

C O R R E C T 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 January 11, 2007 regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 for Melford (formerly the Maryland Science and Technology Center), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The conceptual site plan proposes a mixed-use development consisting of a hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, residential (366 single-family detached and attached units, and 500 multifamily units). The conceptual site plan is required to be submitted for review under the M-X-T zone.

2. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED	
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T	
Use(s)		Mixed-use development including one hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, residential (366 Single-family detached and attached units, and 500 multifamily units)	
Acreeage of application of CSP	334.10	334.10	
Area within 100 year floodplain	89.26	89.26	
Net tract area	244.84	244.84	
Dwelling Units	0	866	
Lots	19	19	
Parcels	5	5	
Square Footage/GFA	536,496* commercial only	Use:	Area/Units Range
		Office**	750,000 s.f. - 3,120,000 s.f.
		Retail	70,000 s.f. - 150,000 s.f.
		Restaurant	10,000 s.f. - 20,000 s.f.
		Office/Retail	131,000 s.f. - 180,000 s.f.
		R&D**	525,000 s.f. - 600,000 s.f.
		Hotel	250,000 s.f. - 325,000 s.f.
		MF Residential	500 units (1000 s.f. - 1200 s.f.)
		SF Residential	366 units maximum 316 - 341 units of SFA (2,400 s.f. to 2,600 s.f.) 25 - 50 units of SFD (3,000 s.f. to 4,000 s.f.)
Proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Based on 10,665,230 square feet (net tract area) within the CSP application	536,496*		Min (s.f.) Max (s.f.)
		Residential	1,333,400 1,621,600
		Commercial**	1,736,000 4,395,000
		Total	3,069,400 6,016,600
		Proposed FAR	0.29 0.57

*The following development exists within the limits of the application:

- Block 2, Lot 2 40,800 square feet
- Block 2, Lot 3 40,800 square feet
- Block 2, Lot 4 30,450 square feet
- Block 3, Lot 1 150,000 square feet
- Block 4, Lot 1 61,680 square feet
- Block 4, Lot 2 61,120 square feet
- Block 4, Lot 3 83,680 square feet
- Block 4, Lot 5 67,966 square feet

**Includes existing commercial development.

3. **Location:** The site consists of approximately 334.1 acres of land in the MXT Zone and is located in the northwest quadrant of US 301 and US 50. The property is located in Planning Area 71B within the 2006 *Approved Bowie-Vicinity Master Plan*.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Crain Highway (US 301/MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50). The site is bounded to the north by Sherwood Manor, an existing subdivision of single-family detached dwelling units in the R-A Zone, and the Patuxent River Park; to the east by the Patuxent River and the US Air Force transmitter station located in Anne Arundel County; to the south by the US 50 right-of-way; and to the west by the MD 3 right-of-way.
5. **Previous approvals:** On January 25, 1982, the District Council approved zoning map amendment application and Basic Plan A-9401 for the subject property, with ten conditions (Zoning Ordinance 2-1982). The zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the E-I-A Zone. On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Planning Board decision (PGCPB No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, with 27 conditions and two considerations. Numerous specific design plans have been approved for the project, including the following:

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT, APPROVED AND/OR UNDER CONSTRUCTION:

	GFA	Site Area (ac)	SDP
Block 2, Lot 2	40,800	10.51	SDP-0203-01
Block 2, Lot 3	40,800	9.14	SDP-0203-01
Block 2, Lot 4	30,450	3.74	SDP-0103
Block 3, Lot 1	150,000	10.88	SDP-0104
Block 4, Lot 1	61,680	7.18	SDP-0103
Block 4, Lot 2	61,120	5.97	SDP-0103
Block 4, Lot 3	83,680	9.07	SDP-0201
Block 4, Lot 5	67,966	6.36	SDP-0402

6. **Design Features:** The project proposes a transit-oriented mix uses consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, residential (366 single-family detached and attached units, and 500 multifamily units). The plan provides for a single existing entrance into the site from US 301. The project proposes retail and office to the right of the entrance road into the development and a 325-500 room hotel on the left side of the entrance. Two existing ponds on site flank both sides of the road to create an entrance feature and will contribute to the sense of arrival into the development for both employees and residents. The existing state-of-the-art US Census Bureau building further adds to the distinctive character of the development. Office and residential buildings are mixed on the opposite side of the entrance road. Once into the development, a traffic circle is planned at a four-way intersection that will provide access to existing research and development, office, and residential uses. To the north of the circle is the additional mixed uses of office and residential and retail and residential. The National Historic

Melford House is located on the property and it is surrounded by green space. To the northeast and southeast are pure residential pods of development, townhouses, and single-family detached. All multifamily dwellings are associated with the office and retail development.

