

A M E N D E D 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 February 2, 2006 regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008/01 for Greenbelt Station, the Planning Board finds:]~~

\*WHEREAS, CSP-01008/01 for Greenbelt Station was approved by the Planning Board on February 2, 2006; and

\*WHEREAS, on July 12, 2012, the Planning Board granted a reconsideration in furtherance of a substantial public interest and found that an error was made in reaching the previous decision due to a change in the applicable transportation LOS, and related matters; and

\*WHEREAS, on July 26, 2012, the Planning Board in consideration of the evidence presented approved an amendment to Finding 17 and Condition 2 relating to the transportation improvements, with related adjustments to the Phasing of said improvements; and

\*WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008/01 for Greenbelt Station, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The conceptual site plan revision is for the purpose of amending the plan to be in conformance with an agreement between the City of Greenbelt and the applicant that alters the approved land use types and development yields for the project. See Finding 2 below for specific land use types and densities.

The original conceptual site plan was approved by the Planning Board and District Council as a Metro Planned Community in the I-2 Zone, pursuant to CB-47-2000.

Subsequent to the approval of the conceptual site plan, the *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area* (October 2001) rezoned the property to the M-X T Zone. The approved sector plan contains a provision that exempts the development from meeting the requirements of the development district standards since the site has approval of both a conceptual site plan by the District Council and a preliminary plan by the Planning Board.

On September 15, 2005, the Planning Board also approved a reconsideration of the conceptual site plan to incorporate transportation-related conditions proffered by the applicant.

\*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

In the north core area, the plan proposes a high-density, mixed-use development around the Metro station with a mix of uses consistent with the definition for a Metro Planned Community, such as office, retail, hotel, and residential. Development for the south core area is proposed to consist of medium-density, mixed-use development with residential and retail as the primary uses. The north and south core areas will be connected by a connector road that will intersect with Greenbelt Road to the south and the Capital Beltway (I-495) to the north. Currently, there is limited access to the Metro station from the Capital Beltway. Access is also provided to the station via Cherrywood Lane. A new interchange is proposed where the north/south connector road is proposed to intersect with the Capital Beltway.

2. **Site Data:**

Zone	M-X-T
Gross Tract Area	243.01 acres
100-Year Floodplain	72.7 acres
Net Tract Area	170.31 acres
North Core Area	78± acres
South Core Area	54± acres
Total Open Space (Including State of Maryland Property)	111± acres

**Proposed Land Uses and Maximum Densities**

South Core Area (54± acres)	
Commercial	115,000 GFA
Residential (mid-rise apartments/condos, townhouses and 2 over 2s)	983 DU (18 DU/AC)
Total Square Footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (Estimated: MF @ 1,000 sf/du; SFA @ 2,000 sf/du)	1,405,000 SF 0.60 FAR

North Core Area	78± acres
Retail	1,100,000 GFA
Office	1,200,000 GFA
Hotel	300 Rooms
Residential	1,267 DU (16 DU/AC)
Total Square Footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR) (Estimated: MF @ 1,000 sf/du; hotel @ 500 sf/room)	3,717,000 SF 1.09 FAR

- Location:** The site is located north of Greenbelt Road, west of Cherry Wood Lane, and south of the Capital Beltway. The site is bounded on the west side by the Greenbelt Metrorail and the MARC rail. The Greenbelt Metro Station and associated commuter parking lot, owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA), occupies 81.08 acres of the northern portion of the site. The southern part of the site, owned by Greenbelt Metropark, LLC, consists of 86.47 acres and was previously used for a mining operation, concrete plant, and asphalt plant. The eastern 75.46 acres of the site were also used for mining and contain the Indian Creek 100-year floodplain and other environmentally sensitive land. This area has been conveyed to the State of Maryland for preservation by Greenbelt Metropark, LLC. A portion of the site is located within the City of Greenbelt.

**Required Findings for Conceptual Site Plans in a Metro Planned Community (Findings 4-12 below.)**

- The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division.**

The proposed conceptual site plan revision is in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of Section 27-475.06.03 for a Metro Planned Community. The revision changes the land use quantities and densities from the original approval and refines the site layout for the south core. No changes are proposed to the concept plan for the north core other than the land use quantities and densities.

The revised plan generally meets the definition for a Metro Planned Community. The site has a contiguous land assemblage of more than 150 acres and includes an existing mass transit rail station operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The conceptual site plan also includes 75 acres of land that includes Indian Creek, which has been placed in preservation by the State of Maryland. The site is planned to be developed with an array of commercial, lodging, recreational, residential, entertainment, retail, social, cultural or similar uses that will be interrelated by one or more themes. Of concern is the substantial reduction of

commercial density and its impact on the quality of development anticipated in the original approval, particularly in the south core where a balanced mixed-use development was anticipated.

The revised conceptual site plan proposes a fairly high-density, mixed-use development around the existing Greenbelt Metro Station (north core) and medium-density, mixed-use development in the south core area, although it is questionable as to whether or not the amount of commercial now proposed for the south core still constitutes a “mixed-use” development. (See further discussion below.) The two areas will be connected by a north/south connector road that will serve as a major vehicular and pedestrian corridor from Greenbelt Road to the Metro station. The connector road would then continue north to intersect with Sunnyside Avenue. A new interchange is proposed at the Capital Beltway to serve the site.

The proposed development plan promotes the optimum use of transit facilities by assuring the orderly development of land in the transit station area and access, both vehicular and pedestrian, to the Metro station and other major transportation systems by providing the highest densities around the Metro station and near the proposed interchange with the Capital Beltway. Based on the applicant’s agreement with the City of Greenbelt, the revision increases the total amount of residential use proposed for the development by 590 dwelling units with a 507-unit increase in the north core, close to the Metro station. However, the plan also decreases the amount of retail space for the entire development by 380,000 square feet; decreases the amount of office by 600,000 square feet for the entire development; and decreases the amount of hotel rooms by 250 units.

The proposed mix of uses, including high-end retail, entertainment, hotel, office and residential will enhance the economic status of the county and provide an expanding source of employment and living opportunities. In the previously approved plans, both the north core and the south core offered employment and living opportunities. The proposed mix of uses was diverse and encouraged a 24-hour environment. From an urban design perspective, the densities and the proposed uses in the original approval were not an issue. While the new plan has proposed overall densities that are one lower than the previously approved plan, the plan for the north core still has a balanced mix of uses that would encourage a 24-hour environment. However, the amount of commercial proposed for the south core has been substantially reduced to a maximum of 115,000 square feet total, and the applicant does not appear to be committed to providing even that much commercial density. It is staff’s opinion that the south core development could end up being essentially a “single-purpose project,” which is not what is envisioned for a Metro Planned Community, nor as a transit-oriented development as recommended in the Greenbelt area sector plan. Therefore, it is recommended that a minimum of 80,000 square feet of commercial be provided for the south core in a manner that is physically and visually integrated on both sides of the connector road to encourage interaction between the various uses.

5. **The uses within the proposed development are either physically or visually integrated in order to encourage interaction between and among the uses within the development and with those who live, work in, or visit the area.**

The original application for CSP-01008 provided three alternative illustrative plans (Alternatives A, B and C) that showed the relationship between the various uses within the proposed development. Alternative C showed a pattern of development that offered the best potential for encouraging interaction between and among the various uses. In conjunction with Alternative C, the applicant provided a Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Diagram (Exhibit B) in the addendum to the conceptual site plan, dated June 13, 2001, that clearly showed the proposed vehicular/pedestrian circulation (where streets and sidewalks coincide), the locations of the proposed “main streets,” the locations of proposed plazas, and pedestrian trails of the illustrative plan.

Inasmuch as there are no specific changes to the concept plan for the north core with this application other than land use quantities, Alternative C is still a valid illustrative plan. The plan shows a pattern of interconnected streets that resemble a grid pattern with a main street connecting to the Metro station. The applicant provided a Metro Station Pedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Diagram (Exhibit C) in the addendum dated June 13, 2001, that shows some preliminary ideas as to how vehicular and pedestrian circulation might occur at the Metro station. The diagram is still speculative at this time, because the applicant has had only preliminary discussions with WMATA, and the final design of the kiss-and-ride, bus drop-off area, parking access, etc., will ultimately depend on how the area directly adjacent to the station develops.

In the south core area, Alternative AC@ also showed a pattern of interconnected streets in a grid pattern. The north/south connector road was shown closer toward the rail lines so that all of the development occurred on the east side of the connector road. Alternative C was superior in design to the other plans because it incorporated a grid street pattern with a “town green” into a “main street” concept that provided for enhanced interaction between the various uses.

The revised conceptual site plan locates the north/south connector road more toward the east with multifamily development and neighborhood commercial on the west side and an all townhouse development on the east side. It is exactly this type of development pattern that was prohibited in the first conceptual site plan as evidenced by Condition 12 of the District Council’s approval, which said in part, “Emphasis shall be placed on a mixed-use development that is pedestrian friendly and bicycle friendly, a grid street pattern with buildings close to the sidewalk, and civic areas with plazas and parks at regular intervals. Instead of a fine-grained development pattern, typical of more urban development where there are more uses mixed together, the proposed plan simulates more coarse-grained development typical of traditional suburban development with only two main uses (residential and retail). A small retail component is mixed with the multifamily on the west side of the connector road, and a single use development (residential) is proposed on the east side. As mentioned in Finding 4 above, commercial uses should be provided in a manner that is physically and visually integrated on both sides of the connector road to encourage interaction of the various uses.

Staff has met with the applicant and has discussed changes to the plan to align it more with the expectations of the original concept plan and make it more of a mixed-use development. What was discussed and should be a part of any future detailed site plans is the following:

At the time of detailed site plan for the south core, the following should apply:

- a. In the townhouse development, a strong grid street pattern should be provided with alleys providing access to all garages. Front-loaded garage units are discouraged and should only be permitted where alleys are not feasible.
- b. All streets within the townhouse development should be two-way streets with parallel parking on both sides where feasible. Street sections shall meet DPW&T standards, unless the area is annexed by the City of Greenbelt.
- c. A civic/recreational facility should be located in the center of the townhouse development. The facility should be sited to create an open air plaza between the north/south connector road and the facility. A village green should be provided to the rear of the facility connecting to the stream valley open space network. A small parking lot may be located between the facility and the village green, but on-street parallel parking should be maximized in the vicinity of the facility.
- d. A minimum of 15,000 square feet of vertical mixed-use (commercial and residential) should be provided on the east side of the connector road.

