

RESOLUTION

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 November 3, 2005 regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050-01 for Signature Club at Manning Village, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** To revise the layout of Pod 2 only, including a reduction to the overall density from 800 dwelling units to 315 total units to include 111 single-family detached units, 140 townhouses, 4 semidetached units, and 60 multifamily units. The entire development is proposed as a condominium regime for an age-restricted (ages 55 and over) community. This plan eliminates previously approved 10,000 to 20,000 commercial retail and 35,000 to 50,00 office.

This case is being reviewed concurrently with Detailed Site Plan DSP-04063 for development of Pod 2.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Commercial retail, office, residential
Acreage	70.75	70.75
Outlots	2	0
Lots	0	2
Dwelling Units	0	315
F.A.R.	0.04	0.24

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 84, Council District 9. More specifically, it is located at in the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of Indian Head Highway (MD 210) and Berry Road (MD 228).
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The site is bounded to the east by forested land with single-family detached residential development beyond; to the south by single-family detached residential development; to the west by a combination of forested and single-family detached residential development; and to the north by single-family detached residential development.
5. **Previous Approvals:** The relevant site was the subject of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 was approved by the Planning Board on July 27,2000, formalized in resolution PGCPB No. 00-142. and Preliminary Plans of Subdivision 4-01063 and 4-01064, formalized in resolutions PGCPB No. 02-07 and 02-08 adopted February 7, 2002. A stormwater management concept approval

was issued on October 19, 2004, and is valid until October 19, 2007. Final Plats of Subdivision 5-05029 and 5-05030 were approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 2005, and were recorded as Manokeek, Plat 13 and 14 in Plat Book 205, Pages 45 and 46, on March 8, 2005. Plat 13 shows a single lot (Lot 11), the development proposed for the site is to be under a condominium regime. Plat 14 shows a single lot (Lot 12) and a large outparcel (Outparcel B), with neither plat containing a lotting pattern or road configuration.

6. **Design Features:** The proposed conceptual site plan is composed of three development pods. Pod 1, already developed with a variety of commercial/retail uses, parking areas and a stormwater management pond, is located southwest of Berry Road and encompasses a gross site area of 26.04 acres and includes 135,000-180,000 square feet of commercial/ retail space and 15,000 to 40,000 square feet of office retail. Pod 2 measures 57.47 acres and contains the major development contemplated by this revision to the conceptual site plan and by DSP-04063—315 residential units, recreational facilities, two stormwater management ponds and parking areas. Pod 2 is intended as an age-restricted residential community and its 315 residential units are divided into four “pads.” Each pad contains development as follows:

Pad	Type of Development	Number of units/Sq. footage
A	Townhomes	140
	Semidetached Units	4
B	Single-Family Dwellings	111
C	Multifamily	60
D	Community Building	2,496

Pod 3 is proposed to contain commercial retail development, a stormwater management pond, and a parking area and will have a gross site area of 13.27 acres. Three other stormwater ponds are provided in the development; two along MD 210 (Indianhead Highway) in the northern end of Pod 2 and a large pond along MD 228 (Berry Road) in the northern end of Pod 1. All roads in the development are proposed to be private except Manning Road, which is proposed as a public street and provides access to the development from MD 228. This revision to the conceptual site plan does not alter the previously proposed development within Pod 3.

Residential types are specified on the conceptual site plan as single-family detached (Type B), multifamily (Type C), townhouse including two semidetached units (Type A), and Clubhouse Pad (Type D). A perennial stream, floodplain and wetlands are indicated on the site, as are typical lighting, signs, and site furniture.

The proposed plan was designed in accordance with the M-X-T design guidelines of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance regarding parking, loading, circulation, site lighting, green areas, signage, grading, service areas, and public spaces.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements in the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.
8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050 was approved by the Planning Board on July 20, 2000. PGCPB Resolution 00-142, formalizing that approval, was adopted on July 27, 2000. The following conditions should be carried forward with this revision:
 1. **At the time of detailed site plan, special attention shall be given, but shall not be limited to, the following:**
 - a. **The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.**
 - b. **The designated focal point areas of the subject property to include human scale, urban design, materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.**
 - c. **The building materials and architecture.**
 - d. **Perimeter landscaping/screening of all development pods shall exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a, of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.**
 - e. **Parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of plant quantities by no less than 25 percent.**
 - f. **Provision of a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2.**
 - g. **The maximum height of office structures shall be limited to a maximum of 3-4 stories. The maximum height of residential structures shall be limited to 5-6 stories.**
 - h. **The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. A comprehensive design approach is recommended.**
 - i. **The provision of a gasoline station use on any pad site within the development. The proposed architecture shall be of a high quality and shall be compatible with the surrounding commercial/retail components with respect to materials and articulation.**

