be capable of being adapted to new uses as the needs and priorities of the development change. The development buildings should express sympathy with the climate, vegetation and topography of the site and reflect the architectural traditions that have emerged in response. The following are additional land planning efficiencies that should be considered by the applicant:

- a. Building projects should be subjected to life-cycle costing to determine the best fit between capital costs, operating costs, and ongoing maintenance costs.
- b. Buildings should be designed to reduce maintenance costs. Buildings should be designed to reduce energy consumption.
- c. Buildings should not be permitted to emit unacceptably noxious or otherwise unpleasant fumes or gases.
- d. Noise from building systems should not be allowed to intrude on adjacent interior or exterior public spaces.
- e. Noise-generating activities should be located within the building, which should be designed to protect users in other buildings or in public open spaces.

(8) To permit a flexible response to the market

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that the proposed conceptual site plan, with its variety of uses, will allow for a flexible response to market forces.

Comment: The staff is concerned that this response 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 I.

- (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.**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that a consistent architectural and landscaping theme will be designed to promote integration of mixed uses proposed for the site and continuation of neighborhood character within the residential areas. A focal point creating even more synergy and neighborhood cohesion will be the proposed development of the main street corridor, which will be continued throughout the town center and the residential and community center components. Pedestrian access from each of the neighborhood units will be by way of a system of integrated pedestrian pathways. These pathways will also provide safe passage of the pedestrian from the community center and residential areas to the proposed recreational and open space areas as well; again furthering the integrity and cohesion of the neighborhood concept.

The associated commercial area, hotel and conference center will provide residents and guests with evening retail activity, thereby increasing the economic viability of the community and surrounding area and the county as a whole. Location of the proposed hotels provides a means by which guests will be in close proximity to adjacent mass transit systems, employment centers, restaurants, and retail opportunity.

Comment: 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:

- a. Brick fronts should be standard for 60 percent of all single-family detached dwelling units.

- b. Single-family detached units whose end walls are visible from any major streets should incorporate one of the following:
- (1) Side-entry garage.
 - (2) Bay window at the first floor level plus two additional features.
 - (3) Equivalent end wall detail and visual interest.
- c. The community center building and office/retail buildings should be designed with special attention to architectural quality, with 60 percent of all facades as brick or stone veneer, and as focal points for the community. The following specific attention should be incorporated in the building envelopes:
- (1) Building materials should reinforce the cohesion of related groups of buildings.
 - (2) Building materials should reflect the building's role as a landmark or a fabric building.
 - (3) Building materials can reflect the identity of the users, but should not be so specific as to preclude a possible future change of use for the building.
 - (4) Building materials should suit the light and climatic conditions found in this region.
 - (5) Large areas of concrete should be avoided. Masonry should be encouraged.
 - (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;**

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that development proposed within the town center has an outward orientation to the Capital Beltway and MD 202 to create a focal point from the county at this gateway interchange. The design of the site will create a sense of place for this quadrant of the interchange through building height, orientation and architecture.

It is also internally oriented to the main street corridor forming the heart of the town center. The development then gradually transitions from commercial office to high-density residential to lower-density residential to be compatible with the lower-density residential development to the north and east of the site.

Comment: Additional consideration should be made in response to the hotel/conference center adjacent to the church site. The conceptual plan does not illustrate the physical adjacency to the

existing structures within close proximity and should be carefully buffered or screened in the detailed site plan. The office building and parking structure at the entrance to the project on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard do not illustrate the physical adjacency to a planned single-family residential subdivision and should consider the impact of the four-story parking structure and six-story office building to the single-family detached dwelling units.

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

Development within the vicinity of the subject site consists of residential uses along Glenarden Parkway and Gary Lane, located slightly to the north of the property. The proposed project is compatible with this development by focusing its single-family detached and attached uses in this location as well.

The proposed development then begins the density transition adjacent to the Balk Hill community for continued compatibility.

East of the subject site, it is anticipated that these sites will consist of mixed use similar in design to that proposed for the subject site, which will continue the compatibility to the eastern property line.

Comment: The staff is concerned that this response will not fulfill the mixed-use requirement of Section 27-548(d), which states the following:

(d) Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.

The applicant should research and confirm the proposed land uses proposed for the adjacent sites to the northeast and east of the site. Compatibility issues appear to be unclear in the statement provided by the applicant. No supporting land use plans were provided to illustrate the assumptions of the applicant. Land use and building and road placement on the site plan and adjacent sites should be carefully examined during the detailed site plan submittal to ensure compatibility.

(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;

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that the proposed development is intended to provide a self-contained, 24-hour environment of residential and commercial uses by

integrating the main street corridor as the focal point of the center of the site with office and hotel and residential uses gathered around the development's focal point.

Comment: 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 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.

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;

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that, as proposed, a development pod will constitute a phase. Each pod, or phase, is designed as a separate but integrated neighborhood unit and is thereby self-sufficient, but allowing for staged integration of additional phases based on market demand and user identification.

Comment: The applicant has not submitted a phasing schedule and has stated that the phasing is the construction of any development pod on the site plan with no specific time schedule. The staff disagrees with the applicant's phasing concept because it does not guarantee a mixed-use development character. Without a commitment by the applicant to develop the commercial site early in the project, the possibility exists that only residential development will occur and that one of the most important corridors from Prince George's County leading to the District of Columbia would not achieve its mixed-use potential. 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 Landover Road (MD 202) corridor with a high-quality retail/office development simultaneous to build-out of the

residential component. The retail portion of the site 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 residential building permits in the initial phase of the development.

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

In justifying the conceptual site plan, the applicant states that an integrated pedestrian system will be designed to promote safe pedestrian travel from parking areas to residential structures and commercial uses and from residential units to on-site recreational and open space areas and the residential community center.

Comment: 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 August 23, 2005, Shaffer to Estes:

In conformance with the adopted and approved Largo-Lottsford master plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assigns shall provide the following:

Provide the master plan trail along the public roadways extending from Campus Way North to office area "E" as indicated on the submitted CSP.

Provide the urban pedestrian walkways as indicated on the submitted CSP. The width of the sidewalk within these walkways should be no less than eight feet in areas of street trees, planters, or pedestrian amenities.

Provide sidewalks or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.

Provide the trail connection through the park and/or school site from Campus Way North to the pedestrian walkway south of area "C."

A more specific analysis of all trail and sidewalk connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional segments of trail or sidewalk may be recommended at that time.