6. **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.**

As discussed in Findings 4 and 5, the mix of uses could be better integrated on both sides of the connector road so as to provide a more “fine-grained” development pattern that would be more cohesive and sustainable.

7. **If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases.**

Phase I of the development is for the south core. Currently, two detailed site plan applications have been submitted and are under review by the Planning Department. The south core has been designed as a self-sufficient entity. The north core is still in the planning stage and is independent of the south core.

8. **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development.**

For further information regarding this issue, see Findings 17 and 19 below.

9. **In areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, urban design**

**characteristics, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial).**

The conceptual site plan schematically shows some potential areas where pedestrian activities could occur. However, the plan does not provide the level of detail necessary to address the above information. The conceptual site plan text contains development and design standards that indicate that a landscape, lighting, signage and image plan will be provided with the first detailed site plan that will “convey a sense of place and scale, and provides a schematic visualization of the project in the future.” Staff recommends that Condition 15 below be adopted to address the above inadequacies.

10. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.**

The eastern portion of the site contains the Indian Creek floodplain consisting of approximately 75 acres of land to remain in preservation by the State of Maryland and which will serve as a natural, wooded buffer between the subject site and the Springhill Lake apartment complex. To the west, the property abuts the Metro/CSX railroad tracks.

A building height study was done at the time of the original CSP for the north core area to establish building heights for the development and to determine what, if any, impacts the building height would have on the Hollywood residential neighborhood development to the west. The study consists of computer-generated simulations of buildings superimposed on photographs from various vantage points from within the Hollywood neighborhood. The height study shows that buildings will be visible from the Hollywood neighborhood, but because of the distance from the residential lots to the proposed buildings, the proposed buildings will not shadow any residential properties in the Hollywood neighborhood. The proposed buildings are approximately 700-800 feet from any residential lot. Additionally, there is an M-NCPPC park between the subject property and the residential lots. Existing mature trees along the edge of the park will help to filter the views of the future buildings.

11. **Unless a finding of adequacy was made at the time of preliminary plat approval, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, U.S. Department of Transportation and/or Federal Highway Administration Program, or to be provided by the applicant.**

See Findings 17 and 18 below for discussion.

12. **The proposed development, if it includes a hotel use, will satisfy a public need for an additional hotel in the market area.**

In a memorandum dated May 1, 2001 (Valenza to Wagner), the Research Section of the Planning Department offered the following comments:

“The applicant has identified 35 hotels with more than 4,000 rooms in the market area. During the last several years the number of rooms, the occupancy rates, and the average daily rate per room have been increasing. This suggests a strong market for additional hotel rooms in the market area. Additionally, the idea of constructing one hotel with 250-300 rooms at the beginning of the project and another with 300-350 in about ten years seems to be a reasonable way to ultimately increase the number of hotel rooms in the market area by 15 percent.”

13. An economic analysis is required by CB-47-2000 justifying that any proposed retail sales area will support a high-quality, main street retail shopping and entertainment complex. No new economic analysis was submitted with the subject application; however, in a memorandum dated May 1, 2001 (Valenza to Wagner), the Research Section offered the following comments:

#### **Retail/Entertainment Facility**

Two elements of the retail market study lead me to believe that the applicant’s evaluation is ambitious. One deals with the percent of income going to retail sales; the other, capture rates.

According to the applicant, the percent of income going to the retail purchases (as identified by the applicant) is lower in the county than in the state, 30.3 percent vs. 35.4 percent. This difference is partially due to lower incomes in the county and a net leakage of retail sales to areas outside the county. Based on this assessment, the applicant applies the higher state percentage to income in the trade area to develop support for the regional retail/entertainment facility.

This approach ignores the income affect on the level of retail sales already identified by the applicant. Part of the explanation for the lower percentage of income going to retail sales in the county is the lower income in the county. Additionally, the lower average retail sales per household in the county is not necessarily evidence of a net leakage of retail sales to areas outside the county.

A national comparison based on the 1997 Economic Census among ten counties with at least 500,000 people that had incomes similar to the county’s showed that the share of income going to retail sales and also retail sales per capita in the county were in line with the averages for the other counties. The applicant’s finding may be more a reflection of the retail sales profile of a particular income group and not an indication of sales leakage.

Regarding capture rates, the applicant assumes very high capture rates in two of the five merchandise categories presented in the study. The general merchandise and the miscellaneous categories are each assigned a ten percent capture rate. The applicant identifies ten competitive regional retail/entertainment facilities, nine existing plus the Bowie Town Center, which is currently under construction. This proposal would put 11 such facilities in the market area. Thus,



the applicant expects some retail stores in the proposed regional retail/entertainment facilities to capture an above average share of sales in these categories.

Stores in this proposed development may capture an above average share of sales, but they are not likely to capture ten percent of the general merchandise and miscellaneous category market. Sales figures used in the applicant's calculations in these categories include the sales at stores not usually found in regional retail/entertainment facilities. The figures include sales at stores such as discount stores and warehouse clubs in the general merchandise category and florists and used merchandise stores in the miscellaneous category. While a few such stores may be found at some regional retail/entertainment facilities, most of them would not be located in such facilities. Therefore, most of the sales at these stores would not be captured by regional retail/entertainment facilities.

Based on figures reported in the 1997 Economic Census, sales at discount stores and warehouse clubs accounted for 35 percent of sales in the general merchandise category, and sales at florists and used merchandise stores accounted for 28 percent of the sales in the miscellaneous category. Thus, approximately 65 percent of general merchandise store sales and 72 percent of sales at stores in the miscellaneous category come from establishments in regional retail/entertainment facilities. This proportionately reduces the applicant's capture rates in these categories to 6.5 percent and 7.2 percent respectively.

The applicant's estimate of supportable retail square footage is reduced by about 25 percent when the calculation includes: (1) the county's share of income going to retail sales; and (2) revised capture rates to reflect sales going to stores not likely to locate in this proposal.

#### **Required Finding, for Conceptual Site Plans, Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance**

14. **The Conceptual Site Plan represents a most reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Section 27-274 without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.**

The applicant describes, in detail, how conformance to the site design guidelines of Section 27-274 will be accomplished in the addendum to the conceptual site plan dated June 13, 2001. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant has provided adequate descriptive information with the CSP text and addendum dated June 13, 2001, to enable the Planning Board to make the required finding at this conceptual level and to allow for the actual design specifications and materials for site and street amenities, signage, lighting, recreational facilities, and landscaping to be determined at the time of the first detailed site plan review. In addition, the first detailed site plan should provide vehicular/pedestrian streetscape design, street tree standards, building setbacks, lot coverage, and a refined layout that shows the locations and general dimensions of all civic components, including parks, plazas, recreational areas and green areas/open spaces.

15. The conceptual site plan for a Metro Planned Community is in conflict with certain provisions of the *Landscape Manual* in which required landscaping more appropriate for "suburban" development would not be appropriate or even possible in a highly dense urban Metro Planned

Community. Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, states that, “The purpose of these regulations is to establish a comprehensive, consistent, and flexible system which will require a buffer...between adjacent incompatible land uses in all conventional zones.” A Metro Planned Community is a special mixed-use appropriate to the M-X-T Zone, which encourages horizontally and vertically mixed uses. In many cases, it will be physically impossible to provide a bufferyard between uses normally required by the *Landscape Manual* when buildings are touching or uses are mixed vertically in accordance with the design concepts inherent in the Metro Planned Community. Therefore, detailed site plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strips, also applies to conventional zones. It is not appropriate to apply this section to mixed-use development where buildings or parking structures may be close to the curb, and a more urban environment is desirable. Therefore, detailed site plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strips, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

In a mixed-use development, the residential requirements of Section 4.1 would be difficult to apply, particularly with high-density development where green space may be nonexistent. Therefore, all detailed site plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.1, Residential Requirements, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

In reviewing detailed site plans for mixed-use development in a Metro Planned Community, Section 3, Landscape Elements and Design Criteria, of the *Landscape Manual* should be used for guidance in determining appropriate methods of landscaping. All other sections of the *Landscape Manual* not mentioned above shall remain in full effect for mixed-use development.

The above exemptions should only apply to detailed site plans or those portions of detailed site plans that provide a true mixed-use development in a Metro Planned Community. Where development is more suburban in nature, the *Landscape Manual* shall apply. The south core area has more potential for development to occur in a more suburban pattern than the north core area.

#### Referrals

16. In a memorandum dated December 6, 2005, (Stasz to Wagner) the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the revised conceptual site plan for Greenbelt Metro Business Park, CSP-01008/01, stamped as accepted for processing on October 18, 2005, and the revised Type I tree conservation plan accepted for processing on December 6, 2005. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CSP-01008 and TCP I/27/00 subject to the conditions found at the end of this memorandum.

#### **Background**

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site as applications SE-3979 and 4-00042. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008, TCPI/27/00 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for Greenbelt Metro Business Park, Lots 1-5, 4-01026, have been approved by the Planning Board.

### **Site Description**

The property is south of the Capital Beltway, north of Greenbelt Road, east of Cherry Wood Lane, and is bounded by the Metro on the west. The entire site is within the Greenbelt Metro Transit District Overlay Zone. There are floodplains, streams, and wetlands on the site. Current air photos indicate that about one-sixth of the site is wooded. No historic or scenic roads are affected by this proposal. The adjacent highways and Metro are significant nearby noise sources. The proposed use is not expected to generate significant noise. A rare/threatened/endangered species is known to occur in the project vicinity. A stormwater concept plan, CSD 8329131-2000-00, was approved by DER on December 11, 2000. The soils information included in the review package indicates problematic soils occur in the proposed development area.