6. **Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures which will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section which reflect those components.**
7. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to an 800-unit senior housing community, and approximately 447,500 square feet of mixed retail and office space; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (576 AM peak hour trips and 1,650 PM peak hour trips) generated by the above development. Community facilities, skilled care facilities, and incidental office and retail space which are not public but are developed within the senior housing community shall be considered ancillary and additional to the permitted 800-unit community.**
9. **At the time of detailed site plan, the transportation staff will ensure that each exit from Pod 1 onto Manning Road allows for at least a two-lane exit. The transportation staff will also ensure that appropriate acceleration and deceleration lanes are provided to serve Pod 1 as a part of frontage improvements along Manning Road.**
13. **All internal paths/trails indicated on the site plan shall be a minimum of six feet wide and asphalt. All internal paths/trails within Pod 2 shall be six feet-wide and an impervious surface unless otherwise restricted in width or material by environmental regulations or agencies.**
14. **Appropriate signage and pavement markings should be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and Manning Road intersection.**

The above conditions have been added to the recommended conditions below.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-01063 and 4-01064:** Preliminary Plan 4-04163 and 4-01064 were approved by the Planning Board on February 7, 2002. Resolutions PGCPB 02-07 and 02-08, formalizing those approvals, were adopted on February 7, 2002. The preliminary plans were valid for two years and were given a one-year extension on April 22, 2004. The final plats were approved and recorded as PB 205 @ 45 and 46.

Staff has reviewed the requirements of PGCPB 02-07 and 02-08 and determined that the requirements apply at time of detailed site plan approval or prior to the issuance of building permits. Therefore, no requirements of the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision are directly applicable to the approval of the subject conceptual site plan. Additionally, the project is based on a condominium regime and, therefore, no further subdivision action will be necessary.

10. Landscape Manual: The proposed residential development will be subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses. Compliance with the specific provisions of these sections will be determined at detailed site plan.
11. Woodland Conservation Ordinance: The property is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans. CSP-99050 and TCPI/52/97 were previously approved with conditions by PGCPB 00-142. Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and TCPI/52/97-01 were approved with conditions by PGCPB No. 02-07. TCPII/121/99 was approved for the 210.60 acres of the Manokeek project that are in the R-A Zone and 32.64 acres in the R-R Zone. TCPII/121/99 has been revised at staff level several times with the most recent, TCPII/121/99-06, being revised on November 22, 2003. TCPII/112/01 was approved in conjunction with DSP-01036 for 26.04 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone and the most recent revision, TCPII/112/01-01, was approved by staff on July 15, 2003. TCPII/39/01 was approved for 57.47 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone. TCPII/39/01-01 is currently under review as a companion to DSP-04043 and includes 70.74 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone.

The revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/52/97-02, has been reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section and they have recommended its approval, subject to a single condition. Therefore, it may be said that the proposed project is in accordance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:
 - a. **Historic Preservation**—In an e-mail received May 25, 2005, the Historic Preservation Planning Section stated that the proposed project would have no impacts on historic resources.
 - b. **Archeology**—In a memorandum dated April 12, 2005, the staff archeologist stated that Phase I (identification) archeological investigations were recommended on the above-referenced property and that the prehistoric site, 18PR287, identified in a 1986 survey should be relocated if possible. Additionally, she noted that the residence of John Manning was shown on the 1861 Martenet map just north of the intersection of Manning and Berry Roads. In a letter dated September 21, 2004, the Historic Planning Section stated that they had reviewed the archaeological Survey of the Manning Signature Club Property and Phase II Archeological NRHP Evaluation of the Manning Signature Club #1 Site and that they concurred with the consultant's conclusion that, based on the paucity of artifacts and lack of features, no additional work would be required. They requested however, that four revised final copies of the consultant's report should be submitted to them. A condition to that effect is included in the Recommendation section of this report.