(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 impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant reviews the following intersections:

- MD 202/Brightseat Road
- MD 202/I-95 SB on-ramp
- MD 202/I-95 NB on-ramp (unsignalized)
- MD 202/McCormick Drive/Saint Josephs Drive
- MD 202/Lottsford Road
- Lottsford Road/Campus Way (unsignalized)

This area was studied extensively by transportation planning staff during the MD 202 Corridor study. This study was a part of the Planning Department's FY 1997 work program and was completed in 1997. The study originally began as a study in support of a sectional map amendment generally including properties within an area bounded by MD 202, the Capital Beltway, Lake Arbor Way, and the proposed alignment of Campus Way. During the course of the study, it evolved into a visioning and implementation study. Much of the direction of the study during its duration was the result of collaborative discussions within a series of study group meetings, with the study group composed of technical staff, citizen representatives, and development interests. From a transportation perspective, the MD 202 Corridor study involved a comprehensive study of transportation in the MD 202 corridor. This comprehensive study included:

- a. Traffic analyses of intersections within a study area along MD 202 adjacent to the properties forming the focus of the study.
- b. Consideration of the development of the study area properties along with the development of other undeveloped zoned properties in the area.
- c. Identification of the transportation facilities that would be needed in the future to provide adequate transportation facilities.
- d. Development of a plan for staging necessary transportation improvements to occur coincidentally with development on the subject property and other undeveloped zoned properties in the area.

The traffic analysis indicated that the transportation network identified in the 1990 Largo-Lottsford master plan, as modified by a 1996 amendment to the plan adding a special-use interchange at I-95 and Arena Drive, was required to serve a buildout level exceeding 5.0 million square feet within the MD 202 Corridor study area. The planning group, after considering the transportation facility requirements for several development scenarios and the likely development patterns that could occur, indicated their support for a cap of 2.7 million square feet within the study area properties.

An important conclusion of the MD 202 Corridor study is that the cost of the needed future transportation improvements in the area should be shared by government and by private developers. The study indicated that further review would be needed to determine the appropriate costs to be borne by private developers and a means of dividing those costs among the various properties. The major improvements considered to be necessary for future development, up to the development cap, are:

- a. Four lanes (each direction) along MD 202
- b. Extension of Campus Way over the Beltway to Brightseat Road
- c. Full-time operations at I-95/Arena Drive interchange
- d. Overpass and partial interchange at MD 202 and Saint Josephs Drive/McCormick Drive

Another important conclusion was that the comprehensive study of transportation staging done as part of the MD 202 Corridor study would be considered part of the empirical evidence in support of development applications in the area for a period of ten years. As this study is currently eight to nine years old, it will provide a suitable basis for the transportation recommendations for the subject application.

A review of background operating conditions in the area was conducted by the applicant. The list of 19 approved developments is accurate. Background traffic includes a 2.0 percent per year growth rate for through traffic along MD 202.

It is noted that the traffic study and the conceptual site plan are not consistent in their land use quantities. The subject plan shows up to 1.8 million square feet of commercial space, up to 400 hotel rooms, and up to 900 residences. The traffic study is based upon 1.626 million square feet of commercial space, 360 hotel rooms, and 791 residences. Given that the traffic study is provided as evidence of the trip impact of the site and the resulting recommendation would be a trip cap on the subject property, the findings will be based upon the traffic study quantities. The applicant would have the flexibility to achieve a viable mix of uses, but the overall trip impact would be capped, thereby preventing all three maximum land uses shown on the subject plan from being achieved. Trip generation is shown on the following table:

Site Trip Generation			
Use	Quantity	AM Trips	PM Trips
Residential—Single-Family Detached	431	323	388
Residential—Townhouse	360	252	288
Office	996,000 sq feet	1,992	1,843
Retail	630,000 sq feet	472	1,890
Hotel	360	234	288
Internal Trips	4% AM 15% PM	-128	-514
Retail Pass-By Trips	40%	-164	-658
TOTAL		2,981	3,525

While a site such as this one, with the mix of uses, does generate internal travel between uses, thereby resulting in a net decrease in external site impact, the traffic study presents a methodology of estimating internal trips that is difficult to interpret. The general quantity of internal trips would appear to be credible, and the methodology may not require revision. Nonetheless, at the time of review of the preliminary plan the internal trip methodology must be explained further to ensure its appropriateness.

Under total traffic, all six intersections studied are shown to operate unacceptably. With regard to various intersections, the following is noted:

- a. Regarding the Lottsford Road/Campus Way intersection, other parties have bonded a traffic signal at this location, but it has not yet been installed. Also, the county is constructing the second half of the planned arterial facility at this location. Both improvements should be considered part of background for the purpose of analyzing the subject development. With a signal in place and the lane configuration under construction, the intersection would operate acceptably.

- b. Regarding the MD 202/Lottsford Road, MD 202/McCormick/Saint Josephs, MD 202/I-95 NB on-ramp, and the MD 202/I-95 SB on-ramp intersections, the applicant notes possible improvements and an intent to pay money toward those improvements as recommended by the MD 202 Corridor study. The applicant has not proffered a dollar amount to be paid. Also, the exact improvements, as analyzed, do not provide the policy LOS (excepting the improvement at MD 202/I-95 NB on-ramp). While the staff continues to support the results of the MD 202 Corridor study, the subject application will have a profound impact on traffic in the area, and the needed improvements must be staged to support this development. The cost methodology is based upon the estimated full costs of significant improvements in the area. It is essential to understand what this applicant is willing to construct, and for what elements the applicant is willing to pay money in supporting of constructing. The major improvements under the MD 202 Corridor study will fix the significant problems in the area. Better information is needed to determine exactly how those improvements will be phased vis-à-vis this development.
- c. Regarding the MD 202/Brightseat Road intersection, the applicant notes possible improvements and an intent to pay money toward those improvements as recommended by the MD 202 Corridor study. It is important to note that the MD 202 Corridor study does not recommend direct improvement to this intersection, but rather includes the proposed extension of Campus Way over the Beltway to Brightseat Road as a means of relieving this intersection through a redistribution of area traffic. Once again, the exact improvements, as analyzed, do not provide LOS E as required by policy. And while the staff supports the results of the MD 202 Corridor study, better information is needed to determine exactly how the Beltway overpass will be phased vis-à-vis this development.

As noted above, the traffic study includes a recommendation to pay a pro-rata share for improvements along MD 202. This has arisen from a conclusion of the MD 202 Corridor study, which indicated the appropriateness of a cost-sharing methodology for the purpose of funding regional improvements needed for the whole area. The MD 202 Corridor study determined that a number of improvements were needed in the area. This was further substantiated with the District Council's approval of A-9956 on a neighboring site. In that approval, the following cost information was presented:

- a. Four lanes (each direction) along MD 202: Needed widening within I-95/MD 202 interchange estimated at \$375,000. Along MD 202 between Arena Drive and I-95, at \$500 per linear foot and 7,500 feet, cost is estimated at \$3,750,000. Total cost: \$4.125 million.
- b. Extension of Campus Way over the Beltway to Brightseat Road: New road construction over 7,000 feet at \$900 per linear foot, or \$6,300,000. Beltway overpass estimated at \$6,700,000. Total cost: \$13 million.
- c. Full-time operations at I-95/Arena Drive interchange: State's Option 1 has an estimated cost of \$18 million. It was determined that FHWA will not approve low-cost improvements (i.e., less than \$1 million) for opening the interchange to full-time traffic.