Conformance to the approved Bowie-Vicinity Master Plan (CR-11-2006)

7. The *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B* was adopted on February 7, 2006. CR-11-2006 contains the following guidelines for the development of the subject property. The guidelines apply to the entire 431.55 acres of land rezoned to the M-X-T Zone. Staff has provided comments as appropriate to find conformance with the guidelines for the subject conceptual site plan application:

- a. **Property in the northeast quadrant of US 50 and MD 3 (known as the Melford Property): This area should be developed with a moderate- to-high density mixture of office, employment, retail, hotel, residential and parkland/open space uses. Figure 1 is an illustrative concept for the planned community at the subject location. This will offer a mix of employment and residential uses that can create a place of activity and interaction for those who live, work, or visit in the area. The residential component should develop in such a way that the residential buildings and settings complement Melford, a National Register Historic Site.**

Development on this site shall conform to the following standards and guidelines:

(1) The mixed use community shall include the following uses:

- **Corporate office**
- **Condominium/Professional office**
- **Research and Development**
- **Hotel**
- **Single-family detached residential (executive housing)**
- **Single-family attached residential (6 to 11 dwellings per acre); a minimum of 20 percent being senior housing units and a maximum of 25 percent being senior housing units, although the District Council may vary such percentages when approving a Concept Plan.**
- **Multifamily residential (at up to 30 dwellings per acre); a minimum of 20 percent being senior housing units and a maximum of 25 percent being senior housing units, although the District Council may vary such percentages when approving a Concept Plan.**
- **Live/work units (e.g., office over retail; residential over retail; residential over office)**

Other uses may include:

- **Flex space and warehouse as an interim use (See Finding 8)**
- **Professional training facilities**

*[Staff] Comment: The application proposes the following uses and square footages:

Proposed Development:

Use:	Area/Units Range
Office	750,000 s.f. - 3,120,000 s.f.
Retail	70,000 s.f. - 150,000 s.f.
Restaurant	10,000 s.f. - 20,000 s.f.
Office/Retail	131,000 s.f. - 180,000 s.f.
R&D	525,000 s.f. - 600,000 s.f.
Hotel	250,000 s.f. - 325,000 s.f. (375 - 500 rooms)
MF Residential	500 units (600 s.f. - 1200 s.f.)
SF Residential	366 units maximum 316 - 341 units of SFA (1,800 s.f. to 2,600 s.f.) 25 - 50 units of SFD (3,000 s.f. to 4,000 s.f.)

The plans do not make a commitment to the number of senior housing units as required in the guideline, therefore, the staff recommends a condition that there be a minimum of 20 percent senior housing units and a maximum of 25 percent senior housing units, in the single-family attached and the multifamily residential housing units.

- (2) **The M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation Oriented) Conceptual Site Plan shall show all existing development and approved development under the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone “as approved.” The mixed-use ratio for the design plans shall be the following, based on the total gross floor area for residential and Employment/Office/Retail/Hotel combined:**

	Minimum	Maximum
Residential	20 percent	30 percent
Office/Employment/Retail/Hotel	70 percent	80 percent

The residential component shall be no greater than 866 dwelling units.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

*[Staff] Comment: The plans have been revised to show all existing development and approved development under the E-I-A Zone as approved. The application proposes the following mixed use ratio based on the proposed square footage of development as follows:

	Minimum (square feet)	Maximum (square feet.)	
Residential	1,333,400	1,621,600	(25–38 percent)
Commercial	2,175,060	4,834,060	(70–74 percent)

The commercial square footage is based on the existing and proposed development of the entire M-X-T zone. At the Planning Board hearing, the opposition testified that the percentage of residential development had the potential of increasing above the percentages listed. In response, the applicant stated at the hearing it would reduce the number of units so as to comply with the guideline. The Planning Board decided that the guideline contained within CR-11-2006 should be included as a condition of approval, in regard to the ratios for residential and commercial development. This issue will be reviewed and addressed during the review of each Detailed Site Plan.

(3) The conceptual site plan shall have an integrated network of streets, sidewalks (on all streets), and open space, public or private, and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.

*[Staff] Comment: The plan provides for an integrated network of streets, pedestrian systems and open space throughout the project. The placement of uses is such that it generally reflects the layout of the Melford Illustrative plan, as was developed as part of the rezoning application for the project.

(4) The community shall be focused upon an open-space network consisting of the Melford house and its historic vista, and other public spaces, which are surrounded by a combination of commercial, civic, cultural or recreational facilities. This network shall be designed with adequate amenities to function as a fully shared space for the entire community.

[Staff] Comment: The plan has been designed with both components of the Melford Historic site (house and grounds and cemetery to the northwest). The surrounding uses associated directly with the Melford Historic Site are residential in nature and are appropriately located in and around the open space network.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

- (5) **The community shall contain additional linked open space in the form of squares, greens, parks, and trails that are accessible, safe and comfortable. The open space should provide a variety of visual and physical experiences. Some of these open spaces should be bordered by buildings and be visible from streets and buildings.**

*[Staff] Comment: The plans do not appear to provide for additional linked open spaces other than those that were shown on the Illustrative Melford plan. Staff recommends that the plan be revised to include additional open space elements that provide for linkages throughout the development.