### **Environmental Review**

1. This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site is more than 40,000 square feet in area and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required to satisfy the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Two forest stand delineations were submitted for review. The reports more than adequately describe the woodlands and condition and location of specimen trees. A revised tree conservation plan was accepted for processing on December 6, 2005. Tree Conservation Plan TCP I/27/00-01 includes the 169.4 acres of the Greenbelt Station site and the 75.46 acres of adjacent property owned by the State of Maryland.

The Greenbelt Station property has a woodland conservation threshold of 18.12 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The plan proposes the clearing of 1.47 acres of the existing 1.87 acres of upland woodland. The plan also proposes clearing 3.00 acres of the existing 29.75 acres of wooded floodplain. The minimum woodland conservation requirement for the Greenbelt Station site is 22.59 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 0.40 acre of on-site preservation, 8.61 acres of on-site planting within the 100-year floodplain where woodland does not currently exist, and planting 16.51 acres on the adjacent State of Maryland property, for a total of 25.05 acres.

The State of Maryland property has a woodland threshold of 30.96 acres. The plan proposes clearing 2.9 acres of woodland in order to lower the land elevation and provide floodplain storage. This area will be replanted after grading to result in no net loss of woodland area on the site. A 4.15-acre area, presently a mound of concrete rubble, will be moved off-site, regraded and planted with woodland. Two existing sediment basins, comprising 13.25 acres of manmade emergent wetland, will be regraded and planted with trees to provide a forested wetland. The

worksheet for the State of Maryland property must be reviewed and certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources prior to certification of the CSP.

**Recommended Action:** The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of TCP I/27/00-01 with the following condition:

1. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan, the tree conservation plan must be certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources or any other representative designated by the State of Maryland.
2. The site contains significant natural features, which are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The 100-year floodplain as shown on the plan meets the requirements. The wetlands delineation had been previously examined in the field and determined to be correct.

**Recommended Condition:** At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, wetlands, and wetland buffers except for approved variation requests, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The conservation easement shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and the City of College Park for review prior to signature. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

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

3. The plan proposes impacts to stream buffers and wetland buffers. Impacts to these buffers are prohibited by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the Planning Board grants a variation to the Subdivision Regulation in accordance with Section 24-113. The approval of a conceptual impact as part of CSP-01008 by the Planning Board or District Council does not relieve the applicant of the need to obtain a variation from the Subdivision Regulations. Some impacts were reviewed and approved with Preliminary Plan 4-01026; however, any new preliminary plan of subdivision will require reevaluation of all proposed impacts.

**Recommended Condition:** All planning, design and engineering shall reflect options and standards that are sensitive to the natural environment. All reasonable measures available to minimize disturbance of wetlands, 100-year floodplain, woodlands, natural steep slopes and other environmentally sensitive areas in the construction and installation of any infrastructure, including the north/south collector road, shall be used.

**Recommended Condition:** At least 30 days prior to any scheduled Planning Board Hearing for a Preliminary Plan, a variation request in conformance with Section 24-113 shall be submitted for each individual impact to streams, stream buffers, wetlands, or wetland buffers.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the issuance of any permit that proposes impacts to wetlands or wetland buffers or waters of the United States, the applicant shall furnish the Environmental Planning Section, the City of College Park, and the City of Greenbelt with copies of the approved federal and/or state permits and provide evidence in the permit package that copies have been delivered.

4. A state endangered wildflower, Trailing Stichwort (*Stellaria alsine*) is known to occur on the site. Habitats of rare/threatened/endangered species should be evaluated as part of the TCP. The location of the population is not known to staff of the Environmental Planning Section.

**Discussion:** The Maryland Endangered Species Act requires review of all state permits by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). MDNR must issue a finding of no significant impact before the permit may be released by any state agency. As in prior cases, the Environmental Planning Section will coordinate with the applicant and MDNR during the State permit review process.

5. Some soils may pose problems for development. The site contains much reworked material from sand and gravel mining. Carefully engineered materials will be needed for most of the proposed development.

**Recommended Condition:** As part of each detailed site plan submission, the applicant shall submit a soils report. The report shall include a map with locations of boreholes and the boreholes logs. Problem soil areas shall be shown on a plan map and, when appropriate, with cross sections. The report shall indicate proposed mitigation measures.

6. There are noise impacts associated with this property from both the Metro line and I-95. Both CB-47-2000 and the Greenbelt Metro sector plan indicate a desire to provide a residential component in the development of this site.

**Recommended Condition:** As part of any detailed site plan submission that contains residential uses, the applicant shall submit a Phase II noise study for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Section. The noise study shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and City of College Park for review. The noise study shall measure noise impacts to the site, map the appropriate contours, and address appropriate mitigation measures to achieve acceptable noise levels.

7. A Stormwater Concept Plan, CSD 8329131-2000-00, was approved by DER on December 11, 2000. Increased optional technologies for control of water quality have been developed since that approval. Stormwater management control should be re-evaluated with respect to the new proposed development.

Two special reports were submitted with this application that address drainage problems in the City of College Park: "Hollywood Drainage Study" and "Hollywood Community

Ground Water Levels.” These studies should be submitted to the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources for evaluation. The conclusions of these reports should be considered during the evaluation of stormwater management design for all detailed site plans.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to or concurrent with the review of any preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan, a revised stormwater management concept plan that considers an evaluation of new technologies for stormwater management, including but not limited to the use of low-impact development techniques and green buildings, shall be submitted. All efforts shall be made to utilize such techniques.

**Recommended Condition:** The reports entitled “Hollywood Drainage Study” and “Hollywood Community Ground Water Levels” shall be submitted to the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources for evaluation. The conclusions of these reports shall be considered during the evaluation of stormwater management design for all detailed site plans and revised concept plans for preliminary plans.

17. In a memorandum dated December 5, 2005 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual site plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 243.01 acres of land in the I-2 Zone. The property is located in an area generally bounded by the Capital Beltway, Cherrywood Lane, Branchville Road, and the CSX/Metrorail tracks. The applicant proposes to develop the property under the I-2 zoning with up to 5.7 million square feet of commercial, retail, office and residential space in accordance with CB-47-2000 and CB-36-2005 as a Metro Planned Community.

The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated July 2005 in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. The studies have been referred to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA), and comments from both agencies are attached. It is the transportation staff’s understanding that the referral package to the adjacent municipalities included a traffic study. Because the package was sent by Development Review Division staff, and not by the Transportation Planning Section, transportation-specific comments have not been provided for inclusion in this memorandum. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of all materials received and analyses conducted by the staff, are consistent with the guidelines.

#### Growth Policy—Service Level Standards

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.

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

#### Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

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

MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue  
MD 193/Greenbelt Road  
MD 193/south site access  
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street  
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street  
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps  
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp  
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp  
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive  
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Drive  
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane  
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane  
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp  
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp  
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access  
MD 201/Ivy Lane  
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue  
Cherrywood Lane and Breezewood Drive  
MD 193 and Cunningham Drive  
MD 193 and 62<sup>nd</sup> Street

Existing conditions in the vicinity of the subject property are summarized in Table 1 (due to the size of the study area and the number of intersections under study, all tables are provided after the text of this memorandum). It is noted that the standard used by the Planning Board for reviewing operations at unsignalized intersections is delay as computed by the unsignalized intersection procedure in the *Highway Capacity Manual*. The traffic study has utilized the CLV methodology. Given that this proposal has had prior review, the study was accepted. To simplify presentation and review, the unsignalized delay will be computed for the total traffic situation only.

A review of background development in the area was conducted by the applicant, and limited background development was identified. The traffic study also includes a growth rate of 1.0 percent per year along the facilities within the study area to account for growth in through traffic. It is noted in the traffic study that the redevelopment of Springhill Lake is not included in background because it is not yet approved. It is staff's understanding that Springhill Lake will require a new preliminary plan to move forward; furthermore, the subject site already has an approved preliminary plan that has tracked several years ahead of that redevelopment proposal. Therefore, it is agreed that Springhill Lake should not be considered part of background development for the purpose of analyzing the subject proposal.

The most questionable component within background traffic is the inclusion of the proposed interchange at the Capital Beltway and the Greenbelt Metro Station and its impacts upon traffic in the area. Several issues were raised in 2001/2002 when this project was previously reviewed, and while that analysis was accepted in the approval of the project, it is still believed that an overall diversion of traffic resulting from the opening of the interchange is underestimated. Nonetheless, comments by the State Highway Administration have not raised issues regarding this, and for that reason the transportation staff accepts the analysis.

The current state Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes this interchange as a project planning study, with funding for design but no funding for construction shown in the current program.

An improvement at MD 201 and Cherrywood Lane is also assumed to be part of background development in the traffic study. It is stated that the applicant was informed by SHA's District 3 office that SHA would construct this improvement, and while SHA's comments did not refute this statement, the improvement has not been included in either the current or approved CTP. It will be included for the purpose of computing background and total traffic for this site, but will also be a requirement for the development of the subject site to proceed.

Background traffic is summarized in Table 2.

The site is proposed for a mixed-use project. The north core (the area in the immediate vicinity of the Metrorail station) is proposed for development of 1,200,000 square feet of general office, 1,100,000 square feet of retail, 300 hotel rooms, and 1,267 multifamily residences. The south core (the area nearer MD 193) is proposed for development of 115,000 square feet of retail, 604 multifamily residences, and 379 townhouse residences. Trip generation has been computed using the general assumptions established during the review of the original conceptual site plan. It is noted that no rates for townhouses were considered in that earlier proposal, however. Due to the location of the townhouses within the overall site, it is advised that the trip generation for the townhouse units be based upon the trip generation in the guidelines with a trip reduction of 25 percent due to proximity to transit. Site trip generation is summarized below:



**Site Trip Generation**

Use	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Office - 1,200,000 square feet</b>	1362	186	1548	253	1235	1488
<b>Retail (North Core)—1,100,000 square feet</b>	314	201	515	1149	1245	2394
<b>Retail (South Core)—115,000 square feet</b>	66	43	109	184	200	384
<b>Hotel—300 rooms</b>	94	68	162	84	87	171
<b>Multifamily Residences—1,567 units</b>	105	440	545	408	220	628
<b>Townhouses—683 units</b>	96	382	478	355	191	546
<b>Total Net Auto Trips</b>	<b>2037</b>	<b>1320</b>	<b>3357</b>	<b>2433</b>	<b>3178</b>	<b>5611</b>
<b>Existing Trip Cap per CSP-01008 and Preliminary Plan 4-01026</b>			<b>4030</b>			<b>6879</b>

It should be noted that the trip generation in the table above is considerably different than that shown in the traffic study. In this table, all multifamily residences were assumed to be mid-rise with a potential transit trip reduction of 33.2 percent, consistent with the assumptions in the original conceptual plan study. The traffic study used similar rates for most of the multifamily units, but used townhouse trip rates with no trip reduction for a large multifamily component.