- d. Overpass and partial interchange at MD 202 and Saint Josephs Drive/McCormick Drive: Estimated in traffic study at \$10 million.

All four major improvements have a total cost of \$45.1 million. While the MD 202 Corridor study serves to provide the needed findings for conceptual site plan approval of this site, better information is needed to determine exactly how the four elements will be phased vis-à-vis this development. More precisely, it is necessary to know what this applicant anticipates building versus indirectly funding.

- 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:

	FAR Range	
Pod A Office	180,000 SF	200,000 SF
Pod B Hotel/Conf. Center	100,000 SF, 120 Rooms	110,000 SF, 150 Rooms
Pod C Recreational Fields		
Pod D Town Center:		
-Retail	575,000 SF	700,000 SF
-Office	640,000 SF	700,000 SF
-Hotel	100,000 SF, 240 Rooms	110,000, 260 Rooms
-Multifamily	670,000 SF, 360 DU	750,000 SF, 400 DU
Pod E Office	150,000 SF	180,000 SF
Pod F Residential		
-Detached Units	645,000 SF, 215 DU	750,000 SF, 250 DU
-Attached Units	175,000 SF, 84 DU	200,000 SF, 100 DU
-Stacked Condos	260,000 SF, 140 DU	300,000 SF, 150 DU
-Clubhouse	6,000 SF	6,000 SF
Total	3,500,000 SF	4,000,000 SF
Site: 244.67 Ac.	10,657,825 SF	
FAR	0.33 FAR	0.38 FAR
Subtotal	1.75 M SF Residential	2.0 M SF Residential
	1.75 M SF Commercial	2.0 M SF Commercial

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 initial phase of the residential development.

9. During the approval of the zoning map amendment, the District Council approved conditions that dealt with the subject property and issues that were to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The conditions to be addressed during the review of the conceptual site plan or tree conservation plans are addressed below.

Zoning Map Amendment, A-9613-C (Zoning Ordinance No. 13-1988)

- 1. There shall be no grading or cutting of trees on the site prior to the approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, except on a selective basis by permission of the Prince George's County Planning Board, when necessary for forestry management or water and sewer lines.**

Review of the 2000 aerial photography of the site indicates that no grading or cutting of trees on the site has occurred.

- 2. The Conceptual Site Plan shall include a tree-stand delineation plan. Where possible, major stands of trees shall be preserved, especially along streams, and where they serve as a buffer between the subject properties and adjacent residentially zoned land.**

The forest stand delineation submitted with the conceptual site plan application, CSP-03006, was reviewed and was found to not fully address the requirements for a detailed forest stand delineation. This is further discussed within the environmental review section of this memorandum.

A Type I tree conservation plan was submitted with this application. This will be fully reviewed within the environmental review section for conformance with this condition.

- 3. The Conceptual Site Plan shall include the entire area of A-9613 approved for the M-X-T Zone.**

The applicant has provided a conceptual site plan that does include the entire area.

- 4. Development regulations shall at a minimum conform with regulations for the I-Zone, except in the area the applicant designated as a "Central Business District."**

The applicant is proposing to provide development regulations that conform with the regulations for the M-X-T Zone, which will include a mixed-use town center.

- 5. Buildings located on lots that abut residentially zoned properties shall not exceed the height limit in that zone, unless a determination is made by the Planning Board**

that mitigating factors such as setbacks, topography and vegetation are sufficient to buffer the views from adjacent residential lands.

The applicant has primarily proposed land uses that are compatible with adjacent residential land uses. Where buildings have been indicated in illustrative site plans, the applicant will be required to make an effort to conform to the regulations of the M-X-T Zone.

- 6. To the extent possible, development shall be oriented inward with access from internal streets. Individual building sites shall minimize access to campus way and Saint Josephs Drive, unless a determination is made that no safe, reasonable alternative is possible.**

The conceptual site plan identifies vehicular circulation in relationship to designated land uses and their orientation to Campus Way North and Saint Josephs Drive. Building placement will be defined in more detail in the detailed site plan submittal.

- 7. The zoning herein is further specifically conditioned upon a test for adequate public facilities, as follows:**
 - a. A comprehensive traffic study shall be submitted for Planning Board review and approval with both the Conceptual Site Plan and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision applications.**
 - b. The traffic study shall include a staging plan that will identify what specific highway improvements are necessary for each stage of development. The traffic study and staging plan shall also address how the various development proposals and highway improvements in the Route 202 corridor (Beltway to Central Avenue) will be coordinated.**
 - c. If Transportation Systems Management (TSM) techniques are necessary to assure adequate transportation capacity, the traffic study shall identify how TSM will be enforced, how it will be monitored, and the consequences if it is unsuccessful.**
 - d. As part of its Conceptual Site Plan and Preliminary Plat of Subdivision approval, the Planning Board shall specifically find that existing public facilities and/or planned public facilities (to be constructed by the State, County or developer) are then adequate or will be adequate prior to any development being completed.**
 - e. Each Detailed Site Plan shall include a statue report identifying the amount of approved development and status of corresponding required highway improvements. To approve a Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board shall find the Plan is in conformance with the approved staging requirements.**

The Transportation findings and recommendations in this report address the conditions outlined in the recommendation and evaluation criteria sections of this report.

- 8. Any retail component planned for the property shall be designed as an integral part of the mixed use development, be oriented to primarily serve the subject development, and shall not be designed to serve as a neighborhood, community or village activity center.**

The applicant has identified the retail component of the project as an integrated town center in the core of the mixed-use development.

- 9. A minimum 150-foot building setback shall be required where the property abuts land in a residential zone or comprehensive design zone planned for residential uses. In addition, development or use of the subject property shall be substantially buffered from such residential uses by maintaining existing vegetation, where appropriate, and by the use of other buffers and screening techniques, such as fences, walls, berms and landscaping. The purpose of this condition is to separate commercial and employment activities from adjacent residential areas, in order to protect the integrity of the adjacent planned low-density residential neighborhoods.**

The applicant has identified compatible land uses adjacent to existing and planned residential neighborhoods and will be required to take into account the setbacks outlined in this condition.

- 10. All buildings, except single-family dwellings, shall be fully equipped with automatic fire suppression systems in accordance with national fire protection association standard 13 and all applicable county laws.**
- 11. The District Council shall review for approval the Conceptual Site Plan, the Detailed Site Plan, and the preliminary plan of subdivision for the subject property.**

- 10. Required Findings of Section 27-276(b) for a Conceptual Site Plan:** 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 parking in the commercial areas should minimize open surface parking as much as possible in an effort to preserve the main street character of the town center.
- b. Provide more structured parking facilities that are combined with the shops at street level and office/housing above retail to minimize large areas of surface parking near or around the main street of the town center.