- c. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated September 16, 2005, the Community Planning section stated:
- These applications are not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier.
 - The conceptual site plan revision proposal is generally consistent with the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan policies for mixed-use development in this area, as implemented by the Planning Board’s approval of CSP-99050, Manokeek, on July 27, 2000. The site data table on this revised site plan does not accurately reflect the proposed development revisions.
 - The detailed site plan proposal for a mix of age-restricted housing on development Pod 2 is generally consistent with the land use concept for higher density residential land use on this site as proposed in CSP-99050/01 and as originally approved in CSP-99050, albeit at a much lower density and without the commercial elements previously proposed for this part of the site.
 - There are a number of site plan issues to address regarding the design or location of sound barrier walls, fencing, interior sidewalks and paths, and pedestrian access to other parts of the overall site.

In addition, the Community Planning Division raised the following planning and site plan issues:

- **Mix of Uses**—The 1993 master plan states, “A major mixed-use development area is recommended for the intersection of MD 228 and Indian Head Highway. Retail, office and other types of employment development, as well as community facilities and some higher density residential land uses, are envisioned.” (See page 90) The master plan envisaged mixed-use development being a mixture of retail, office, high-density residential uses, community, recreational and leisure facilities within close proximity to each other, all co-mingled in a shared environment.

The proposed development conforms to the requirements of Sec. 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance, which provides that “The uses allowed in the M-X-T Zone may be located in more than one (1) building, and on more than one (1) lot.” Taking into account the total mix of development for Pods 1-3, the land use proposal for Pod 2 substantially conforms to the development concepts approved in CSP-99050.

- **Fences and Walls (Along MD 228)**—A proposed sound barrier wall is shown along MD 228 on CSP-99050/01; there is a dashed line along the public utilities easement (PUE) adjacent to MD 228 on DSP-04063, but it is not identified on

the legend. Moreover, there is no design detail on either the CSP or DSP documents submitted to this division for review. The design of this fence/wall is important from two aspects: (1) the view of the site from highway frontage, which is extensive, and (2) the effectiveness of the design as a sound buffer for the proposed residential dwellings from traffic noise on MD 228, which is substantial. (Per Condition 5, PGCPB 00-142, CSP-99050 and Condition 4, PGCPB No. 02-07, Preliminary Subdivision 4-01063.)

Along site periphery elsewhere—A symbol that appears to be a fence is shown along the rest of the site but is not indicated in the DSP legend. Again, there is no detail for fence design. Although not as visible as the fencing along MD 228, as development occurs on adjoining sites, the fence design will be important.

Urban Design Comment: Subsequent to review by the Community Planning Section, the applicant has submitted additional materials, which include a detail for a proposed noise attenuation wall and a revised detailed site and tree conservation II plan. The Urban Design Section has found the design of the noise attenuation acceptable and the Environmental Planning Section has determined that the wall, in fact, provides noise attenuation to the required levels and that its placement on the site does not negatively impact the TCPII.

- Noise—Concerns have been raised in the community about noise from traffic on MD 228 and the measures proposed to mitigate the effect on future residents. In addition to the sound barrier wall indicated on CSP-99050/01, consideration should be given to acoustical interior buffering for the housing proposed in noise impact areas along MD 228.

Urban Design Comment: The Environmental Planning Section's review will ensure that exterior noise levels will be, at a maximum, 65dBA and interior noise levels will be 45dBA in accordance with standard requirements.

- Bocce Ball and Horseshoe Pits—There is a detail of these recreation facilities on page 11/11 of DSP-04063 (landscape plan), however, the location of these proposed facilities is not evident on the site plan. Are they proposed, or is the detail in error?

Urban Design Comment: The bocce ball facility and horseshoe pits detailed on the landscape plan will be provided for the proposed project.

- Interior Sidewalks and Trails—CSP-99050/01 indicates paths and trails, primarily along streets, but also in open space areas on the western portion of the site. Again, the legend for DSP-04063 does not contain a symbol for sidewalks, but their proposed location can be interpolated from parallel lines along the street. Sidewalks are generally proposed only on one side of the street, leaving

residents on the opposite side to cross the street to reach a sidewalk, or to walk in the street or across private yards. Consideration should be given to requiring sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Urban Design Comment: Condition 1(a) below requires sidewalks on both sides of all internal roads.