Total traffic is summarized in Table 3.

As was done during review of the original conceptual plan, the applicant seeks to phase the development, with a portion of the development on the site able to proceed without completion of the I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive interchange as Phase I, and the remainder of the development as Phase II. This is acceptable. Phase I is assumed to be consistent with the prior approved conceptual plan and would include uses that would generate no more than 412 AM and 933 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Phase II would include the total trip generation under the existing cap established for the subject property. It is noted that current proposed development in this proposal could be accommodated within that cap.

*Traffic Impacts: Phase I:* The following improvements are determined to be required under Phase I for the subject property:

- A. MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue: Construct a second left-turn lane along the southbound Rhode Island Avenue approach. Construct a third westbound through lane beginning east of the intersection and extending west to the northbound US 1 ramp. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
- B. MD 193/Greenbelt Road: Construct a second left-turn lane along the westbound MD 193 approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.

- C. MD 193/Site Access: Construct this access point to SHA standards as a signalized intersection, with separate outbound right-turn and left-turn lanes and exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes into the site.
- D. Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive: Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency/agencies at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to release of the bonding for the signal.

*Traffic Impacts: Phase II:* The following improvements are determined to be required under Phase I for the subject property:

- A. MD 193/site access: Construct a second left-turn lane along the southbound site access approach. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
- B. I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive: Provide a new ramp into the site from northbound I-95/I-495 and a new ramp from the site onto southbound I-95/I-495 (complete existing I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive interchange).
- C. Cherrywood Lane/ Metro Access Drive: Install a single lane roundabout.
- D. MD 193/62<sup>nd</sup> Street: Construct a second northbound approach lane (within the existing right-of-way). Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
- E. MD 201: Construct or bond the following road improvements to MD 201. These road improvements are required to meet the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. At the current time, improvements to MD 201 are not listed in the State Highway Administration's Consolidated Transportation Program. The applicant will either make the improvements noted below or provide funding to the appropriate governmental agency at a cost of \$3.5 million toward the ultimate MD 201 improvements.
  - 1. MD 201/Cherrywood Lane: Construct a second northbound through lane, begin 1,000 feet south of Cherrywood Lane and extend north for 2,500 feet. Construct a second left-turn lane along the eastbound Cherrywood Lane approach. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
  - 2. MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue: Construct a second through lane northbound and southbound along MD 201 a total distance of 2,500 feet in each direction. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.

*Total Traffic Impacts:* Total traffic with the improvements described in the two sections above are summarized in Table 4.

It is noted that all intersections meet the current policy level-of-service standard, and they meet the LOS D standard that was in effect at the time that the original application was reviewed.

*Required Transportation Findings:* CB-36-2005 amended the findings required for a Metro Planned Community at the time of Conceptual Site Plan (Section 27-475.06.03(b)(2)(F)(viii)) to read thusly:

“Unless a finding of adequacy was made at the time of preliminary plat approval, the proposed development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time by existing, programmed, or guaranteed transportation facilities, as follows:

- “(aa) Adequate roads will be available to serve the development and all traffic it will generate, or an adopted and approved Master Plan shows those roads, which have their construction scheduled and 100 percent funded in the current adopted County Capital Improvement Program, State Consolidated Transportation Program, or Federal Highway Administration Program; and the generated traffic will be accommodated by roads and intersections in the development's traffic study area, so that they will operate at adequate levels of service, as defined in the General Plan and the *Guidelines for Analysis of Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*; or
- “(bb) If existing or programmed facilities will not be adequate to serve traffic generated by the development, then the applicant (and successors or assignees) will fund transportation improvements or trip reduction programs that will alleviate the inadequacy through funding guaranteed by the applicant and bonding with either the Federal Highway Administration, the State Highway Administration, or the Department of Public Works and Transportation (said bonding amounts established pursuant to agreements by and between the applicant with the respective agency) which secures ten percent of facilities construction costs at the time of conceptual site plan or detailed site plan;”

With regard to the findings that are currently required consistent with CB-36-2005, once again, the transportation conditions are sufficient to correct the identified inadequacies. At this time, two additional conditions are required to meet the requirement of the finding established by CB-36-2005:

1. A condition is needed to require that a ten percent guarantee of the cost of all off-site transportation facilities be provided to the appropriate operating agencies. This ten percent guarantee should be provided in writing prior to the approval of the detailed site plan.
2. A condition is needed to require that a report detailing the cost of all off-site transportation facilities shall be submitted at the time of review of the detailed site plan. Such report shall be referred to the appropriate operating agencies. Full concurrence of the agencies shall be required, and any modifications to the report agreed upon by the applicant and the agencies shall be a part of the record for the detailed site plan.

With such conditions in place in addition to the transportation-related conditions placed upon CSP-01008, the Transportation Planning Section believes that the plan would conform to the findings required for approval of the conceptual site plan.

DPW&T offered no comments on the traffic study. SHA offered a few minor comments that have been incorporated, where appropriate, into the conditions. The main comment offered by SHA concerned the I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive interchange and its status in the state CTP. SHA recommends that the applicant prepare a supplemental traffic study that analyzes the contingent traffic impact from the project if the interchange improvements are not constructed. It is also recommended that the applicant conduct additional merge, diverge, and weaving analyses along the interstate. These studies have not been required for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has accepted a trip cap on the amount of development that can occur without the interchange modifications. If it were to occur that the interchange would be greatly modified in function or not built at all, there would need to be a new traffic study for the development on the subject site to move beyond the Phase I trip cap.
2. In the case of the additional analyses along the interstate, SHA recently completed a project planning study for the new interchange ramps. The subject plan does not introduce additional development onto the site, and according to the computations the current proposal would have a slightly lesser impact than the plan that was approved in 2001 and considered SHA's project planning study. Analyses such as merge, diverge, and weaving were a part of that study and, given the status of the subject property, should have fully considered potential development of the subject site. A number of conditions have been proffered by the applicant that relate more directly to requests by and facilities within the City of Greenbelt. These conditions are not related to traffic study review; while the transportation staff supports these conditions, they are not part of the Transportation Planning Section recommendation.

#### Plan Comments

MD 193 is a master plan arterial facility and Cherrywood Lane is a planned collector facility. Both facilities are currently built to their functional recommendations. The Greenbelt Metro Area sector plan recommends a north/south collector through the subject property and an east/west collector linking this new roadway to Breezewood Drive. Although the transportation staff supports both roadways, the environmental impact of the Breezewood Drive connector may be too great to allow conventional construction. Furthermore, much of this proposed roadway crosses land that will be held by the State of Maryland as an environmental preserve. The sector plan text appears to place a greater emphasis on providing a bicycle and pedestrian connection along this route, and the transportation planning staff supports this strategy.

The north/south connector roadway should have a right-of-way of no less than 80 feet with sidewalks on both sides along its entire length. The typical section has been provided and is acceptable in concept. In general, the transportation staff recommends sidewalks along both sides of all roadways within the plan—both public and private roadways—but will consider the

elimination of sidewalks along one side of a given roadway at the time of detailed site plan in cases where specific land uses or environmental features might preclude the desirability of a sidewalk.

A high-quality pedestrian network is very important to achieving the levels of transit ridership appropriate for this location. Future detailed site plans should give full consideration to the provision of extensive nonvehicular amenities and design features. The following should be considered:

1. Providing direct pedestrian connections between land uses and the Metrorail station rather than circuitous ones.
2. Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting related parking facilities farther away.
3. Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.
4. Providing a direct pedestrian/bicycle link between the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection, the north core area, and the Metrorail station.

<b>TABLE 1</b>				
<b>EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Critical Lane Volume (AM &amp; PM)</b>		<b>Level of Service (AM &amp; PM)</b>	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,418	1,365	D	D
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	912	1,331	A	D
MD 193/south site access	Future			
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,083	1,111	B	B
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,074	1,146	B	B
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	900	936	A	A
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	612	908	A	A
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	761	746	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	unsignalized		--	--
Cherrywood Lane/ Metro Access Drive	unsignalized		--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	unsignalized		--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,246	1,382	C	D
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	954	1,014	A	B
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	977	865	A	A
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,031	805	B	A
MD 201/Ivy Lane	742	735	A	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,364	1,364	D	D
Cherrywood Lane and Breezewood Drive	unsignalized		--	--
MD 193 and Cunningham Drive	942	1,069	A	B
MD 193 and 62 <sup>nd</sup> Street	889	1,251	A	C
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

<b>TABLE 2</b>				
<b>BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>Critical Lane Volume (AM &amp; PM)</b>		<b>Level of Service (AM &amp; PM)</b>	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,491	1,422	E	D
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	1,067	1,455	B	E
MD 193/south site access	Future			
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,153	1,196	B	C
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,133	1,206	B	C
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,026	1,113	B	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	650	993	A	A
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	819	842	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	unsignalized		--	--
Cherrywood Lane/ Metro Access Drive	unsignalized		--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	unsignalized		--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	904	1,058	A	B
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,169	1,227	C	C
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,133	1,020	B	B
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,268	1,010	C	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	996	817	A	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,650	1,638	F	F
Cherrywood Lane and Breezewood Drive	unsignalized		--	--
MD 193 and Cunningham Drive	1,002	1,138	B	B
MD 193 and 62 <sup>nd</sup> Street	949	1,320	A	D
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