- (6) **Retail uses shall be designed to:**

- **Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.**
- **Create outdoor amenities, such as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high quality street furniture and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.**
- **Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes and customized shopfronts to create a street-like rhythm.**
- **Provide attractive, quality facades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC and other unsightly functions.**
- **Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street front experiences to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment[; a]. All uses are connected by sidewalks; crosswalks run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks are wide, appealing, shaded and configured for safe and**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways are separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, on-street parallel parking and/or structures; walking distances through parking lots are minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings, and walkways are made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.

- **Screen parking from the streets and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.**
- **Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, and/or landscape islands.**
- **Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, direct and indirect, high quality, energy efficient lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.**
- **Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards and requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners, which shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to the existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.**
- **Temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior facades of a building shall not be permitted.**
- **Design retail pad sites to be compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.**
- **Green areas or public plazas should be provided between pad sites.**
- **Restaurants should have attractive outdoor seating areas with views of the public spaces/lakes or other natural features.**

*[Staff] Comment: All of these guidelines are appropriately reviewed at the time of detailed site plan for retail development. Therefore, the staff recommends that the guidelines be added as conditions to the approval of this plan, to be fulfilled at the time of detailed site plan.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

(7) **Residential uses shall meet the following design standards:**

- **Single-family detached:**
 - **There shall be a range of lot sizes, with a minimum square footage on any lot of 3,000 square feet of finished living space.**
 - **At least 20 percent of the houses shall be a minimum of 4,000 square feet of finished living space.**
 - **Garages should not dominate the streetscape, and all garages should either be detached, or located in the rear (accessible by alleys or driveways), attached and set back a minimum of eight feet from the façade, or attached and oriented for side entry access.**
- **Multifamily and single-family attached:**
 - **Building design and materials shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive.**
 - **Use of siding should be limited.**
 - **A significant number of amenities, such as are typically provided for luxury projects shall be provided.**

*[Staff] Comment: All of these guidelines are appropriately reviewed at the time of detailed site plan for residential development. Therefore, the staff recommends that the guidelines be added as conditions of approval.

- (8) **Any additional research and development type flex space and/or warehouses shall be limited to not more than ten percent of total non-residential space. Generally this flex space is intended as an interim use, which shall be redeveloped predominantly with office use, as market conditions permit. When an area is initially developed as research/development, flex space and/or warehouses, that area should be the first considered for redevelopment when market conditions permit new office development. The long-term goal is that all of the non-residential uses would be office with retail (including a main street) and hotel.**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

*[Staff] Comment: The guideline above is appropriately applied at the time of the detailed site plan review for research and development space. Therefore, the staff recommends that the guideline above be added as a condition of approval.

(9) All stream channels on the site should be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.

*[Staff] Comment: Based on the information currently shown on the plans, this guideline has been met. In addition, the guideline above should be added as a condition of approval of the CSP.

(10) All residential development proposals shall demonstrate that interior noise levels will conform to State of Maryland (COMAR) noise regulations.

*[Staff] Comment: Noise contours are not shown on the plans. It appears that some of the residential units proposed in the southernmost portion of the site will be within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for US 50. This guideline will be addressed at time of preliminary plan review. Either the units will have to be moved outside the corridor or noise mitigation measures will be required.

(11) The stormwater management concept plans, shall incorporate bioretention and other low impact development techniques throughout the site.]

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline was deleted from this portion of the text of CR-11-2006; however, it is a provision that applies to all development in the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan (See p. 49, Policy 2, Strategy 4). This guideline will be addressed during the review of the preliminary plan.

(12) The proposed lighting system shall include the use of full cut-off lighting systems with limited light spill over. The lighting plan and design drawings shall be included with each detailed site plan approved in the future.

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application.

(13) Development plans shall show the minimization of impervious surfaces through various phases of the project. Early phases of the project may use surface parking and later phases of development will seek to reclaim the surface parking by the use of structured parking to the maximum extent possible.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

*[Staff] Comment: There does not appear to be a commitment to provide structured parking in later phases. This should be addressed during the review of the preliminary plan as the current design proposes an extremely high percentage of impervious surfaces.

(14) Fifty percent of parking for multifamily uses shall be structured parking.

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application to be demonstrated prior to the approval of a detailed site plan for development of multifamily projects.

(15) The design of the stormwater management ponds shall show them as amenities with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application to be demonstrated prior to the approval of a detailed site plan. Native plants will be used throughout the site for landscaping and reforestation.

(16) Streams shall have a 100-foot natural buffer and a 150 foot-wide building and parking setback. There shall be a 150-foot buffer on the 100-year floodplain. If a utility must be extended into any buffer, then an equal area of natural buffer alternative shall be retained on the community property.

*[Staff] Comment: These buffers have not been shown on the plans, so it is difficult to evaluate how the design addresses this guideline. During the review of the preliminary plan, this guideline will be evaluated in detail. If any clearing is proposed within the buffers it must either be removed or the “natural buffer alternative” must be provided. Several areas show clearing into the buffers and no “buffer alternative” areas are shown.