- c. Architectural aesthetic lighting should be well integrated in the architectural character of the town center, particularly at the main street corridors and storefronts.
 - d. While providing an attractive tree-lined view of the urban texture of the main street in the town center, an effort should be made to maintain “glades” of existing vegetation in the office and hotel pods as they should take advantage of the natural topography and vegetation that exist on the site.
 - e. Urban vistas from residential towers should overlook the tree-lined boulevards, park and marketplace features of the town center.
 - f. Opportunities to provide open public spaces within the residential as well as urban context of the town center main street should be taken advantage of and integrated into the building entrances and arcades.
 - g. Provide a public street connection between the subject site and Glenarden Parkway.
10. **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.
11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet gross tract area, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and more than 5,000 square feet of woodland clearing is proposed. A revised Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI/13/05) was submitted with the revised conceptual site plan application.
- The revised tree conservation plan (TCPI/13/05) has been reviewed. The woodland conservation threshold for this site is 34.76 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The amount of required woodland conservation based on the amount of clearing currently proposed is 82.78 acres.
- The TCPI has proposed to meet the requirement with 34.76 acres of on-site preservation and 48.02 acres of credits for off-site mitigation on another property, which meets the minimum requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The woodland conservation threshold has been provided on-site, and woodland conservation areas have been proposed in the priority woodland areas of the property.
- Comment:** No additional information is required concerning the TCPI.
12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are as follows:
- a. **The City of Glenarden** issued a memorandum dated August 23, 2005, discussing the

concerns of the city and the Council of the City of Glenarden's current position regarding CSP-03006, Woodmore Towne Centre. The memorandum is attached as an exhibit of this staff report.

The following is a summary of the issues of concern:

- (1) Municipal services to residential and commercial areas.
- (2) Egress roads to the property. The developers have proposed an emergency/public works access at 11th Street with a control gate or a full service road at 7th Street with a deposit of \$150,000 in escrow for the city to build or not build at their choosing. Neither of these options is acceptable to the Council—the Council wants full access by way of Glenarden Parkway with the developers bearing the cost.
- (3) Stacked town home concept. The Council's position is still 20-foot-wide town homes.
- (4) Equal buildout of residential and commercial property. We only have assurances that the infrastructure for both will be done at the same time. This Council wants assurance that equal buildout of residential and commercial will occur.
- (5) Commercial/retail establishments (types of commercial/retail uses proposed)
- (6) Homeowners associations management company. The developers are committed to providing a Maryland-licensed management company for the project. The Council is awaiting the final documents on this from the City of Glenarden's attorney.
- (7) Park/school concept. There is confusion as to where the middle school will be located that will service this and other adjoining communities. The Council has noticed that the road construction at this site is not suitable for bus traffic. Either M-NCPPC or the School Board needs to tell the Council where the middle school will be located for this area.
- (8) Pedestrian safety. The developers are having a study done for the site. This Council is also concerned about pedestrian safety outside the site. MD 202 and other arteries leading to the Metro do not have sidewalks, pedestrian crossings, etc. This is a state and county improvement project.

Comment: The staff has met with the City of Glenarden to discuss the abovementioned issues. This staff report addresses six of the eight items in the findings and recommendations sections of this report.

- b. The **Community Planning Division** provided the following comments on this application (Washburn to Estes, May 27, 2005):

“The application is generally in conformance with the master plan recommendations for land use. However, there are master plan issues with regard to potential transportation impacts on Landover Road (MD 202). In addition, the City of Glenarden has expressed strong concerns about the application’s provisions for public safety and emergency access.

“The master plan identifies the property as lying within Neighborhoods D and F. These neighborhoods are described on page 63 of the master plan as planned locations for Low Suburban single-family detached residential suburban development in Neighborhood D and mixed-use High Suburban density residential and office/retail uses in Neighborhood F. The master plan recommends use of the Comprehensive Design Zone technique as a plan implementation tool for this area.

“Neighborhood F is within Major Employment Area 3. The master plan sets forth a number of specific development guidelines for Employment Area 3 on pages 86-90. The master plan envisions a High Suburban density mixed-use community with significant residential and commercial development served by Landover Road (MD 202), the future Campus Way North (A-29), and the future St. Joseph’s Drive (C-145). The plan recommends the use of extensive buffering between employment and residential areas. It also recommends the preparation and submission of a comprehensive traffic study to be submitted for Planning Board review and approval (page 87).

“Although the conceptual site plan’s proposed mix of uses is generally in conformance with the master plan, it shows no connections with the surrounding street grid aside from connections with the proposed St. Joseph’s Drive and Campus Way North (from the east). In the absence of a completed Campus Way North and St. Joseph’s Drive, the lack of additional street connections may result in substantial traffic impacts on adjacent arterials and collectors, particularly Landover Road (MD 202).

“In a recent meeting with Glenarden elected officials, the applicant justified the limited connectivity of the proposed development’s street grid by claiming that this feature was a required condition of the 1988 annexation of the subject property by the City of Glenarden. However, the current Glenarden mayor and council have insisted that they want the proposed development to include additional connections to the existing street grid to the north of the property in order to ease public safety (police, fire, and emergency medical service) access to the site. This issue is especially important to the mayor and council of Glenarden because of the property’s location within the town’s incorporated area.

“The property was rezoned from the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to the M-X-T Zone by the District Council in 1988 (Case No. A-9613-C, ZO 13-1988). A number of conditions

were adopted as part of the rezoning. One condition linked the rezoning to an adequate public facilities (APF) test that incorporated a comprehensive traffic study and the consideration of Transportation Systems Management (TSM) techniques. Based on this requirement and the recommendations contained in the master plan for the proposed development site, a comprehensive multimodal transportation system analysis should be prepared and submitted for Planning Board review and approval as part of this application.

“Finally, the master plan recommends the preservation of PMAs such as those identified on the property in their natural state (page 51). These areas will have to be accommodated in any approved site plan.”

- c. The **Department of Environmental Resources** has stated that the proposal is consistent with approved stormwater concept plan #2098-2003-01.
- d. The **Environmental Planning Section** previously reviewed the rezoning application for this site (A-9613-C), which was approved with conditions by the District Council on March 14, 1988. The Environmental Planning Section also reviewed the pre-acceptance conceptual site plan package for the above referenced site.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL TO BE ADDRESSED AT CONCEPTUAL SITE PLAN

During the approval of the zoning map amendment the District Council approved conditions that dealt with environmental issues that were to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The environmental conditions to be addressed during the review of the Conceptual Site Plan or Tree Conservation Plans are addressed below.

ZONING MAP AMENDMENT, A-9613-C (Zoning Ordinance No. 13-1988)

- 1. There shall be no grading or cutting of trees on the site prior to the approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, except on a selective basis by permission of the Prince George’s County Planning Board, when necessary for forestry management or water and sewer lines.**

Review of the 2000 aerial photography of the site indicates that no grading or cutting of trees on the site has occurred.

- 2. The Conceptual Site Plan shall include a tree-stand delineation plan. Where possible, major stands of trees shall be preserved, especially along streams, and where they serve as a buffer between the subject property and adjacent residentially zoned land.**

The forest stand delineation submitted with the conceptual site plan application, CSP-03006, was

reviewed and was found to not fully address the requirements for a detailed forest stand delineation. This is further discussed within the environmental review section of this memorandum.