<b>TABLE 3</b>				
<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,566	1,597	E	E
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	1,272	1,647	C	F
MD 193/south site access	1,389	1,404	D	D
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,209	1,314	C	D
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,206	1,402	C	D
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,132	1,216	B	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	727	1,133	A	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	897	913	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	66.7*	28.4*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/ Metro Access Drive	25.2*	73.0*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	44.1*	37.0*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,256	1,358	C	D
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,169	1,227	C	C
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,133	1,020	B	B
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,291	1,033	C	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,009	888	B	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,884	2,006	F	F
Cherrywood Lane and Breezewood Drive	21.0*	24.2*	--	--
MD 193 and Cunningham Drive	1,109	1,305	B	D
MD 193 and 62 <sup>nd</sup> Street	1,055	1,488	B	E
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				



<b>TABLE 4</b>				
<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS</b> (Intersections with conditioned improvements are highlighted in bold)				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	* <del>[1,296]</del> <u>1,566</u>	* <del>[1,421]</del> <u>1,597</u>	* <del>[C]</del> <u>E</u>	* <del>[D]</del> <u>E</u>
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	1,023	1,428	B	D
MD 193/south site access	1,389	1,404	D	D
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,209	1,314	C	D
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,206	1,402	C	D
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,132	1,216	B	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	727	1,133	A	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	897	913	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	766	1,000	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/ Metro Access Drive	9.4*	16.9*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	44.1*	37.0*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,256	1,358	C	D
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,169	1,227	C	C
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,133	1,020	B	B
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,291	1,033	C	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,009	888	B	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,241	1,219	C	C
Cherrywood Lane and Breezewood Drive	21.0*	24.2*	--	--
MD 193 and Cunningham Drive	1,109	1,305	B	D
MD 193 and 62 <sup>nd</sup> Street	* <del>[1,034]</del> <u>1,055</u>	* <del>[1,412]</del> <u>1,488</u>	B	* <del>[D]</del> <u>E</u>
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p>				

\*Denotes Amendment  
Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language  
Transportation \*~~[Staff]~~ Conclusions

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the subject plan as required under Section 27-475.06.03 of the Prince George's County Code\*~~[, subject to the conditions in the recommendation section below]~~. \*The conditions are consistent with the policy level of service for properties within a Regional Center in the Developed Tier, as defined in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*. As a means of reflecting the change in the level of service to the overall caps, all trip caps are to be adjusted upward by 150 trips.

18. In a memorandum dated October 27, 2005 (Harrell to Wagner), the Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section of the Countywide Planning Division offered the following comments with regard to fire, rescue and public schools:

The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual plans for the 243-acre site, of which 86 acres are owned by the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority. The site is proposed for development as an up-scale, mixed-use community with integrated residential, office, retail, hotel, entertainment, recreation and open space in accord with the provisions found in CB-35-1998. The following are the public facilities findings:

#### **Fire and Rescue**

The existing fire engine service at Branchville Fire Station, Company 11, located at 4905 Branchville Road has a service response time of 2.18 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Berwyn Heights Fire Station, Company 14, located at 8811 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue has a service response time of 1.14 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at College Park Fire Station, Company 12, located at 8115 Baltimore Avenue has a service response time of 3.41 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at Berwyn Heights Fire Station, Company 14, located at 8811 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue has a service response time of 1.14 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

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

\*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

The proposed community will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance, ladder truck and paramedic services.

#### Police Facilities

The proposed development is within the service area for Police District I-Hyattsville. The Police Chief has reported that the current staff complement of the Police Department is 1,302 sworn officers and 43 student officers in the academy for a total of 1,345 personnel, which is within the standard of 1,278 officers.

#### **School Facilities**

In the four years that have lapsed since the release of the original referral, the school surcharge condition has been revised. Further, the new condition replaces previous surcharge requirements. The new condition reads as follows:

County Council bill CB-31-2003 establishes a school facilities surcharge in the amount of \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between I-495 and the District of Columbia, \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. Council bill CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation and the current amounts are \$7,412 and 12,706 to be a paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

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

All of the information in this finding is for informational purposes only, as there is no requirement for a finding of adequate public facilities other than roads with this conceptual site plan.

19. In a memorandum dated October 28, 2005 (Chang to Wagner), the Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

#### **DETERMINATION**

The proposal is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan development pattern policies for the Developing Tier.

The application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2001 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area*.

#### **BACKGROUND**

*Location:* The subject property is located on the south side of the Capital Beltway (I-95/I-495), east of the CSX railroad tracks, west of Cherrywood Lane, and north of Branchville Road.

*Size:* 243.01+ acres including the 75.46 acres owned by the State of Maryland, preserved for open space

*Existing Uses:* A Metro station, a MARC commuter train station, parking lots, sand and gravel processing facilities, and woodlands

*Proposal:* The applicant proposes a mixture of development for the north and south cores in a total of 2,250 residential dwelling units, 1.25 million square feet retail, 1.2 million square feet office, and a 300-room hotel. This application (CSP-01008/01) is a revision to the previously approved CSP-01008.

#### GENERAL PLAN, MASTER PLAN AND SMA

*2002 General Plan:* Developed Tier, the MD 193 Corridor, and the Greenbelt Metro Metropolitan Center—The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium- to high-density neighborhoods. The vision for the corridors is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate- to high-densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. This development should occur at local centers and other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections or transit stops along the corridor. Metropolitan centers have a high concentration of land uses and economic activities that attract employers, workers, and customers from other parts of the metropolitan Washington areas, such as large government service or major employment centers, major educational complexes, or high-intensity commercial uses. High-density residential development may also be located in or very near Metropolitan Centers.

*Master Plan:* 2001 Approved Sector Plan for the Greenbelt Metro Area

*Planning Area/ Community:* Planning Area 67/Greenbelt

*Land Use:* Metro and MARC stations, mixed-use, transit-oriented development, and open space

*Environmental:* The environmental envelope map on page 77 of the sector plan identifies that the central portion of the site is within the preservation and conservation management area (PCMA). The soils and areas of possible instability map on page 73 of the sector plan identifies that the majority of the site contains hydric soils with possible high water table and drainage problems. The woodlands map on page 69 shows that the site contains substantial woodlands in the midst of the site.

*Historic Resources:* The property is adjacent to the Greenbelt National Register Historic District and Survey Area.

*Transportation:* Greenbelt Road (MD 193) is a four- to six-lane arterial road with a 120- to 200-

foot right-of-way. Cherrywood Lane is a proposed two- to four-lane road with an 80- to 100-foot right-of-way. The Capital Beltway (I-95/I-495) is an eight-lane freeway with a 300- to 400-foot right-of-way. The sector plan recommends a proposed major highway interchange at the Greenbelt Metro Station.

*Public Facilities:* A new elementary school is recommended in the general vicinity of Springhill Lake. If Springhill Lake is not to be redeveloped, the new school should be located in the Core Area to meet actual demand for the new development in the Core Area (see page 99). As new development occurs in the sector plan area, a possibility of locating a police substation within the sector plan area should be evaluated. The continued use of the Community-Oriented Policing Program within the sector plan area is strongly encouraged (see page 100).

*Parks and Trails:* The sector plan recommends a stream valley park and neighborhood parks throughout the communities to allow walking distance of one-third to one-quarter mile from most residences to the park facilities (pages 92 and 93). The sector plan recommends multiuse trails along the Indian Creek and on-road bicycle trails along Cherrywood Lane and Greenbelt Road. Existing bike routes are along sections of Cherrywood Lane, Metro Drive, and Greenbelt Road.

*SMA/Zoning:* 2001 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area* rezoned the property from the R-R, R-P-C/R-R, I-1, and I-2 Zones to the M-X-T Zone. The SMA superimposed a Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ) over the subject property. Any development except under certain exceptions specified in the DDOZ applicability section of the sector plan are subject to a detailed site plan review and shall meet the use requirements and development standards. However, this application (CSP-01008) is exempted from the development standards per Amendment 1 of CR-63-2001 (page 280).

## **PLANNING ISSUES**

This illustrative site plan and landscape plan proposes high-density, mixed-use development at the previous WMATA wetland mitigation area located on the east side of the railroad tracks, approximately 400 feet south of the Greenbelt Metro platform. The vegetation planted to create a wetland on this site did not grow. However, the sector plan places this area in the conservation area, which is defined as follows:

“Conservation area is established to protect environmental features in a multiple use situation, allowing certain types of disturbance, such as active and passive recreation, transit activities, public gathering spaces and interpretive facilities and nonmotorized commuter facilities. However, active recreational uses should not be allowed for the WMATA wetland mitigation area.” (See page 76.)

The Environmental Planning Section staff will determine whether the proposed uses are appropriate for this site or this site will be placed in the environmental envelope.

The statement of justification states that commercial blocks will provide most retail uses in close proximity to the Metro station to create a park-like environment and encourage shopping before and after the daily work commute, as well as during daytime and evening hours. It further states that retail entrances will be oriented toward pedestrian plazas, parks or streets. While this application does not provide specific building layouts, consideration should be given to locate retail main entrances at or near the Greenbelt Metro station platform, similar to the Pentagon City Metro station or Union Station/Metro shopping malls.

The mixture percentages for various land use components in the north core mixed-use development are generally consistent with the sector plan’s recommendation and are shown in the following comparison chart. There is a minor difference in the office category. The sector plan recommends a minimum of 30 percent versus 25 percent proposed by the applicant.

<b>Components</b>	<b>Sector Plan</b>	<b>Applicant’s Proposal</b>
Land Use Category	Minimum and maximum percentages of mixed-use development in the north and south core area	Mixed-use development in the north core
Residential	30 to 60 percent	30 to 60 percent
Office	30 to 60 percent	25 to 60 percent
Retail	10 to 40 percent	10 to 40 percent

The land use plan on page 32 of the sector plan recommends a future pedestrian/bicycle bridge crossing the Metro/CSX railroad tracks near the Board of Education property. It was estimated in 1999 that this facility would cost \$500,000 to build. Funding options for this bridge have not yet been explored. (See page 138.) The site plan should show an arrow indicating a possible future connection from the south core to the communities on the west side of the railroad tracks.