(17) The following facilities shall be evaluated for transportation adequacy in all subsequent traffic analyses for the subject property:

- **MD 450/MD 3 intersection**
- **US 301/Harbour Way-Governors Bridge Road**
- **Belair Drive/northbound On-Off ramp to MD 3**
- **Belair Drive/southbound On-Off ramp to MD 3**

*[Staff] Comment: The Transportation Planning Section reviewed the CSP for conformance to the required findings for a conceptual site plan in the M-X-T zone and provided the analysis in accordance with guideline above. See Finding 13 below.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

- (18) **At the time of submission of the detailed site plan application, the owner shall present a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site for approval by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board.**

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline is proposed as Condition 6 in the recommendation section of this report.

- (19) **Prior to the acceptance of building permits in the area in the immediate vicinity of Melford House labeled as POD 1, the owner shall begin the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed prior to the release of any use and occupancy permit for POD 1.**

*[Staff] Comment: Staff recommends that this guideline be modified to reflect the issuance of the certain percentage of single family building permits. This is a more productive way to assure the completion of the restoration process and has been the process associated with other projects though out the county.

- (20) **Prior to submitting a conceptual site plan, the applicant shall determine the extent of the land that should be the subject of a Phase I archeological investigation. The applicant's findings shall be submitted to the historic preservation staff of M-NCPPC for review and approval. Upon approval of this determination, plans may be approved and permits may be issued for any portion of the subject property excluded from the scope of the Phase I investigation. No plans may be approved and no permits shall be issued for the area subject to the Phase I investigation before satisfactory completion of the Phase I investigation, or if required Phase II and/or III.**

*[Staff] Comment: The Historic Preservation Section has reviewed the Phase I report. Staff recommends that a condition be adopted that requires the completion of a Phase II archeological investigation.

- (21) **Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a written agreement/MOU with the Historic Preservation (HPC) that defines/outlines responsibilities and timing for the maintenance/stabilization of all historic buildings within the Environmental Setting, to be followed by quarterly reports submitted by the property owner and/or developer, so that the HPC and staff may monitor the condition of the Melford House, grounds and cemetery.**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

*[Staff] Comment: The substance of this guideline is addressed in the recommendation section of this report as proposed Conditions 6, 7 and 8.

(22) Any detailed site plan shall demonstrate that proposed buildings do not obstruct the historic vista of the Melford House.

*[Staff] Comment: Proposed Condition 4 is contained within the recommendation section of this report.

(23) Prior to acceptance of any detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the impact review area follow the guidelines on page 91 for the CDP 8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application as stated in proposed Condition 5. However, the timing of the fulfillment of this condition should be changed (to prior to the approval of the detailed site plan), because compliance should occur and be evaluated at the time of the DSP, not prior to acceptance of the application.

(24) 288+/- acres of the property are either already developed pursuant to a specific design plan (SDP) approved in the E-I-A Zone or a specific design plan has been approved. The Zoning Ordinance at Sections 27-282 and 27-527 describe a detailed site plan and a specific design plan. The property owner may submit a conceptual site plan in the M-X-T Zone pursuant to Section 27-546 essentially showing the same development and plans as in the M-X-T Zone. If the entire property is placed in the M-X-T Zone, all existing development and/or approved specific design plans shall be shown “as approved” on the conceptual site plan submitted in the M-X-T Zone. Use and occupancy permits have been issued for the following uses for structures existing on the property or to be constructed:

**Office/Medical Practitioner Office; Office; Office/Manufacturing;
Contractor Office; Office/Industrial Laboratory; Office/Real Estate
Subdivision Sales; Institutional/Educational/Church; Educational Institute;
School/Studio for Artistic Instruction**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

All of these uses are also permitted in the M-X-T Zone, so no non-conforming uses are being created. The SDPs are as follows: SDP-0103; SDP-0301; SDP-0203/01; SDP-0104; SDP-0204 (sign); and SDP-0201 (building4-E, F, G). These existing SDPs shall still regulate development of the properties.

*[Staff] Comment: The information above is factual in nature and does not require any additional action on the part of the applicant.

- (25) **The 12.75-acre impact review area approved for the Melford Historic Site by the Historic Preservation Commission and the Planning Board (PGCPB No. 99-28A) should be integrated into a design plan that establishes viewsheds from the Melford Historic Site to the Patuxent River. Open space should be provided adjacent to the historic site that will allow it to be seen from greater distances within the Melford property. A dedicated pedestrian link between the Melford Historic Site and the cemetery should be created. Trails should be provided that connect it to the regional trail system.**

*[Staff] Comment: The plan provides for an open space network around the historic site and establishes viewsheds to and from the house to the historic cemetery. The plan provides for an indirect vista east of the Historic Site to the Patuxent River. This view could be improved with a more axial alignment of the open space. The plans should be revised to create a more direct view at the time of the preliminary plans and the detailed site plans. Another less emphasized vista is implied by the street layout north and east of the Historic Site, which uses the street system and flanking structures to frame a narrow view toward the river. This vista should be better defined with a broader street section in order to open the view and to make it a more prominent element of the overall design. Further development of this vista should be investigated at the time of preliminary plan and detailed site plan review.