A Type I tree conservation plan was submitted with this application. This will be fully reviewed within the environmental review section of this memorandum for conformance with this condition.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

1. A revised detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was submitted on June 28, 2005. The FSD was found to fulfill all technical requirements.

Comment: No further information regarding the FSD is required.

2. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet gross tract area, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland, and more than 5,000 square feet of woodland clearing is proposed. A revised Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI/13/05) was submitted with the revised conceptual site plan application.

The revised tree conservation plan (TCPI/13/05) has been reviewed. The woodland conservation threshold for this site is 34.76 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The amount of required woodland conservation based on the amount of clearing currently proposed is 82.78 acres.

The TCPI has proposed to meet the requirement with 34.76 acres of on-site preservation and 48.02 acres of credits for off-site mitigation on another property, which meets the minimum requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The woodland conservation threshold has been provided on-site, and woodland conservation areas have been proposed in the priority woodland areas of the property.

Comment: No additional information is required concerning the TCPI.

3. Condition 3 of Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C (Zoning Ordinance No. 13-1988) stated the following:

3. **The Conceptual Site Plan shall include a tree-stand delineation plan. Where possible, major stands of trees shall be preserved, especially along streams, and where they serve as a buffer between the subject property and adjacent residentially zoned land.**

An FSD and Type I tree conservation plan were submitted with the conceptual site plan application. The TCPI shows major stands of trees preserved within the PMA and contiguous to the PMA. Buffers of existing woodland between the subject property and adjacent residentially zoned land have not been shown, most probably because the buffer areas are not located in the PMA and therefore have less priority for woodland conservation. No landscape buffers are required between the single-family residential proposed in Pod F and the adjacent residential development.

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section will coordinate the use of existing trees as buffers with the Urban Design Review Section.

4. Three transportation noise generators (I-95, MD 202 and Campus Way North) were identified as affecting the site and were evaluated. A Phase I Traffic Noise Analysis for Woodmore Towne Centre, dated March 31, 2005, prepared by Polysonics Corporation, was submitted with the current application. This noise analysis, which is reviewed below, only addresses I-95 and MD 202.

The Capital Beltway (I-95): The Beltway is classified as a freeway with a noise impact zone (65 dBA Ldn noise contour) extending approximately 1,355 feet from the centerline of the roadway based on the Environmental Planning Section noise model. This model applies to this study of the subject property. The Phase I noise study submitted uses parameters in modeling noise impacts to the site that are not appropriate. On May 20, 2003, according to the study, Polysonics conducted a 24-hour traffic noise measurement survey at the Woodmore Towne Centre site. The Environmental Planning Section agrees that the use of actual on-site noise monitoring is acceptable, if it is associated with the accurate traffic counts. The noise study applied an average daily traffic (ADT) for year 2000 traffic of 187,4000 vehicles, instead of the year 2003 ADT of 214,675 vehicles, in establishing base noise levels as required. The ADT was then modeled for 25 years in the study, instead of the 10 years used in the EPS model. At this time, ADT counts from SHA are available for year 2004. The noise analysis should be revised using the following parameters, consistent with the EPS model: The modeling should address a 10-year timeframe, beginning with the year 2004 ADT. The on-site noise measurement should be calibrated to the year 2003 ADT for modeling.

The noise analysis submitted delineates the location of noise impact contours at five feet above grade, which will be used for the evaluation of outdoor recreational activity areas; at 20 feet above grade, which will be used for the evaluation of noise impacts on residential buildings; and 120 feet above grade, which will be used for hotel noise impact assessment. It is unclear whether the noise contours shown on the revised conceptual site plan were recalculated based on the correct parameters. The delineation of the 80 dBA Ldn noise contour is especially important, since the noise analysis recommends “no commercial buildings or hotels be constructed within the 80 dBA Ldn noise impact zone (120 feet).”

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated 65, 70, 75 and 80 dBA Ldn noise contour lines related to the Capital Beltway based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), a year 2003 ADT of 214,675 vehicles shall be used to calibrate the on-site noise measurements made in 2003, and a posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour; and these noise contours shall be correctly delineated on the conceptual site plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the conceptual site plan shall be revised to place no commercial buildings or hotels within the 80-dBA Ldn noise impact zone (120 feet).

Landover Road (MD 202): Landover Road is classified as an expressway with a noise impact zone (65 dBA Ldn noise contour) extending approximately 373 feet from the centerline of the roadway, based on the Environmental Planning Section noise model, based on a posted speed limit of 55 mph, a year 2003 ADT of 60,725, and a 10-year timeframe for projection.

The Phase I noise study submitted uses parameters in modeling noise impacts to the site that are not appropriate. The ADT used is the year 2002 traffic of 59,450 vehicles, not the year 2003 ADT of 60,725 vehicles, for establishing existing noise levels, or the year 2004 ADT of 59,775 vehicles. The ADT is then modeled for 23 years, instead of the 10 years used in the EPS model. The noise analysis should be revised to adopt consistent parameters with the Environmental Planning Section noise model.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated 65, 70, and 75 dBA Ldn noise contour lines related to Landover Road (MD 202) based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), a year 2003 ADT of 60,725 vehicles shall be used to calibrate the on-site noise measurements made in 2003, and a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour; and these noise contours shall be correctly delineated on the conceptual site plan.

Campus Way North: Campus Way North is classified as an arterial roadway that is adjacent to the residential portions of this application. Specific traffic data from the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation is needed because the roadway has not been constructed. The noise analysis submitted does not consider the noise impacts related to Campus Way North.

A Phase I Traffic Noise Analysis prepared for the Balk Hill Development, by the Polysonics Corporation, dated May 20, 2003, for Campus Way North was evaluated to see if an appropriate noise contour delineation had been previously determined and could be applied to this case. The parameters used in the noise analysis are not appropriate given the buildout of land adjacent to this roadway. The analysis assumes an ADT of 2,138, which is unacceptably low when 900 new residential units are proposed on the

site; a speed limit of 30 mph for cars and 25 mph for trucks, which is very low for a 120-foot-wide arterial; and a 25-year timeframe for modeling, instead of the 10 years requested by EPS. A revised noise study was not required for the Balk Hill sites because these sites provided noise mitigation measures for outdoor activity areas adjacent to Campus Way North.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated noise contour lines related to Campus Way North based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), and a proposed speed limit and traffic volume determined by the Transportation Planning Section. The conceptual site plan shall be revised to correctly delineate the modeled 65 and/or higher unmitigated dBA Ldn noise contour for Campus Way North.

Recommended Condition: At time of preliminary plan application, a Phase II noise study shall be submitted for review that addresses noise impacts of I-95, MD 202, and Campus Way North. The Phase II noise study shall address how noise has been mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn for the outdoor activity area and 45 dBA Ldn for interior areas, and the recommendations of the Phase II noise study shall be addressed on the preliminary plan and TCPI.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of residential structures within the 65 dBA Ldn noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.