- Exterior Pedestrian Access/Intersection Design—Both MD 228 intersections with MD 210 and with Manning Road East are proposed to be grade separated. As the conceptual site plan is currently designed, there is a sidewalk indicated off-site along the entrance road connecting to Manning Road and to the future commercial development on Pod 3. However, there is no pedestrian access between Pod 1 (retail, commercial office) and Pod 2 (age-restricted residential community). Ideally, there would be a pedestrian friendly means to connect the residential and primary commercial components of this mixed-use development proposal, but none are shown on CSP-99050 as approved, or on the proposed amendment CSP-99050/01. The high-volume, high-speed character of MD 228, designated as an expressway, makes the design of a safe pedestrian crossing problematic, but it should not be impossible.

Urban Design Comment: Previous and a recommended condition below require such a crossing.

- d. **Transportation**—In a memorandum dated September 26, 2005, the Transportation Planning Section stated the following:

It is noted that Section 27-546(b)(8) states that property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a sectional map amendment “shall provide supporting evidence which shows whether the proposed development will exceed the capacity of transportation facilities...” This site was placed in the M-X-T Zone by means of a sectional map amendment. A traffic study was submitted and reviewed in 1999 when the original CSP-99050 application was reviewed. Given that the purpose of the current plan revision is to decrease density on the site, it would appear that additional study of transportation is not needed. This is further emphasized by the fact that the entire subject property has been subdivided and restudied in 2001, and the entire property has been platted and recorded.

The original CSP included the following land uses within the traffic analysis:

Retail/Commercial/Office: 447,500 square feet
Age Restricted Housing: 800 residences

The current plan (taking note of the companion detailed site plan) includes the following land uses:

Retail/Commercial/Office: 230,000 square feet
Age Restricted Housing: 315 residences

Given that the residential and nonresidential densities have been reduced, and in consideration that the original application was supported by a traffic study and that subsequent applications have resulted in the recordation of all portions of this site, it is determined that evidence is available to show that the proposed development will not exceed the capacity of transportation facilities.

The access and circulation shown on the conceptual plan appears to be reasonable.

Insofar as the uses proposed on this site plan are generally consistent with the uses proposed at the time of preliminary plan, making the basis for the preliminary plan findings is still valid, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this memorandum, the transportation staff finds that the subject property will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with transportation facilities which are existing, programmed, or which will be provided as a part of the development if the development is approved. Given that the conditions on the original CSP-99050 have been superceded by conditions placed upon the three preliminary plans approved within the site, it does not appear necessary to carry the transportation-related conditions forward on the revised conceptual plan.

- e. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated May 9, 2005, the Subdivision Section offered the following:

The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plans 4-01063 and 4-01064 on February 7, 2002. The resolutions, PGCPB 02-07 and 02-08, were adopted on February 7, 2002. The preliminary plans were valid for two years and were given a one-year extension on April 22, 2004. Final plats of Subdivision 5-05029 and 5-05030 were approved by the Planning Board on March 3, 2005, and were recorded as Manokeek, Plat 13 and 14, in Plat Book 205, Pages 45 and 46, on March 8, 2005. Plat 13 shows a single lot (Lot 11); the development proposed for the site is to be developed under a condominium regime. Plat 14 shows a single lot (Lot 12) and a large outparcel (Outparcel B). Thus, neither contains a lotting pattern or road configuration.

- f. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated May 5, 2005, the senior trails planner stated that although no master plan trail issues in the adopted and approved Subregion V Master Plan impact the subject site, a comprehensive network of internal homeowner association trails has been provided. Additionally, with respect to sidewalk connectivity, the senior trails planner recommended, due to the density of the proposed development and the

nature of the projected population, that sidewalks be provided on both sides of the street.

He also noted that safe and convenient pedestrian access be provided from the subject site to the commercial component of nearby Pod 3, including sidewalk and/or trail connections, and appropriate pavement markings and other safety features at the crossing of Manning Road should be provided in the future detailed site plan that will include Pod 3.