While the following DDOZ development standard on signs is not mandatory per CR-63-2001, Amendment 1, it should still be considered as a design guideline for the review of this site plan:

Page 179, Signs, DDOZ Development Standard 1: “Prior to or concurrent with submission of the first Detailed Site Plan for the Core Area, a Common Sign Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Board. It shall include plans, sketches and/or photographs indicating the location, quantity, design, materials, overall size, letter size, methods of sign attachment, illumination and other information the Planning Board requires, for all signs in the mixed-use centers, including freestanding/monument and individual office/retail tenant signs.”

20. The Urban Design Section has determined that, based on a maximum 2,250 dwelling units for the project, utilizing the formula for determining the value of recreational facilities, the amount of recreational facilities that should be provided should be a minimum of \$2,000,000.00. Facilities such as tennis courts, ballfields, picnic areas, sitting areas, play areas, multipurpose courts, trails, fitness stations, and swimming pools should be provided. A private neighborhood park should be provided in the south core that should include, at a minimum, four tennis courts, one soccer field, one softball field and one baseball field, or other facilities such as a community building with

bathhouse and swimming pool. The location of all recreational facilities should be provided at the time of the first detailed site plan.

21. In a memorandum dated December 6, 2005 (Shaffer to Wagner), the trails planner with the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

**Background**

The adopted and approved Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan identifies several trail, bicycle, and pedestrian issues that impact the subject site. The sector plan identifies many goals regarding bicycle and pedestrian access including the following:

- A. Develop a connected and continuous pedestrian and bicycle network that provides access to, through and from all areas within the Sector Plan area, particularly the transit station, mixed-use/activity centers, recreation areas and neighborhoods.
- B. Select bike routes by identifying key corridors that: (1) are in close proximity to residential areas; (2) serve potential destinations such as parks, shops, schools, employment areas and the Greenbelt station; and (3) are continuous with efficient connections to surrounding neighborhoods and regional trails.
- C. Pedestrian routes to destination should be identified. Sidewalks should be provided along both sides of these public rights-of-way to provide safe and convenient pedestrian circulation.
- D. Bikeways (designated bike lanes) along Cherrywood Lane should remain for commuting purposes.
- E. A recreational/scenic stream valley trail shall be constructed in the core area to extend the Indian Creek Trail north to the station site and beyond.

Bicycle and pedestrian facilities are also recommended along the planned north/south connector road. The sector plan includes a variety of possible cross sections for this road, all of which include wide sidewalks or a bike/pedestrian trail along both sides. Negotiations are on-going between the applicant and the City of Greenbelt regarding the cross section for the north/south connector road. Staff supports the north/south connector road as depicted on DSP-04081. A 15-foot-wide decorative sidewalk is indicated along both sides of the north/south connector road within the south core. In conjunction with these wide sidewalks, designated bike lanes are shown along the connector road.

The bike lanes should be striped in conformance with the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities. This guide includes recommended striping and widths for designated bike lanes, both with and without on-street parking. The following guidelines are included by AASHTO:

- For areas with no on-street parking: Provide a 16-foot-wide outside curb lane, with 11-foot travel lanes, a four-foot designated bike lane, and a one-foot gutter pan.
- For areas with on-street parking: Provide 13 feet for the area including the on-street parking and the designated bike lane. This will allow eight feet for the parking and an additional five feet for the bike lane.
- For areas with right-turn lanes: Provide the designated bike lane between the through lanes and the turn lane consistent with Figure 11 of the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.

Standard and wide sidewalks will be a crucial component of making the development a walkable transit-oriented community. A detailed analysis of the internal sidewalk network will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Standard or wide sidewalk facilities should also be provided along the site's frontage of Branchville Road, as this is an important connection to the Lake Artemesia on the south side of MD 193. A wide sidewalk or sidepath may be appropriate along Branchville Road, which serves as a bicycle and pedestrian connection under MD 193 and to Lake Artemesia and the M-NCPPC Anacostia Tributaries Trails Network.

Several trail connections included on the previously approved CSP-01008 are omitted from the current application. The trails omitted include the master plan trail along Indian Creek, a connecting trail from Cherrywood Lane to the stream valley trail, a connector trail from the north/south connector road to the stream valley trail, and a bike/pedestrian facility along the Metro Entrance Road. These should be added back on to the revised CSP. In some cases, these trail connections will be fulfilled by internal standard or wide sidewalk connections.

The master plan trail along Indian Creek will be mostly within land dedicated to the State of Maryland and/or the City of Greenbelt. Coordination between Greenbelt and the state regarding the location of the trail, the maintenance and operation of the trail, and the necessity of a public use trail easement will be necessary. Surface type and trail location will be especially important for this trail within the environmentally sensitive area.

#### **Sidewalk Connectivity:**

The internal sidewalk network will be examined at the time of detailed site plan. A comprehensive network of standard and wide sidewalks will complement the proposed trails and on-road bike facilities and are crucial for creating a walkable transit-oriented development.

22. The Prince George's County Department of Environment Resources (DER) has approved a stormwater management concept plan, 2657-2001-00, dated June 7, 2001, and subject to 11 conditions. DER has indicated that the conceptual site plan is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan.



23. In a memorandum dated February 1, 2006, the City of College Park recommended approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, subject to conditions.
24. In a memorandum dated January 27, 2006, the City of Greenbelt recommended approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, subject to conditions.
25. In a memorandum dated January 20, 2006, the Town of Berwyn Heights with two major concerns – stormwater runoff and public education facilities.

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/27/00-01), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 2,250 residences; 1,215,000 square feet of retail space; 1,200,000 square feet of general office space; and 300 hotel rooms, or different uses generating no more than the number of peak-hour trips (4,030 AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 6,879 PM peak-hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development.
  - a. South Core—Development in the south core shall not exceed 983 housing units and 115,000 square feet gross floor area of neighborhood-serving retail and/or office. Up to 1022 dwelling units may be permitted subject to verification by the Transportation Planning Section that the additional dwelling units do not exceed the overall trip caps for the development. Neighborhood-serving retail and/or office shall include, at a minimum, 80,000 square feet which may be reduced as noted below\*. Development in the south core shall contain at least two of the following three land use types: residential, neighborhood commercial, and office.
  - b. North Core—The development of the north core shall conform to the following maximum floor area and housing unit counts:

Use Type Maximum Floor Area/Unit Count

Residential 1,267 housing units  
Retail 1,100,000 square feet gross floor area  
Office 1,200,000 square feet gross floor area  
Hotel 300 units

Use Type Minimum/Maximum Use Mix

Residential 30-60 percent of total gross floor area  
Retail (includes hotel) 10-40 percent of total gross floor area  
Office 25-60 percent of total gross floor area

- c. In addition to these basic development parameters, all future development for the south core shall be in general conformance with the illustrative plan dated January 13, 2006, in regards to site layout, development pattern, and the intended relative amounts of development of different types and their relationships and design. Development for the north core shall be in general conformance with the illustrative plan approved by CSP-01008 (Alternative C), unless revised.

South Core:

- i. A single building of two over two condominiums will contain commercial retail/office space on the first floor, which shall be constructed on the east side of the connector road prior to the issuance of residential building permits in excess of 100 dwelling units on the east side of the connector road. If deemed successful under commercially reasonable standards\*, the applicant may construct additional similar buildings.
- ii. A minimum of 80,000 square feet of commercial retail/office shall be constructed prior to the issuance of residential building permits in excess of 785 dwelling units. The minimum square footage may be reduced to 60,000 SF upon a demonstration that the space has not been determined to be commercially feasible\*.

\*If the applicant constructs the space and the applicant has continuously marketed the space for a period of one hundred eighty (180) days through an exclusive listing agent, and had been unable to obtain a user, said effort shall constitute a satisfactory demonstration to justify a waiver or modification of said requirement. The Planning Board's waiver of the commercial space requirements will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed but does not prohibit a revision to the plan to provide commercial space in the future. The space may then be converted or marketed as residential space.

North Core:

- i. At least 500,000 square feet of commercial space with a minimum 75,000 square feet of office shall receive building permits prior to the release of residential permits for over 500 dwelling units.
- ii. At least 75,000 square feet of additional office space shall receive building permits prior to release of residential permits for over 800 dwelling units.
- iii. The north core shall be required to provide retail uses, office uses, and residential uses. This requirement shall supersede the provisions of Section 27-

475.06.03(b)(1)(H) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires that at least two of the three categories listed therein be included in the development.

- d. Prior to signature approval, the conceptual site plan and the illustrative plan for the south core shall be revised as follows:
  - i. A single building of two over two condominiums on the east side of the connector road, facing the village green will show commercial retail/office space on the first floor.
  - ii. Show minimum of 80,000 square feet of commercial retail/office space on the plan.
  - iii. Label all private recreational areas, proposed locations for all entertainment and cultural activities, public service and dining areas within the commercial area.
  - iv. Show the proposed location of the proposed College Park overpass.
2. Development of this site shall be developed as two phases within the context of planned transportation improvements. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property during the given phase, the following road improvements associated with the phase shall:
  - (a) have full financial assurances or
  - (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and
  - (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
  - A. Phase I: Limited to uses generating no more than the number of peak-hour trips \*[439] 589 AM peak-hour vehicle trips and \*[933] 1083 PM peak-hour vehicle trips).

The transportation improvements include:

- \*[i. ~~MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue: Construct a second left turn lane along the southbound Rhode Island Avenue approach. Construct a third westbound through lane beginning east of the intersection and extending west to the northbound US 1 ramp. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed. ]~~

\*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- \*[ii]i. MD 193/Greenbelt Road: Construct a second left-turn lane along the westbound MD 193 approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
- \*[iii]ii. Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive: Prior to the approval of the first detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency/agencies at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.
- \*[iv]iii. MD 193/Site Access: Construct this access point to SHA standards as a signalized intersection, with separate outbound right-turn and left-turn lanes and exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes into the site. Also, prior to the approval of the first detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency/agencies at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.
- \*[v]iv. Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Drive: Install a single lane roundabout.