5. Section 24-101(b)(10) defines the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) as including streams, a 50-foot stream buffer, the 100-year floodplain, adjacent wetlands, a 25-foot wetland buffer, adjacent slopes in excess of 25 percent, adjacent slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils (soils having a K-factor greater than 0.35), and sensitive habitat areas.

The plans as submitted accurately show the various components and the ultimate limit of the PMA for the portion of the property that drains to the Patuxent River basin.

Section 24-130(b)(6) requires that when property is located outside the Patuxent River Watershed, the Planning Board may require the expansion of the minimum 50-foot stream buffer to include the 100-year floodplain, adjacent slopes of 25 percent or greater, and highly erodible soils on slopes of 15 percent or greater, and additional area deemed necessary to protect the stream or 100-year floodplain. This is called the expanded stream buffer.

The ultimate limits of the expanded stream buffer have been accurately delineated for those portions of the site that drain to the Anacostia River basin.

Discussion: No further information is required with respect to the location of the PMA or expanded stream buffer.

6. The Subdivision Ordinance (Section 24-130(b)(5)) requires the preservation of the PMA in a natural state to the fullest extent possible. The conceptual site plan shows no impacts to the PMA.

The Subdivision Ordinance (Section 24-130(b)(6) requires the preservation of the “expanded stream buffer unless the Planning Board approves a variation request.” The plans as submitted propose two areas of impact to the expanded stream buffer for the construction of public roads.

The first impact to the expanded stream buffer is a major stream crossing proposed for access onto the site by the extension of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. A perpendicular crossing is proposed at a location that appears to have the least impacts.

The second impact to the expanded stream buffer is for the extension of a public right-of-way into Pod E. A minor shifting of the roadway to the east would further reduce the proposed impacts. Both of these impacts will be more fully evaluated during the preliminary plan review process. A variation request will be required for all impacts that remain at that time.

Recommended Condition: At time of preliminary plan, the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area or expanded stream buffer shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible, and any required variation requests or letters of justification shall be submitted.

- e. The Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter dated July 28, 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.
- f. The **Subdivision Section** referral reply comments dated April 25, 2005, stated that pursuant to Section 24-107 of the Subdivision Regulations a preliminary plan of subdivision is required for the construction of more than 5,000 square feet of gross floor area, prior to detailed site plan.

The property is Parcels 24 and 25. The site data information should be revised to include Parcel 25. There are no other subdivision issues at this time.

- g. **The Park Planning and Development Division of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)** (Asan to Estes, August 23, 2005) staff has reviewed the submitted plan and made the following findings. The subject property consists of 244.67 acres located in the northeast quadrant of Landover Road and I-95. The property is zoned M-X-T. The property contains 100-year floodplain and wetlands.

Zoning Ordinance No. 13-1988, condition 7d, states: **As part of its conceptual site plan and preliminary plan of subdivision approval, the planning board shall specifically find that existing public facilities and /or planned public facilities (to be constructed by the state, county or developer) are then adequate or will be adequate prior to any development being complete.**

Zoning Ordinance no. 13-1988, condition 9, states: **A minimum 150-foot building setback shall be required where the property abuts land in a residential zone or comprehensive design zone planned for residential uses. In addition development or use of subject property shall be substantially buffered from such a residential uses by maintaining existing vegetation, where appropriate, and by the use of other buffers and screening techniques, such a fence, walls, berms and landscaping. The purpose of this condition is to separate commercial and employment project the integrity of the adjacent low-density residential neighborhoods.**

The master plan for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73, designates a 40-acre floating park symbol on the northeast corner of subject property.

DISCUSSION

The applicant proposes dedication of 13.5 acres of parkland to the south of Campus Way North extended to the development, the construction of the public recreational facilities, and the provisions of private recreational facilities in the residential area of the development.

While the acreage of dedicated parkland is considerably smaller than is proposed in the master plan, DPR staff believes that this urban park may be able to serve as the needed community park if it is developed as an urban park with most of the property utilized. This will require creative design and substantial investment in infrastructure. The proposed public park is centrally located, highly visible, and accessible to all residents and guests. The applicant is proposing to construct the following recreational facilities on dedicated parkland: 2 soccer fields, softball field, a 100-space parking lot, a pavilion with a sitting area to be incorporated into a pedestrian entrance plaza, architectural fencing along the public rights-of-way to provide a safety barrier between the park users and the traffic, and a water fountain. Staff recommends that a restroom facility also be provided as well as a cross easement over 100 parking spaces. According to Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines, the play fields shall not be sited in the areas within 50 feet of

parking lots, access drives, property lines, or roads. The applicant will develop the park using high-quality and durable construction materials in a design theme in character with the rest of town center. If the above-mentioned facilities cannot be located on the dedicated park parcel, the parcel should be increased in size to accommodate the facilities mentioned above. Location and design of the facilities must be approved by DPR.

Staff believes that dedication of 13.5 acres of usable parkland, construction of the public recreational facilities, and provision of private recreational facilities on-site will satisfy the intent of the master plan and meet the recreational needs of the proposed community.

Comment: The staff suggest that in incorporating the green space for a town center, not only should a civic amenity such as a playing field in a park be provided, but that the green spaces should be integrated into the town center to provide a sense of place by providing amenities such as a plaza/park areas. It is also suggested that green spaces should link open spaces in the form of squares, greens and parks that are accessible, visible, safe and comfortable. Some of these open green spaces should be bordered by buildings and be visible from streets and buildings within proximity of the town center “main street.”

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 private 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 groups. 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 clubhouse should be designed as an architectural focal point for the community.

The applicant proposes to build the clubhouse and central recreational facilities in Phase III 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.

- h. The **State Highway Administration** stated the following in a memo dated April 15, 2005:

“This office completed its evaluation of the submitted plan and has no objection to revisions of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 approval. Based upon the support documentation we note that the owner/developer is required to provide transportation improvements to the State and County road system. The Agency fully expects that construction of the improvements will be completed prior to use and occupancy of the proposed development sites.”

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.

i The **Transportation Planning Section** provided the additional following comments regarding the conceptual site plan:

- (1) The proposed access and circulation plan is satisfactory. Most of the development is arrayed around a grid-like street pattern. It appears that the streets incorporate vehicular and nonvehicular access.
- (2) The streets appear to be adequately sized to handle the quantity of development proposed. All public streets within and adjacent to this development are within the City of Glenarden and will be maintained by the city. Therefore, all cross-sections must have approval of the City of Glenarden prior to detailed site plan approval.
- (3) There is a degree of utility to having a public street connection between the subject site and Glenarden Parkway. This connection must be reflected on the preliminary plan of subdivision unless it is determined by the City of Glenarden that such a connection is not necessary and/or desirable.
- (4) Campus Way is shown on the master plan as an arterial facility to the east of the subject property, transitioning to a collector facility to cross the Capital Beltway. The plan directs this roadway into a traffic circle, connects the Beltway overpass by a major collector facility to the platted Saint Josephs Drive/Ruby Lockhart Boulevard intersections, and shows a major collector connection between Campus Way and the overpass access roadway. This is acceptable for the following reasons:
 - (a) Campus Way was given latitude to be four lanes instead of six in the master plan.
 - (b) The plan preserves the connection across the Capital Beltway to link areas north of MD 202.
 - (c) All needed vehicular links are made in consideration of environmental features.