- g. **Public Facilities**— In a memorandum dated April 29, 2005, the Public Facilities Section stated that fire engine, ambulance, and paramedic services are all within response time guidelines. Ladder truck service, however, is beyond the established response time guidelines. In order to compensate for this deviation from established response time guidelines, the Public Facilities Section recommended that all commercial structures be fully sprinklered in accordance with National Fire Association Standard 13 and all applicable Prince George's County laws. The community building included in the project may be subject to this requirement, a determination of which will be made at the time of building permit review. Please note that the above synopsis of the Public Facilities Section's referral comments are offered for informational purposes only. Findings regarding the adequacy of public facilities are generally made at the time of the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision for a site.
- h. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated October 5, 2005, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

Background

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed applications CSP-99050, 4-97091, 4-01063, 4-01064, 4-01065, TCPI/52/97, and TCPI/52/97-01 for the subject properties. CSP-99050 and TCPI/52/97 were approved with conditions by PGCPB. No. 00-142. Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and TCPI/52/97-01 were approved with conditions by PGCPB No. 02-07. TCPII/121/99 was approved for the 210.60 acres of the Manokeek project that are in the R-A Zone and 32.64 acres in the R-R Zone. TCPII/112/01 was approved in conjunction with DSP-01036 for 26.04 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone. TCPII/39/01 was approved for 57.47 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T Zone. This application proposes a revision to 70.75 acres of the 338.77-acre Manokeek project. DSP-04063 and TCPII/39/01-01 for the same 70.75 acres are in concurrent review.

Site Description

This 70.75-acre property in the M-X-T Zone is located at the northwest corner of MD 228 and existing Manning Road. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and wetland buffers are found to occur on the property although there are no areas of 100-year floodplain. No areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils or areas of severe slopes have been found to occur on the property. MD 228, which is located

along the southern property line, and MD 210, which is located along the western property line, have been identified as noise generators which would have adverse noise impacts on any residential development. The soils found to occur, according to the "Prince George's County Soil Survey," include Beltsville silt loam and Aura gravelly loam, which have limitations with respect to perched water tables, impeded drainage, and a hard stratum. Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program publication entitled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the property. This property is located in the Mattawoman Creek watershed.

Review of Previously Approved Conditions

The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject applications. The text in **bold type** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans.

PGCPB. No. 00-142, CSP-99050, July 27, 2000.

- 6. Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures that will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components, the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section that reflect those components.**

Comment: This condition should be carried forward. Traffic-generated noise impacts are discussed in detail in the Environmental Review section below.

PGCPB. No. 98-22(A)/1, 4-97091, July 27, 2000.

- 2. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits that impact wetlands, the applicant shall provide the Natural Resources Division with copies of the appropriate federal, state and local wetland permits that may be required.**

Comment: This condition should be carried forward, with rewording to note the change of "Natural Resources Division" to "Environmental Planning Section."

PGCPB. No. 02-07, 4-01063, February 7, 2002.

- 2. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan.**

Comment: This condition should be carried forward.

- 4. A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour and shall be submitted as part of the Detailed Site Plan submission. The study shall include noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA.**

Comment: This condition should be carried forward.

Environmental Review

1. This site contains natural features that are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The Subregion V Master Plan indicates that there are substantial areas designated as Natural Reserve on the site. As noted on page 136 of the Subregion V Master Plan:

“The Natural Reserve Area is composed of areas having physical features which exhibit severe constraints to development or which are important to sensitive ecological systems. Natural Reserve Areas must be preserved in their natural state.”

The Subregion V Master Plan elaborates on page 139:

“The Natural Reserve Areas, containing floodplain and other areas unsuitable for development should be restricted from development except for agricultural, recreational and other similar uses. Land grading should be discouraged. When disturbance is permitted, all necessary conditions should be imposed.”

For the purposes of this review, the natural reserve includes all expanded stream buffers and isolated wetlands and their buffers. All streams shown as perennial or intermittent on the plans will require minimum 50-foot stream buffers that shall be expanded in accordance with Section 24-130(b)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations.

A wetlands study was submitted with this application. The 100-year floodplain has been approved by the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources. The expanded stream buffer required by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations is shown on the revised Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/52/97-02.

The impacts shown on the Type I Tree Conservation Plan are consistent with those previously approved by the Planning Board.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of any grading permits that impact wetlands, the applicant shall provide the Environmental Planning Section with copies of the appropriate Federal, State and local wetland permits that may be required.