B. Phase II: Limited to uses generating no more than the number of peak-hour trips (\*[4,030] 4,180 AM peak-hour vehicle trips and \*[6,879] 7,029 PM peak-hour vehicle trips). The transportation improvements include:

- i. MD 193/site access: Construct a second left-turn lane along the southbound site access approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
- ii. I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive: Provide a new ramp into the site from northbound I-95/I-495 and a new ramp from the site onto southbound I-95/ I-495 (complete existing I-95/I-495/Greenbelt Metro Access Drive interchange).
- ~~\*[iii]. MD 193/62nd Street: Construct a second northbound approach lane (within the existing right-of-way). Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed. ]~~
- \*[iv]iii. MD 201: Construct or bond the following road improvements to MD 201. These road improvements are the improvements that are required to meet the Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance. At the current time, improvements to MD 201 are not listed in the State Highway Administration's Consolidated Transportation Program. The applicant will either make the improvements noted below or provide funding to the appropriate governmental agency at a cost of \$3.5 million (with appropriate inflation index) toward the ultimate MD 201 improvements.

\*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language

- a. MD 201/Cherrywood Lane: Construct a second northbound through lane, begin 1,000 feet south of Cherrywood Lane and extend north for 2,500 feet. Construct a second left-turn lane along the eastbound Cherrywood Lane approach. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
  - b. MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue: Construct second through lane northbound and southbound along MD 201 a total distance of 2,500 feet in each direction. Modify traffic signal and pavement markings as needed.
3. Future detailed site plans shall give full consideration to the provision of extensive nonvehicular amenities and design features. The following shall be considered:
  - (a) providing direct pedestrian connections between land uses and the Metrorail station rather than circuitous ones;
  - (b) siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station and siting related parking facilities farther away;
  - (c) placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network; and
  - (d) providing a direct pedestrian/bicycle link between the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection, the north core area, and the Metrorail station.
4. The applicant (and his successors and/or assignees) shall fund all off-site transportation improvements required by this resolution through funding that secures a minimum of ten percent of facilities construction costs per phase as described above in Condition No. 2.a and b. Such funding will be accomplished by bonding (or a similar approved funding instrument) with either the Federal Highway Administration, the State Highway Administration, or the county's Department of Public Works and Transportation, with said bonding amounts established pursuant to agreements by and between the applicant with the respective agency. Proof of such funding shall be required prior to detailed site plan approval.
5. A report detailing the cost of all off-site transportation facilities shall be submitted at the time of review of each detailed site plan. Such report shall be referred to the appropriate operating agencies for their review. Full concurrence of the agencies shall be required prior to detailed site plan approval, and any modifications to the report agreed upon by the applicant and the agencies shall be a part of the record for the detailed site plan.
6. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan, the tree conservation plan shall be certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources or any other representative designated by the State of Maryland.

7. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, wetlands and wetland buffers except for approved variation requests, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The conservation easement shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and the City of College Park for review prior to signature. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation is prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director.”

8. All planning, design and engineering shall reflect options and standards that are sensitive to the natural environment. All reasonable measures available to minimize disturbance of wetlands, 100-year floodplain, woodlands, natural steep slopes and other environmentally sensitive areas in the construction and installation of any infrastructure, including the north/south collector road, shall be used.
9. At least 30 days prior to any scheduled Planning Board hearing for a preliminary plan, a variation request in conformance with Section 24-113 shall be submitted for each individual impact to streams, stream buffers, wetlands, or wetland buffers.
10. Prior to the issuance of any permit that proposes impacts to wetlands or wetland buffers or waters of the United States, the applicant shall furnish the Environmental Planning Section, the City of College Park, and the City of Greenbelt with copies of the approved federal and/or state permits and provide evidence in the permit package that copies have been delivered.
11. As part of each detailed site plan submission, the applicant shall submit a soils report. The report shall include a map with locations of boreholes and the borehole logs. Problem soil areas shall be shown on a plan map and, when appropriate, with cross sections. The report shall indicate proposed mitigation measures.
12. As part of any detailed site plan submission that contains residential uses, the applicant shall submit a current Phase I Noise Study. If warranted by the Phase I Noise Study, applicant shall submit a Phase II noise study for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Section. The noise study shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and City of College Park for review. The noise study shall measure noise impacts to the site, map the appropriate contours, and address appropriate mitigation measures to achieve acceptable noise levels.
13. Prior to or concurrent with the review of any preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan, a revised stormwater management concept plan that considers an evaluation of new technologies for stormwater management shall be submitted. The use of low-impact development techniques and green buildings, shall be considered and all reasonable efforts shall be made to utilize such techniques.

14. The reports entitled “Hollywood Drainage Study” and “Hollywood Community Ground Water Levels” shall be submitted to the Prince George’s County Department of Environmental Resources for evaluation. The conclusions of these reports shall be considered during the evaluation of stormwater management design for all detailed site plans and revised concept plans for preliminary plans.
15. Emphasis shall be placed on a mixed-use development that is pedestrian-and bicycle-friendly, a grid street pattern with buildings close to the sidewalk, and civic areas with plazas and parks at regular intervals.
16. All detailed site plans shall consider the development district standards of the Greenbelt Area sector plan.
17. Concurrent with the review and approval of the first detailed site plan for each core area, plans, sections and details of the streetscape for all streets shall be provided for Planning Board approval, including building setbacks, the dimensions and details of all travel lanes, parking bays, sidewalks, street tree spacing, and planting areas.
18. The design specifications and materials for site-wide amenities, signage, lighting, street furniture and recreational facilities shall be approved by the Planning Board with the first detailed site plan for the north core and the first detailed site plan for the south core, which plans may be submitted separately. Also, at the time of the first detailed site plan for the north or south core, specific amenities that are considered site-wide will be identified, and those amenities that may be different between the north and the south core will be identified. In addition, the first detailed site plan shall provide a refined layout that shows the locations and general dimensions of all civic components, including parks, plazas, recreational areas and green areas/open spaces. Special attention shall be paid to address size, lighting, design and scale of any signage facing the Hollywood neighborhood.
19. In general, the building height in the north core area shall be 4-10 stories with a maximum height of 140 feet from finished grade, except landmark buildings, which may rise to 12 stories, with a maximum height of 165 feet from finished grade. Taller buildings shall be located in the maximum height zone as defined in the Greenbelt Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. In the south core, building heights shall generally range from 2 to 5 stories, with a maximum height of 70 feet from finished grade. Additional building height may be granted as outlined in the Greenbelt Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. Any height analysis submitted shall reflect the height review guidelines delineated in the Greenbelt sector plan.
20. In order to optimize the use of transit, the following shall be taken into consideration:
  - a. Residential and office buildings in the north core area should be located close to the Metro station.

- b. Below grade parking structures should be provided with buildings constructed over the parking structures.
  - c. Large, above-grade parking structures next to the Metro station are discouraged.
21. When parking structures face a “main street,” only one-third of the structure at the street level may be exposed to the street. The other two-thirds must contain retail stores and/or restaurants. All exposed areas of parking structures shall be designed with high-quality materials.
  22. Each detailed site plan shall specify that all tree pits along the streets that have shops and restaurants and in all plazas shall be connected with a continuous noncompacted soil volume under the sidewalk. Details of how this will be accomplished shall be included on the plans and shall be agreed upon by the Planning Board or its designee. The use of “CU-Soil” as a “structural soil” or other equal product for shade trees planted in tree pits is strongly encouraged.
  23. Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall pay a public schools surcharge of \$7,412 per dwelling unit (adjusted for inflation), pursuant to CB-31-2003.
  24. At the time of detailed site plan submission for any retail in the north core, a refined economic analysis shall be submitted to justify the support of a high quality main street retail shopping and entertainment complex. This analysis shall justify the amount of retail space proposed for the high intensity, regionally oriented north core area.
  25. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private and/or public recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. A complete recreational package shall be provided at the time of the first detailed site plan for each core and shall include facilities in the amount of \$1,750,000 at a minimum.
  26. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of Development Review Division (DRD) for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of a detailed site plan by the Planning Board.
  27. The developer, his successors, and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
  28. Three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFAs) or similar alternative shall be submitted to DRD for its approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a grading permit. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA or alternative instrument shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George’s County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.



29. A performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, shall be submitted at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
30. The north/south connector road alignment may shift at the time of preliminary plan, detailed site plan, final plat, and/or permit to reflect adjustments required to reduce environmental or other impacts. The technical and economic feasibility of bridging over these environmental features should be considered in analyzing alternatives.
31. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for an area that includes the WMATA wetland mitigation area, should a permit to develop that area be granted by the Army Corps of Engineers, the developer, his successors, heirs or assignees shall provide the City of College Park with existing hydrology data for North College Park to serve as a base line of information for the assessment of actual flooding impacts. This will also include the federal and state permits, including the supporting data. The developer shall be required to take whatever reasonable measures necessary to prevent any actual flooding impacts.
32. At the time of each Detailed Site Plan review, the developer shall submit plans to the Maryland Department of the Environment for review and comment and shall notify the City of College Park of each plan submittal. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review for any area that includes 100-year floodplain impacts, modeling data generated in conjunction with the Maryland Department of the Environment permitting process for floodplain fill shall be provided to the City of College Park. The City shall also be notified of any proposed changes to floodplain elevations. Floodplain mitigation shall fully compensate for all floodplain impacts in the project area including upstream and downstream.
33. At the time of preliminary plan, realign the internal loop road to avoid the permanent impacts to stream buffers and streams, unless a variation is approved by the Planning Board at the time of preliminary plan approval.
34. Any detailed site plan submitted for development in the north core shall include the following elements:
  - a. Public open space areas (to include parks, plazas, sitting areas, gardens) and locations for informal gatherings. There shall be no less than one such open space per length of street frontage. Open spaces shall measure in aggregate, at least one acre. These spaces shall be open to the public, and open air.
  - b. A public open space in the vicinity of the Metro station that provides a memorable identity for the area.
  - c. Vertical mixed-use buildings around the Metro station.
  - d. Some residential uses located along the loop road to take advantage of views into the preservation area and to screen parking garages.
  - e. Office buildings configured along the Capital Beltway to screen parking garages.