Nonetheless, the plan shows potential reservation of the portion of the roadway linking this site to a possible Beltway overpass. It has been clearly shown that the overpass is one major element of a plan to provide adequate transportation facilities in the area. It has been clearly shown that all major intersections in the area fail miserably without the major elements of the MD 202 Corridor study

recommendations in place. Therefore, the conceptual site plan shall be revised to remove mention of reservation and to indicate that dedication to the western property line will be required.

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 APPROVED the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/13/05), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval, the plans shall be revised as follows or the indicated information shall be provided on the plan: Approved development for CSP-03006 shall be as follows:

900-1,100 residential units
400,000-1,000,000 square feet of retail
400,000-1,000,000 square feet of office (subject to waiver provisions in Condition 1.a. below)
400,000 square feet of retail and 400,000 square feet of office are required minimum amounts for the two uses.
No more than 2,000,000 square feet of retail and office combined are permitted.

In addition to these basic development parameters, all future development shall be in substantial conformance with the Illustrative Plan dated September 21, 2005, in regards to site layout, development pattern and the intended relative amounts of development of different types and their relationships and design.

- a. Phasing lines and the phasing schedule shall be shown on the plan. A stipulation shall be added to the phasing schedule that at least 100,000 square feet of retail within the Town Center Pod D shall receive building permits prior to release of the 300th residential permit (in POD F). Of this 100,000 square feet of retail, at least 1/3 shall be for tenants occupying space consisting of 30,000 square feet or less.

At least 150,000 square feet of office will receive building permits prior to release of the 500th residential permit.

At least 400,000 square feet of office will receive building permits prior to release of the 900th residential permit.

The conditions requiring building permits for office use may be waived or modified if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board that insufficient market demand exists for said office use. If the applicant demonstrates that it has graded pad sites for 150,000 square feet of office space and stubbed utilities to those pad sites and the applicant has continuously in good faith marketed those pad sites for a period of one hundred and eighty (180) days through an exclusive listing agent, and has been unable to obtain a user, said effort shall constitute a satisfactory demonstration to justify waiver or

modification of said office permitting requirement. The Planning Board's waiver of the office space permitting requirements will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed.

- b. Standards shall be submitted for the architectural appearance (size, massing, character, materials, details) of the office, retail and recreational buildings.
 - c. Label all the facilities in the recreation area of Pod F and indicate on the plan the main elements in the community building. The community building shall not be smaller than 3,500 square feet in gross floor area.
2. Prior to or concurrent with the submission of any detailed site plan for any development parcel, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees 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 quantity, location and appearance of all the signs in the development. This signage plan shall not be required to be submitted prior to or concurrent with a detailed site plan for infrastructure only. At the time of submitting said signage plan to staff of MNCPPC, the applicant shall also submit a copy of said signage plan to the City of Glenarden.
 3. Prior to signature approval of the conceptual site plan, the following revisions shall be made:
 - a. A tree-lined boulevard with median, or a double row of street trees on each side, or another equivalent treatment agreed to by and between the applicant and staff, shall be provided between Campus Way North and the Residential Pod F community center.
 - b. Provide additional retail shops with second level office/residential along the north/south corridor of the main street in the proposed location of the retail kiosk areas.
 - c. Provide additional shops with second level office/residential along the east/west corridor of the main street in place of the proposed location of the retail kiosk area.
 - d. Show proposed locations for civic uses such as a library, museum, cultural center, etc., on the town center main street. The final determination concerning the feasibility of providing these uses as well as their location(s) shall be determined by the applicant in consultation with the City of Glenarden prior to or by the time of the approval of the appropriate detailed site plan.
 - e. Show proposed locations for entertainment and cultural activities, public service and dining on the town center main street. The final determination concerning the feasibility of providing these uses as well as their location(s) shall be determined by the applicant in consultation with the City of Glenarden prior to or by the time of the approval of the appropriate detailed site plan.

- f. Extend the retail shops with second-level office/residential along the east/west corridor of main street.
 - g. Provide additional retail shops along the north/south corridor of main street adjacent to the proposed department store.
 - h. Identify future shops/retail/restaurant at vacant space adjacent to Office Tower A and adjacent parking structure.
4. The detailed site plan(s) for private recreational facilities submitted for approval by the Planning Board shall comply with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
 5. The recreational community center of Residential Pod F shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Pod F.
 6. Three weeks prior to submission of a final plat, three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) shall be submitted to DRD for their approval. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
 7. A performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee in an amount to be determined by DRD shall be submitted to DRD at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits for the section or phase in which the specified facilities are located.
 8. The developer, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board or its designee, through the review of the homeowners association documents that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
 9. The following private recreational facilities shall be provided within the development and shall be deemed adequate:

Townhouse area of Residential Pod F—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)

Two over two area of Residential Pod F —one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.

Up to two of the play areas for the townhouses and two over two in Pod F may be relocated to the 13.5 acre park subject to DPR approval.

Central recreational area on a minimum of acres 2 acres of land (excluding woodland preservation area), including the following:

- Community center with meeting room, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), appropriately sized fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons
- 25-meter swimming pool
- One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)
- One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)
- One tennis court
- Appropriately sized parking facility for the residents only

The Planning Board may modify these requirements and approve alternate facilities at the time of approval of detailed site plan.

10. 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 single-family detached residential building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.
 - b. Prior to the issuance of the 300th single-family detached residential 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 two over two units shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each of these types of units respectively. The completion of those recreational facilities allocable to the townhouses shall occur prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for 75 percent of all of the townhouses. The completion of the recreational facilities allocable to the two over two units shall occur prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for 75 percent of the two over two units.
11. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan:
 - a. The TCP I shall be revised to eliminate approximately six acres of woodland conservation from the 13.5 acres parcel to be dedicated to DPR. The offsite-mitigation acreage shall be increased accordingly in the woodland conservation worksheet.
 - b. The applicant shall submit a copy of the approved/proposed stormwater management concept plan for Phase II.

12. 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.
13. The following development standards apply and shall be demonstrated throughout the review of future plans within Pod F:

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED (6,000 Sq. Ft. or Larger):

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—45 percent
Minimum lot frontage at the street line—60 feet
Front yard setback—25 feet
Side yard setback—6/12 combined feet
Rear yard setback—20 feet
Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet
Maximum height of building—40 feet
Deck standards—7 feet from any property line

Traditional SFD (5,000-6,000 Sq. Ft.)