2. The property is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved Tree Conservation Plans. CSP-99050 and TCPI/52/97 were approved with conditions by PGCPB. No. 00-142. Preliminary Plan 4-01063 and TCPI/52/97-01 were approved with conditions by PGCPB. No. 02-07. TCPII/121/99 was approved for the 210.60 acres of the Manokeek project that are in the R-A zone and 32.64 acres in the R-R zone. TCPII/121/99 has been revised at staff levels several times, with the most recent, TCPII/121/99-06, being on November 22, 2003. TCPII/112/01 was approved in conjunction with DSP-01036 for 26.04 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T zone and the most recent revision, TCPII/112/01-01, was approved by staff on July 15, 2003. TCPII/39/01 was approved for 57.47 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T zone. TCPII/39/01-01 is currently under review as a companion to DSP-04043 and includes 70.74 acres of the Manokeek project in the M-X-T zone.

The revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/52/97-02, has been reviewed. The basic changes to the plan include updating the worksheet to include as-built portions of the project and proposed new clearing for the area being reviewed as DSP-04063. The plan accurately reflects TCPII/121/99-06, TCPII/112/01-01 and TCPII/39/01. The plan accurately notes that some areas of off-site woodland conservation have been approved and the worksheet contains a footnote referencing all approved off-site woodland conservation including each site's TCPII number.

The plan proposes clearing 154.08 acres of the existing 270.07 acres of upland woodland and clearing 0.63 acres of the existing 43.61 acres of floodplain woodland. The woodland conservation threshold for the project is 106.33 acres. The woodland conservation requirement is 145.48 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 109.28 acres of on-site preservation, 5.44 acres of on-site planting and 30.76 acres of off-site conservation.

The plan proposes a large acreage of woodland conservation along Mattawoman Creek and within the large-lot residential area adjacent to the stream valley. This design is consistent with the adopted Green Infrastructure Plan.

There are technical revisions that need to be made and conditions are included in the recommendation section of this report.

Recommended Action: The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of TCPI/52/97-02 subject to the following condition:

1. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan, the Type I tree conservation plan shall be revised to:
 - a. Label the M-X-T, R-R and R-A portions of the site on sheet 1 of 5.
 - b. Type in previous approvals into the approval blocks.
 - c. Fix the worksheet to indicate no “shortage.”
 - d. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

Recommended Condition: A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan. As part of this approval the review shall reevaluate the small tree save areas adjacent to the SMECO easement, reevaluate clearing in the wetland buffer on the north side of the main wetland system just west of the internal street crossing and evaluate a woodland planting or landscaped connection between the isolated wetlands in the northern open space.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of any new permits for Lot 11, TCPII/116/01 shall be revised to reflect clearing required for the development of Lot 11.

2. MD 228, which is located along the southern property line, and MD 210, which is located along the western property line, have been identified as noise generators that would have adverse noise impacts on any residential development. For residential uses, outdoor activity areas must have noise levels of 65 dBA Ldn or less to be in conformance with Maryland standards. The outdoor activity areas on the impacted lots are the areas with 40 feet of the rears of the affected houses. The interiors of all structures must have noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn or less to be in conformance with state standards. Condition 5 of PGCPB No. 00-142 states:

“The applicant shall submit a detailed Noise Study for review and approval in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for development of Pod 2 which clearly reflects the limits of the 65 dBA noise contours for MD Routes 210 and 228 at the residential areas of Pod 2. The study shall propose noise attenuation measures for all residential areas which are located with the 65 dBA noise contours.”

A noise study was not submitted with Preliminary Plan 4-01063 as requested. Condition 4 of PGCPB No. 02-07, 4-01063 was created to replace Condition 5 of PGCPB No. 00-142, which requires a Phase II noise study at time of DSP submission.

Because this application is specifically proposing residential uses within an area that is significantly impacted by traffic-generated noise, a Phase I noise study is required for review. The ground level noise contour needs to be shown to evaluate the impact on outdoor activity areas and an upper level noise contour is needed to evaluate the impact on the second story of residential structures. Because DSP-04063 for the same 70.75 acres is in concurrent review, a Phase II noise study may be substituted for a Phase I noise study.

A phase II noise study was submitted. Staff were initially concerned that on-site measurements were taken only after or before rush hour traffic. After discussions about this procedure with the acoustical engineer who prepared the report, staff are satisfied that this methodology for calibration of noise measuring devices is consistent with standard approved practices. The study clearly demonstrates the need for a noise attenuation structures. The approximate location is shown on the Type I tree conservation plan. The details of the structures should be further evaluated as part of the detailed site plan.