- (26) **Development abutting the Melford Historic Site, outbuildings, and cemetery should be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical architectural character. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize any adverse impacts to the historic site.**

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application to be fulfilled at the time of the detailed site plan.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

- (27) **Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area.**

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline should become a condition of approval of the subject application to be fulfilled at the time of the detailed site plan.

- (28) **Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested in cooperation with the appropriate utility.**

*[Staff] Comment: This guideline will be evaluated during the review of the preliminary plan, when requests for impacts to these areas must be submitted and reviewed.

- (29) **Community recreational facilities shall take full advantage of environmental features on and adjacent to the property, and shall include extensive trail and boardwalk systems. These recreational facilities may also include educational features for the general public and public schools, such as kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, with curriculum available to schools for use in specific locations.**

*[Staff] Comment: The staff recommends that the plans be analyzed at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision for conformance to the guideline above.

- (30) **The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

*[Staff] Comment: The staff recommends that the plans be analyzed at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision for conformance to the guideline above.

Conformance With Other Master Plan Text

Evaluation for conformance with the applicable provisions of the master plan, as stated below, will be conducted during the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision and the detailed site plan review as appropriate.

Policy 1: Protect, preserve and enhance the green infrastructure network; Strategy 2, Primary Corridors

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

The Patuxent River is a designated Primary Corridor in the master plan. The subject property abuts the Patuxent River and run-off created is deposited directly into the river channel. Strategy 2 reads as follows:

“Protect primary corridors (Patuxent River and Collington Branch) during the development review process to ensure the highest level of preservation and restoration possible, with limited impacts for essential development elements.”

“Essential development elements” include road crossings of streams to access otherwise landlocked portions of sites and the construction of utilities which are limited to stormwater outfalls, sewer lines, electrical lines, gas lines and phone lines (although the last three can usually be designed to eliminate the impacts). This definition does not include grading for buildings, roads, stormwater management ponds or any other feature where the design could be changed to eliminate the impact.

In order for the subject application to be in conformance with the provisions of the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, and to be consistent with other Planning Board approvals, the buffers described in CR-11-2006 should be included in the PMA for this site. The PMA definition includes “...Specific areas of rare or sensitive wildlife habitat, as determined by the Planning Board.” The buffers adjacent to a primary corridor are sensitive habitat that should be protected in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

Policy 2: Water quality; Strategy 4

The CSP and conceptual TCPI do not show how this strategy is to be implemented. There appear to be no low impact development techniques proposed. This will need to be addressed with the preliminary plan application.

Policy 2: Conservation landscaping; Strategy 6

The DSP will be evaluated for how this strategy is being implemented.

Policy 3: Tree cover; Strategy 4

The DSP will be reviewed for conformance with the distribution of tree cover throughout impervious surface areas.

Policy 4: Green buildings and alternative energy sources

The DSP will be evaluated for the implementation of green building techniques and alternative energy sources.

Policy 5: Light pollution

The DSP will be evaluated for the use of alternative lighting technologies and full cut-off optics.

Policy 6: Noise pollution

This policy and the associated strategies will be evaluated at time of preliminary plan review.

M-X-T Zone Required Findings (Section 27-546.07 of the Zoning Ordinance)

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

*[Staff] Comment: This conceptual site plan for Melford is in conformance with the requirements of Part 10, Division 2, of the Zoning Ordinance.

8. **The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation.**

*[Staff] Comment: The subject property is located at the intersection of two major arterial Roadways, US 301 and US 50. The property to the north of the M-X-T-zoned property, known as Sherwood Manor, a single-family detached development, is located some distance from the subject application. The plan proposes office, a hotel, and research and development along the perimeter of the adjacent roadways.

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

*[Staff] Comment: The subject application is part of a larger tract of land known as the Melford Property, which was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T zone. The only adjacent residential property is north of the M-X-T zone, but is not directly adjacent to the subject application. The area of intervening land is developed with the IDA building and the Masonry Institute, which is currently under construction. Development proposed in the CSP is completely compatible with these structures. Any further development of the intervening M-X-T-zoned land will require both a conceptual site plan and a detailed site plan.

10. **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.**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

*[Staff] Comment: The illustrative plan lays out a development scenario of the property that provides for the design of the road layout and buildings that fit well into the site and provide for the development of a cohesive development in and among the existing and approved (but not yet constructed) projects on site.

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

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant has stated that the project will be developed in basically two phases. Phase I is the minimum square footages proposed in the development data charts in Finding 2, above. Phase II includes the square footages proposed that would exceed the trip cap and would require a new traffic analysis. It appears that the development will be able to be self sufficient as each phase moves forward.

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

*[Staff] Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has provided a full review of the pedestrian systems proposed for the development and found that the plan should be approved. See Finding 15 below for a detailed discussion of trail issues.