35. The applicant shall make all reasonable efforts to include within the neighborhood serving commercial area of the south core a boutique grocery store (such as Trader Joe's, Balducci's, or Whole Foods). This grocery store shall be oriented to provide access to an outdoor sitting/gathering area, adjacent to the adjoining retail/commercial users.
36. The north/south connector road shall have a right-of-way of no less than 80 feet with sidewalks on both sides along its entire length, except where the road crosses Narragansett Run, at which point the road width shall be narrowed to reduce environmental impacts. Other public rights-of-way widths shall be dictated and approved by the appropriate governing agency.
37. To the extent possible, The applicant shall avoid designing dead-end streets in the project area, as such designs present maneuverability difficulties for trash trucks, fire trucks, delivery vehicles, etc., and also disrupt effective and efficient police patrol patterns. Turn-around areas at the terminus of streets (such as hammerheads, bulb-outs, or cul-de-sac) shall not be permitted. The street network shall be based upon a grid pattern.
38. At the time of the first detailed site plans for the south core, the applicant shall provide a plan which generally depicts vehicle circulation, deliveries, and access to the rear of the development.
39. Pedestrian crossings shall be provided at all intersections along the north/south connector road, unless waived by the appropriate agency.
40. A hiker/biker trail located to the north, east and south of the medium-density residential area, located east of the north/south connector road within the south core, shall be connected to the north/south connector road, Branchville Road and Cherrywood Lane opposite Breezewood Drive. This portion of trail shall be phased to be constructed concurrent with construction of the medium-density residential area as described herein.
41. Prior to the issuance of the 200th residential building permit (rental apartment buildings are assumed to be one permit per building regardless of the number of dwelling units), the applicant shall provide a pedestrian and service vehicle connection from the terminus of the north/south connector road to connect with the WMATA Metrorail platform. In the event the applicant provides a shuttle service from the south core to the WMATA Metrorail platform or another service is provided, the condition to provide a pedestrian and vehicular connection is waived, subject to approval of a schedule for shuttle operations is approved by the City of Greenbelt and the County.
42. In the south core, the applicant shall provide a pedestrian only promenade integrated with commercial buildings. Decorative paving materials, such as brick, shall be used in the pedestrian promenade to distinguish the area visually from those that permit motorized vehicles.
43. The general location of the College Park pedestrian overpass on the west side of the railroad shall be between Huron Street and the City of College Park Public Works facility. The cities of

College Park and Greenbelt shall review and approve the final location and design of the pedestrian overpass which shall also be subject to review and approval by CSX, WMATA and other agencies. The overpass shall be designed to provide a direct point of access which is visible from the North-South Connector Road. Entrance to the overpass shall be ramped to provide handicapped access, and may include not more than one switchback in ramp direction, unless agreed to by the cities of Greenbelt and College Park. Circular ramps are not permitted, unless agreed to by the cities of Greenbelt and College Park. Subject to the approval of a detailed site plan for any property adjacent to the overpass, access to the overpass may be incorporated into a structure and/or the site details.

44. The applicant shall construct a wide sidewalk or multiuse trail along the west side of Cherrywood Lane, from Metro Access Drive to Breezewood Drive. The alignment, design and timing of such a sidewalk/trail shall be subject to the approval of by the City of Greenbelt, as determined prior to the issuance of the first building permit for building construction in the south core.
45. The applicant shall fund/construct one-half the total trail extension from Cherrywood Lane to connect with the pedestrian system of the North Core. Should redevelopment of Springhill Lake not occur, the applicant shall fund/construct the total complete trail extension. Timing for the construction of the trail extension shall be determined at the time of approval of the first detailed site plan for the north core.
46. The applicant shall establish a continuing funding mechanism for a trolley/tram or similar light transit system to provide a mobile connection between the north and south cores. Such tram shall be implemented at the time that the north/south connector road is complete between the south core and WMATA rail platform. Hours of operation shall be determined at the time of the first detailed site plan approval for the north core. The applicant shall explore with Springhill Lake and Beltway Plaza owners the funding of a local shuttle system (exclusive of the tram/trolley) linking Springhill Lake, Beltway Plaza, and the project area.
47. The conceptual site plan shall be revised to indicate at least one pedestrian connection from the north/south connector road to Branchville Road, and the continuation of these connections to Beltway Plaza to the east, and Lake Artemesia to the southwest. A second connection shall be provided if feasible. The applicant shall only be responsible to construct pedestrian sidewalk, path or trail, on the north side of Branchville Road along the frontage of the subject property. The following conditions pertain to trails:
  - a. Provide in-road bike lanes along both sides of the planned north/south connector road in conformance with AASHTO guidelines.
  - b. Construct sidewalks on both sides of proposed and existing roads, unless waived by the appropriate agency.
  - c. The existing in-road, designated bicycle access shall be maintained along Cherrywood Lane.

- d. A stream valley trail shall be provided along the western edge of the environmental envelope of Indian Creek, subject to the approval by the appropriate public agency. This trail shall be constructed to DPR standards. The trail shall include an interpretive program, as mentioned in the submitted conceptual site plan.
  - e. Bike racks shall be provided. Bike lockers shall be provided if deemed appropriate by the applicant and appropriate governmental agency. The appropriate number and locations will be determined at the time of each detailed site plan.
48. Design consideration shall be given to mixing unit types to avoid mono-cultures of housing, and to avoid continuous groupings of similar unit types, scale and massing. Where appropriate, buildings shall provide for a vertical mix of uses to create a mix of uses on a site specific and neighborhood basis.
49. In the south core, if residential units are sited to back of the stream valley park, creating a visual barrier between public spaces and the stream valley open space, protection of broad view sheds to the stream valley and State of Maryland open spaces shall be a primary objective in locating buildings.
50. Any public building proposed for the civic open space in the south core, or other public space in the project area, shall be conceptually designed by the applicant, to include plan views and elevations, at the applicant's cost, to ensure consistency in design, scale, and use of materials. The civic open space in the south core shall be oriented to create a focal point for the south core and shall reflect a visual and functional connection with public spaces on the opposing side of the north/south connector road. The building program shall be defined by the public agency responsible for the funding and operation of the structure.
51. Where appropriate, the applicant shall utilize techniques such as smart parking, shared use parking, pay-to-park facilities, car sharing, etc. to control the supply of and demand for parking with the overarching goal of reducing the number of vehicle trips.
52. No freestanding cellular towers, antennas, or monopoles are permitted. Cellular towers, antennas, monopoles and other similar devices may be incorporated into or on top of a separate building.
53. No auto dependent uses are permitted. Auto dependent uses include businesses with drive-through windows, car washes, and gas or service stations. Banks and pharmacies with drive-up windows are permitted in the south core, so long as the drive-up is related to a walk-in retail or service establishment.
54. Large blank building walls are not permitted when facing public areas, such as streets, parking lots, recreation areas, or zones of pedestrian activity.
55. Street blocks shall be limited to lengths no greater than 400 feet in length, unless the curb line and/or building frontage is interrupted by an offset sufficient in size and design to create a functional public space.

56. The retail component in the north or south core shall not be planned, designed, or constructed to be considered a mall, as defined by the Urban Land Institute as, “a covered shopping center characterized by inward-facing shops facing an enclosed walkway instead of the surrounding parking lot.” Retail components shall be designed consistent with a “main street” or “lifestyle” design.
57. Low maintenance, drought-tolerant landscaping shall be provided in areas contained with or isolated by roads, highway ramps, utility structures, or any other physical feature that would render the area unfeasible for regular maintenance.
58. Concurrent with the submission of the first detailed site plan for each core, a common sign plan for the subject property shall be submitted. The height of freestanding/monument exterior signs shall generally not exceed six feet in height for the area encompassing the main signage area. Combined with other architectural features (architectural bases, structures, planters, mounds), the height of freestanding/monument signs may be allowed to exceed six feet in height, as reviewed and approved by the City of Greenbelt. With the exception of 4, page 179 (Freestanding or Monument Signs), the design guidelines set forth in the Greenbelt Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment shall be considered the basis for development and review of the common sign plan for the project.
59. The applicant shall provide a public civic/open space area in the south core, measuring approximately 200 feet in width by 700 feet in length, extending from the north/south connector road to the Indian Creek stream valley. The civic/open space shall be designed to include, at a minimum, a formal gathering place, seating areas, a building for civic/public use, and other design elements that will define the total civic/open space and relate the space and uses to the neighborhood, streetscape, landscaping, and community in general. Prior to the issuance of the 200<sup>th</sup> building permit (as defined above), the applicant shall submit proof of compliance with this condition. Such proof may be demonstrated by approved plans with requisite permits.
60. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, a determination shall be made as to any additional public streets provided, subject to approval of the City of Greenbelt.
61. At the time of the review of the first detailed site plan for each core area, the applicant shall provide a plan showing all proposed private and public trails, including the identification of public access points to the proposed stream valley trail system.
62. The cumulative environmental impacts associated with previously approved variation requests shall not be exceeded by any proposed development or construction within the project area.
63. In the south core, the loop road between the civic open space and the adjacent open space leading to the stream valley shall be narrowed to the minimum width necessary to accommodate two travel lanes. Parking shall be prohibited between the civic open space and the open space

adjacent to the stream valley. A decorative and textured pavement material shall be used for this length of street to demonstrate the connection between the adjacent open spaces.

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Eley, Vaughns, Squires, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, February 2, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 23rd day of February 2006.

\*This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the reconsideration action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission relating to transportation analysis reporting only on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey, Shoaff, Geraldo and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 26, 2012, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

\*Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6<sup>th</sup> day of September 2012.

Patricia Colihan Barney  
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:WC:arj

\*Denotes Amendment

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strikethrough~~ indicate deleted language