Recommended Condition: The location and appearance of the required noise attenuation structures shall be reviewed and approved with the detailed site plan and Type II tree conservation plan.

3. The 70.75 acres of the 338.77-acre Manokeek project that is the principal subject of this application has an approved stormwater management concept plan, CSD 32197-2004. The plan shows the extensive use of bioretention areas.

Comment: No further action regarding stormwater management is required for the review of this conceptual site plan.

- i. **Department of Environmental Resources (DER)**—In comments dated April 19, 2005, DER stated that the site plan for Manokeek–Signature Club at Manning Village, CSP-9905/01, is consistent with approved stormwater concept plans 32197-2004 and 008004410.
- j. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—In a memorandum dated May 24, 2005, DPW&T offered the following:
 - That because Berry Road (MD 228) and Indian Head Highway (MD 210) are state-maintained, coordination with the Maryland State Highway Administration is necessary.

Urban Design Comment: Staff has coordinated with the Maryland State Highway Administration regarding MD 228 and MD 210. Please see finding 11(o) below.

- That Manning Road East is a proposed Collector roadway within the property as shown on the area master plan for the Subregion V comprehensive plan.

Urban Design Comment: Transportation Planning Section staff has offered that the alignment of Manning Road East has been changed so that it is no longer necessary to show the collector roadway alignment on the plans nor to indicate right-of-way dedication for the road.

- That the roundabout on Manning Road east will have to be redesigned.

Urban Design Comment: DPW&T's requirement that the roundabout on Manning Road east will have to be redesigned shall be enforced through their separate permitting process.

- That street construction and right-of-way dedication for the proposed collector roadway (C-529) must be in accordance with DPW&T's standards.

Urban Design Comment: As stated above, since the alignment of Manning Road east has been changed, considerations regarding the collector have become unnecessary in connection with the subject project.

- That all storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's and the Department of Environmental Resources' requirements.

Urban Design Comment: Requirements regarding the design of storm drainage systems and facilities shall be enforced through DPW&T's separate permitting process except on Manning Road east. Internal subdivision streets are planned to be private.

- That conformance with DPW&T street tree and street lighting standards is required.

Urban Design Comment: Requirements regarding street trees and lighting shall be enforced through DPW&T's standards except on internal subdivision streets that are planned to be private.

- That an access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed in order to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.

Urban Design Comment: As per the Transportation Planning Section's comments, such study was completed, submitted, analyzed, and found acceptable

by staff. The study's recommendations have been incorporated into project design.

- That all proposed roadways with 24-foot wide pavements are private roadways.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That the applicant should show rights-of-way dedicated to public use and private roadway limits on the plans.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That the posting of DPW&T bonds and the necessary permit fees are required for all subdivision roadways.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That a DPW&T street construction permit for the proposed roadway improvements within the subdivision is required.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That a cul-de-sac or turnaround meeting county standards at the end of all proposed roadways within the subdivision is required.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That all improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county are to be in accordance with the county road ordinance, DPW&T's specifications and standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Urban Design Comment: All internal roads in the proposed development are planned as private roadways.

- That a soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and geotechnical engineering evaluation for Manning Road East and the subdivision streets is required.

Urban Design Comment: The soils investigation report for Manning Road east will be required through DPW&T's separate permitting process. All internal subdivision roads are planned to be private.

- That existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments and that coordination with the various utility companies is required.

Urban Design Comment: The applicant will, of necessity, coordinate with the various utility companies through the development process.