13. **On a conceptual site plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a sectional map amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent of construction funds are allocated within the adopted county Capital Improvement Program, or the current state Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of conceptual site plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

*[Staff] Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual site plan application referenced above. The property is located in an area generally bounded by MD 3 to the west and US 50 to the south. The applicant proposes to develop the property under the M-X-T zoning with a mixed-use development, as stated below.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated June 20, 2006 (revised September 26, 2006), 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), the State Highway Administration (SHA), and the City of Bowie. 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 Developing 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) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 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.

TRAFFIC IMPACT STUDY

Pursuant to the findings of CR-11-2006, and in conjunction with the scoping agreement between the applicant and staff, the traffic impact study identified the following intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD 3 / MD 450-Gas Station Access	E/1565	F/1645
Belair Drive / Ramp from MD 3 SB	A/420	A/452
Belair Drive / MD 3 NB Ramps	A/144	A/272
US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	B/1078	E/1493

The traffic study also identified three background developments whose impact would affect some or all of the study intersections. Those background developments are:

- Rips Subdivision (118 PM trips, 119 PM trips)
- Zehner Property (19 AM trips, 25 PM trips)
- Charles Carroll Subdivision (8 AM trips, 17 PM trips)

Additionally, a growth rate of one percent per year (from 2006 through 2012) was applied to the existing traffic counts along MD 3 and US 301. A second analysis was done to evaluate the impact of the background developments on existing infrastructure. The analysis revealed the following results:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD 3 / MD 450-Gas Station Access	E/1657	F/1746
Belair Drive / Ramp from MD 3 SB	A/427	A/466
Belair Drive / MD 3 NB Ramps	A/147	A/276
US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	B/1134	E/1570

An analysis of the traffic data under “Total” conditions represents a combination of background traffic and site-generated traffic. The following land uses were used in the study as the basis for computing site-generated traffic:

- 42 Single Family dwelling units
- 316 Townhouse/Condo dwelling units
- 500 Apartment units (Garden and mid-rise)
- Hotel – 375 rooms
- Restaurant (High Turnover/Sit down) – 11,250 Square feet
- Retail/Shopping Center – 136,025 square feet
- Office (General) – 706,750 square feet
- Office (Research and Development) – 287,340 square feet
-

Using trip generation rates from the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, as well as the Institute of Transportation Engineer’s (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual, 7th edition*, the study has determined that the proposed development, based on the above-mentioned uses, would generate a net total of 2,774 (1,952 in, 822 out) AM peak hour trips, and 3,593 (1,404 in, 2,189 out) PM peak hour trips. Using these site-generated trips, an analysis of total traffic conditions was done, and the following results were determined:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD 3 / MD 450-Gas Station Access	E/1857	F/1931
Belair Drive / Ramp from MD 3 SB	A/816	A/992
Belair Drive / MD 3 NB Ramps	A/1139	A/1046
US 301 /& Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way	C/1228	E/1644

The results shown in the table above have indicated that there are two intersections that would operate unacceptably under total traffic conditions. Both intersections are located within the MD 3/US 301 corridor, where the use of mitigation (CR-29-1994) is allowed. To that end, the applicant has proffered a Transportation Facilities Mitigation Plan (TFMP) at these intersections to meet the mitigation critical lane criteria. Specifically, the applicant is proposing to provide the following lane configurations:

MD 3/MD 450/Gas Station Access intersection.

- Provide an additional northbound and southbound through lane.

US 301/Gov. Bridge Road/Harbor Way intersection

- Provide an additional left turn lane on the eastbound approach.

With these improvements in place, the projected LOS/CLV would be the following:

TOTAL CONDITIONS <i>with mitigation improvement</i>		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD 3 / MD 450-Gas Station Access	E/1516	F/1639
US 301 / Gov. Bridge Road / Harbor Way	C/1191	E/1531

The traffic study concludes that a provision of an additional left turn lane at the intersection of US 301/ Gov. Bridge Road / -Harbor Way would mitigate the site impact by more than 150 percent.

It further indicates that with all of the improvements identified, the roadway system can accommodate the proposed development.

Upon review of the applicant's traffic study, staff agrees with its overall conclusion regarding the road system being able to accommodate the proposed development. However, staff disagrees with some technical aspects of the report regarding methodologies and procedures pursuant to the guidelines.

- Regarding the use of mitigation, one of the technical requirements is that the traffic study must show the magnitude of the percentage of CLV reduction as a result of the improvement being proffered. At both intersections being considered for mitigation, the study reported that the proffered improvements will reduce the respective CLV by more than 150 percent, but did not quantify the actual margin.
- The intersections at Belair Drive with ramps to and from MD 3 are described as "signalized" intersections, by virtue of the fact that both intersections are equipped with signals that are always in flashing mode. While it may be technically accurate to describe these intersections as being signalized, from an operational perspective, they do not function as signalized intersections and therefore should not have been analyzed using the CLV procedures, which assume phasing operation. Based on comments from SHA on this traffic study, it would appear that plans are underway to have these signals reprogrammed to function as normal traffic signals before the proposed development begins operation. In this regard, having the intersections analyzed under "Total" conditions with the CLV procedure seems appropriate.