Minimum net lot area	5,000 square feet (limited to 30% of total SFD lots)
Minimum finished living area square feet	2,200 square feet
Two car garage	yes
Maximum lot coverage	50 percent
Minimum lot frontage at the street line	50 feet
Front yard setback	20 feet
Side yard setback	5/10 combined feet
Rear yard setback	20 feet
Accessory building rear yard setback	2 feet
Maximum height of building	40 feet
Deck standards	7 feet from any property line

75% of the single family detached units will have at least 75% masonry front facades. No less than 10% of the masonry shall be stone. Limited amounts of synthetic stucco may be used for accent treatments. The remaining 25% of the single family detached homes may be of vinyl siding or like material. Homes with fronts of siding shall be intermittently spaced among the total number of single family detached dwellings.

TOWNHOUSES:

All townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance. A minimum of 75% of the front facades of the townhouses shall be masonry. No less than 10% of the masonry shall be stone. Synthetic stucco may be used for accent treatments.

TWO OVER TWO UNITS:

Not more than seven ground level units in a row
Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 20 feet wide
Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet
Minimum of 75 percent of the front facade shall be masonry.
No less than ten percent of the masonry shall be stone.
Synthetic stucco may only be used for accent treatments such as lintels, door and window trim.

The Planning Board may modify these standards at detailed site plan if it can be found that the modification will improve the quality and functioning of the community.

14. At the time of detailed site plan, the following standards shall be observed:
 - a. Sixty percent of three sides of the clubhouse shall be brick, and the building shall be placed in a visually prominent location.
 - b. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.
 - c. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design. Such fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by DPW&T and/or the City of Glenarden as appropriate prior to or by the time of approval of the appropriate detailed site plan.
 - d. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate access areas, such as, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily development, and the office/retail development.
 - e. A double row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along major boulevards on both sides of the sidewalks, if determined to be necessary. 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*. In addition, a double row of two and one half to three inch caliper trees shall be provided along the interior street which extends from the extension of Glenarden Parkway to the residential Pod F community center, which a road segment shall not be required to be a boulevard with median..
 - f. Increase the number of units fronting onto Campus Way North and ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.

- c. A public street connection between the subject site and Glenarden Parkway shall be reflected on the preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - d. The following rights-of-way must be shown as dedication on the preliminary plan of subdivision:
 - (1) The public roadway between Saint Josephs Drive (at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard) and the western property line at the Capital Beltway.
 - (2) The public roadway connection between Campus Way and the roadway described in (1) above.
 - (3) The public roadway connection between the subject site and Glenarden Parkway.
17. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:
- a. Provide the master plan trail along the public roadways extending from Campus Way North to office area "E" as indicated on the submitted CSP.
 - b. Provide the urban pedestrian walkways as indicated on the submitted CSP. The width of the sidewalk within these walkways should be no less than eight feet in areas of street trees, planters, or pedestrian amenities.
 - c. Provide sidewalks or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.
 - d. Provide the trail connection through the park and/or school site from Campus Way North to the pedestrian walkway south of area "C."
 - e. A more specific analysis of all trail and sidewalk connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional segments of trail or sidewalk may be recommended at that time.
18. The applicant shall undertake the following actions regarding public parks:
- a. Dedication to the Commission of 13.5± acres as shown on Department of Parks and Recreation Exhibit "A."
 - b. Land to be dedicated shall be subject to conditions 1 through 7 of attached Exhibit "B."
 - c. The applicant shall construct the following recreational facilities on the dedicated parkland: two combination football/soccer fields, softball field, 100-space parking lot, pavilion, drinking fountain, restroom facility and architectural fence. Other facilities of

equal value may be substituted with written approval from the Department of Parks and Recreation.

- d. A concept plan showing the location and design of the recreational facilities on dedicated parkland shall be submitted to DPR for review 60 days prior to submission of the preliminary plan for the residential portion of the development.
 - e. The recreational facilities shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the applicable standards in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.
 - f. Prior to submission of final plat of subdivision for the residential lots, the applicant shall enter into a public recreational facilities agreements (RFA) for the construction on dedicated parkland.
 - g. The applicant shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee to DPR to secure the grading and construction of the recreational facilities on park property, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
 - h. Detailed construction drawings for recreational facilities on park property including grading plan, layout and details shall be submitted to DPR for review 60 days in advance prior to submission of the detailed site plan for the residential development.
 - i. Construction of the park shall be completed prior to issuance of 50 percent of the residential building permits.
19. Prior to approval of conceptual site plan CSP-03006 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/13/05 subject to the following conditions:
- a. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated 65, 70, 75 and 80 dBA Ldn noise contour lines related to the Capital Beltway based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), a year 2003 ADT of 214,675 vehicles shall be used to calibrate the on-site noise measurements made in 2003, and a posted speed limit of 55 miles per hour; and these noise contours shall be correctly delineated on the conceptual site plan.
 - b. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the conceptual site plan shall be revised to place no commercial buildings or hotels within the 80 dBA Ldn noise impact zone (120 feet).
 - c. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated 65, 70, and 75 dBA Ldn noise contour lines related to Landover Road (MD 202) based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), a year 2003 ADT of 60,725 vehicles shall be used to calibrate the on-site noise

measurements made in 2003, and a posted speed limit of 50 miles per hour; and these noise contours shall be correctly delineated on the conceptual site plan.

- d. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, a revised noise study shall be submitted that models the unmitigated noise contour lines related to Campus Way North based on a 10-year timeframe for projection (2004-2014), and a proposed speed limit and traffic volume determined by the Transportation Planning Section. The conceptual site plan shall be revised to correctly delineate the modeled 65 and/or higher unmitigated dBA Ldn noise contour for Campus Way North.
20. A minimum of sixty percent of all facades of street frontage elevations of multifamily units shall be brick.
21. Prior to approval of the applicable detailed site plan, relocate office building parking structure at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard entrance from close proximity to the northeast property line adjacent to proposed single-family dwelling units. Alternatively, the applicant may be relieved of this requirement upon demonstrating to the Planning Board that the parking structure has been attractively finished and sensitively designed so as to be compatible with the adjoining office building.
22. At time of preliminary plan application, a Phase II noise study shall be submitted for review that addresses noise impacts for I-95, MD 202 and Campus Way North. The Phase II noise study shall address how noise has been mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn for outdoor activity area and 45 dBA Ldn for interior areas, and the recommendations of the Phase II noise study shall be addressed on the preliminary plan and TCPI.
23. Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of residential structures within the 65 dBA Ldn noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.
24. At time of preliminary plan, the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area or expanded stream buffer shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible, and any required variation requests or letters of justification shall be submitted.
25. No pole signs shall be erected in the development. Free standing pylon signs will be allowed.

Detailed Site Plan Consideration: Prior to submission of any future applications, applicant will continue to study and will not foreclose the option of providing additional sleeved perimeter block development of retail shops with second-level office/residential use around a 50,000- to 125,000-square-foot retail tenant at the core or in close proximity of the town center main street.

PGCPB No. 05-205
File No. CSP-03006
Page 44

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George's County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board's decision.

* * * * *

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 Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Squire, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 29, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of October 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:EE:rmk