- k. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated April 21, 2005, WSSC stated that a water and sewer extension would be required. Additionally, they stated that an on-site plan review package should be submitted and specified the individual at WSSC to contact regarding that submission. Finally, they mentioned that Project DA2425A99 is an approved project within the limits of the proposed site and gave contact information for the applicant to acquire additional information on the project. Compliance with WSSC's requirements will be ensured by their separate permitting process.
- l. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—In a letter dated April 15, 2005, SHA stated that they have no objection to Conceptual Site Plan CSP-099050/1.
- m. **Accokeek Development Review District Commission**—In a letter dated June 2, 2005, the Accokeek Development Review District Commission (ADRDC) stated that their major concern was noise abatement from MD 210 and MD 228. Particularly, they stated that the installation of a six-foot noise mitigation fence might not prevent the noise levels in the residential development from exceeding 65 dBA as required. Therefore, they recommended that:
- The developer be required to provide a noise abatement study to the Environmental Planning Section and ADRDC.
 - Maximum permitted noise levels not exceed 65dBA for exterior noise and 45 dBA for interior noise level.
 - Buffers provided between the residential development and the noise generators be required to exceed six feet in height.
 - That structures extending above six feet in height or above the noise attenuation wall be constructed so as to maintain interior noise levels within accepted guidelines.

Although the ADRDC has verbally stated that revised plans for the project, including a stepped noise attenuation, was acceptable to them, they have not updated their written

comments. In a telephone conversation with staff, an ADRDC representative stated that they are hesitant to update their comments on the proposed project because the applicant

failed as promised to deliver a set of revised plans for their review. Staff has interfaced in this respect and the ADRDC will receive revised plans well before the Planning Board hearing for the project and should be able to verbally update their comments at that time.

13. As required by Section 27-276 (b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the conceptual site plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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/52/97-02), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-99050-01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval, the plans for the project shall be revised and the following items submitted:
 - a. The Type I tree conservation plan shall be revised to:
 - i. Label the M-X-T, R-R and R-A portions of the site on sheet 1 of 5.
 - ii. Type in previous approvals into the approval blocks.
 - iii. Fix the worksheet to indicate no "shortage,"
 - b. The TCPI revised plan shall be signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
 - c. Applicant shall submit four revised final copies of the archeological Phase I Survey and Phase II NRHP Evaluation Report that address all comments to the Historic Preservation Planning Section. In order to determine compliance with this condition, the Historic Preservation Planning Section, as designee of the Planning Board, shall determine that the reports are acceptable.
 - d. Subject to approval of the State Highway Administration, a pedestrian crossing of MD 228 shall be included on the plans for the project.
2. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan. As part of this approval, the review shall reevaluate the small tree save areas adjacent to the SMECO

easement, reevaluate clearing in the wetland buffer on the north side of the main wetland system just west of the internal street crossing, and evaluate a woodland planting or landscaped connection between the isolated wetlands in the northern open space.

3. Prior to the issuance of any new permits for Lot 11, TCPII/116/01 shall be revised to reflect clearing required for the development of Lot 11.
4. The location and appearance of the required noise attenuation structures shall be reviewed and approved with the detailed site plan and Type II tree conservation plan.
5. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits that impact wetlands, the applicant shall provide the Environmental Planning Section with copies of the appropriate federal, state and local wetland permits that may be required.
6. At the time of detailed site plan, special attention shall be given, but shall not be limited to, the following:
 - a. The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.
 - b. The designated focal point areas of the subject property to include human scale, urban design, materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.
 - c. The building materials and architecture.
 - d. Perimeter landscaping/screening of all development pods shall exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a, of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.
 - e. Parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of plant quantities by no less than 25 percent.
 - f. Provision of a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2.
 - g. The maximum height of office structures shall be limited to a maximum of 3-4 stories. The maximum height of residential structures shall be limited to 5-6 stories.
 - h. The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. A comprehensive design approach is recommended.

- i. The provision of a gasoline station use on any pad site within the development. The proposed architecture shall be of a high quality and shall be compatible with the surrounding commercial/retail components with respect to materials and articulation.
7. Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures which will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section which reflect those components.
8. At the time of detailed site plan, all internal paths/trails indicated on the site plan shall be a minimum of six-feet wide and asphalt. All internal paths/trails within Pod 2 shall be six-feet-wide and an impervious surface unless otherwise restricted in width or material by environmental regulations or agencies.
9. Appropriate signage and pavement markings should be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and Manning Road intersection.
10. A Phase II Noise Study shall be prepared for all residential living and use areas located within the 65 dBA noise contour and shall be submitted as part of the detailed site plan submission. The study shall include noise attenuation measures to mitigate the exterior noise levels to 65 dBA or less in outdoor residential use areas and to attenuate interior noise levels for residential living areas to no more than 45 dBA.

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 Vaughns, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Vaughns, Eley, Squire and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 3, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 1st day of December 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:rmk