In addition to the planning staff, the study was reviewed by two other agencies, the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public and Transportation (DPW&T) as well as the City of Bowie. Since most of the transportation facilities being impacted are under the jurisdiction of SHA, the DPW&T did defer to SHA on many of the operational issues associated with those intersections. In its September 11, 2006 memorandum to staff (Issayans to Burton) however, the DPW&T concurred with the study's recommendation of widening Governor Bridge Road as part of the proposed improvement to the US 301/Gov. Bridge Road intersection. In the revised study on September 26, 2006, however, the applicant has demonstrated that a conventional improvement would not result in a CLV of 1450 or less, and consequently, a new recommendation under mitigation was being pursued. Specifically, the study recommended an additional left turn lane only on the eastbound approach, rather than on both approaches as was originally proposed in the original study. In light of this, no additional widening is being sought on the westbound approach.

SHA, in its September 25, 2006 referral (Foster to Foster) to staff, appeared to be in general support of the study findings. However, there were some issues that were raised by SHA that are worth commenting on:

- SHA is concerned that recent construction activities may not have been considered in the analyses of the development. The traffic analyses for the subject application did consider the impact of recent construction activities observed by SHA staff.
- Regarding the proposed improvement at the MD 3/MD 450/gas station access intersection, specific engineering detail was provided. SHA will require the additional southbound through lane shall begin at the Patuxent River Bridge, and extend 2,000 feet south of MD 450. Similarly, the additional northbound through lane shall begin 2,000 feet south of MD 450, and extend to the Patuxent River Bridge, north of MD 450.
- SHA recommends coordination between its Office of Traffic and Safety and the applicant regarding the operation of the lights (from flashing mode to normal mode) at the intersections of Belair Drive, Melford Boulevard and the ramps to and from MD 3.
- Recent electronic correspondence between staff and SHA has indicated that SHA is concerned with the accuracy of the traffic count that was collected at the MD 3/MD 450 intersection on Tuesday May 30, 2006 (the day after Memorial Day). The applicant did a recount on Thursday September 28, 2006, where the results showed lower volumes. Taking a more conservative approach, all of the analyses were done using the higher volumes.

On September 19, 2006, staff received a letter from the City of Bowie (Meinert to Burton), in which comments were provided based on their review of the original traffic study. A number of issues were raised by the city, many of which were resolved in the applicant's revised in the September 26, 2006 study. Below are some of those issues:

- The city is concerned that they were not given a role in defining the scope of the traffic study. The scope of the traffic was determined by the council in its findings on CR-11-2006. However, the scope may be expanded for subsequent preliminary plan applications.
- The Southeast Quadrant study was part of the analyses for the Bowie-Collington-Mitchellville and Vicinity Master Plan that was approved in 1991. That plan has now been amended (and superseded) by the Bowie and vicinity plan, which was approved in 2006. There are no provisions in the 2006 master plan that maintain the recommendations from the Southeast Quadrant Study.
- In the revised traffic study, the analyses were based on a 375-room hotel rather than the 200 rooms that were previously assumed.
- The intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive was not part of the original scope but could be included in any subsequent analyses required for preliminary plan approval.

- The use of mitigation was necessary for the US 301/Gov. Bridge Road/Harbor Way intersection. Providing widening on both the eastbound and westbound approaches would not lower the CLV below the 1450 threshold based on the revised analyses.

Based on the required findings above, staff concludes that the proposed development generally meets the code requirements provided that the development does not exceed the total number of trips cited in the traffic study (2,774 AM and 3,593 PM) and all of the associated improvements proffered are fully implemented.

Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section determines that the plan conforms to the required findings for approval of the conceptual site plan from the standpoint of transportation if the application is approved with the following conditions:

- a. The proposed development shall be limited to a mix of uses where the net new trips shall not exceed 2,774 AM and 3,593 PM peak hour trips.
- b. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency

(A) At MD 3/MD 450/gas station access intersection

The applicant shall provide an additional northbound and southbound through lane. Pursuant to SHA requirements, the additional southbound through lane shall begin at the Patuxent River Bridge, and extend 2,000 feet south of MD 450. Similarly, the additional northbound through lane shall begin 2,000 feet south of MD 450, and extend to the Patuxent River Bridge, north of MD 450.

(B) At US 301/Gov. Bridge Road/Harbor Way intersection

The applicant shall provide an additional exclusive left turn lane on the eastbound approach. The overall lane use for this approach shall be two left turn lanes and a shared left-through-right lane.

Referrals

14. The Subdivision Office reviewed the plans for the site as proposed for a mixed-use, transit-oriented development plan including residential, commercial and employment uses. The site has two approved Preliminary Plans of Subdivision, 4-98076 (approved 08/28/00) and 4-02093 (approved 02/06/03). The former preliminary plan was for the majority of what was then called The Maryland Science and Technology Center to the west, while the latter was for three parcels to the east and was limited to two stormwater management ponds. An amended Basic Plan (A-9401/02) for the site was approved as part of the recently adopted and approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity (CR-11-2006, adopted 02/07/06). The

amended Basic Plan reflected development of the types being presented in this application.

The subject CSP shows a general layout consistent with the approved Preliminary Plans of Subdivision. It should be noted, however that the approval of 4-02093 was for the construction of the stormwater ponds only, and did not test for adequacy of public facilities. Accordingly, this proposal should be conditioned upon the approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to the approval of a detailed site plan. Subdivision staff had no other comments.

15. The Transportation Planning Section reviewed the plans for conformance with the Countywide Trails Plan and the Adopted and Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan. The property is also formerly a portion of the Maryland Science and Technology Center. The M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) owns numerous parcels of land along the Patuxent River, including both to the north and south of the subject site. DPR has implemented natural surface trails on several parcels of the publicly-owned land along the Patuxent. To the south of the subject property, the Governor Bridge Park to the south of US 50 includes numerous natural surface trails to the river, and around various ponds and wetland areas. To the north of the site, M-NCPPC owns the stream valley land behind the Sherwood Manor subdivision. Staff has also worked with the Queen Anne community to implement hiker/equestrian trails in the public land along the Patuxent River near MD 214.

Prior approvals for the subject site reflected the ultimate desire to develop a trail along the Patuxent to connect to existing and planned trails along the river. For example, approved SDP-0301 (SDP for stormwater management ponds, Blocks 5 and 6) included a recommendation for a public use easement to accommodate the future provision of this trail. This condition reads:

3. Prior to Final Plat approval, a 30-foot-wide trail easement shall be recorded for the master-planned trail construction, maintenance and public use.

Land outside the floodplain and environmental buffers will be necessary to accommodate this trail. The trail should be run north-south parallel to the Patuxent River and be designed to accommodate future extensions to both the north and south. Based on a meeting with the applicant on September 28, 2006, this trail will be located outside the PMA and beyond land dedicated to M-NCPPC. It will be incorporated into the area adjacent to and around the stormwater management ponds. This trail will be on HOA land, and should be located within a public use easement to ensure public access to the master plan trail. Consideration should be given to how this stream valley trail will continue to the south in the area of the hamlet. Area outside the PMA and off private lots should be provided to accommodate this trail.

CR-11 also recommends that trails be included as part of the residential development. Development standards 29 and 30 read as follows:

- 29. Community recreational facilities shall take full advantage of environmental features on and adjacent to the property, and shall include extensive trail and boardwalk systems. These recreational facilities may also include educational features for the general public and public schools, such as kiosks along the trails,**

boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, with curriculum available to schools for use in specific locations.

- 30. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

Access to the open space, educational opportunities, and observation points will be evaluated at the time of detailed site plan in keeping with these development standards.

Development standard 3 of CR-11 also recommends the following regarding sidewalk facilities:

- 1. The conceptual site plan shall have an integrated network of streets, sidewalks (on all streets), and open space, public or private, and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.**

Related to this, the submitted overall color plan includes a note that reads: "Sidewalks on both sides of streets provide a comprehensive pedestrian circulation network throughout. These sidewalks are located parallel to travel lands and clearly separated from vehicular circulation. Connecting these sidewalks between blocks are crosswalks, located at each intersection, to focus pedestrian movement along the safest route. Since the street network is based on interconnected grid system, the most efficient, pleasant, and safe path between two points is along a street".

Staff supports this planned sidewalk network, which is consistent with the guideline above. These sidewalks, in conjunction with connector trails and the stream valley trail, will provide a comprehensive trail and pedestrian network throughout the site. The sidewalk network and internal trails can be evaluated more fully at the time of preliminary plan and detailed site plan. It should be noted that a trail exists around the lower pond. Providing connections to this trail via sidewalks and connector trails should be a priority. This is a popular trail that is used by many nearby residents and recreational cyclists, and it will be an important component of the trail network on the site.

Development standard 15 recommends the following regarding stormwater management facilities:

- 15. The design of the stormwater management ponds shall show them as amenities with gentle natural slopes and extensive native plantings.**

The planned trail parallel to the Patuxent River will be adjacent to the pond and should be designed to complement and enhance the pond. The exact location and type of trail appropriate along this corridor should be determined at either preliminary plan or detailed site plan. Consideration should be given to the most appropriate trail surface for this environmentally sensitive Patuxent River corridor.

Conclusions

In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, prior approvals for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, and CR-11, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide the following:

- a. Provide a stream valley trail parallel to the Patuxent River corridor. This trail shall be within either dedicated M-NCPPC land or on HOA land within a public use trail easement. Where the trail is adjacent to existing or planned ponds, it should comply with development standard 15 of CR-11. At the time of detailed site plan, special consideration should be given to the surface of the trail to ensure that it is compatible with M-NCPPC plans for the Patuxent River stream valley.
 - b. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with development standard 3 of CR-11. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks should be considered.
 - c. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features will be evaluated at the time of DSP.
 - d. Connector trails should also be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority should be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the Lower Pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and should be in conformance with design standards 29 and 30 of CR-11.
16. The Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) considered this application at a hearing on September 19, 2006, and would like to forward the following recommendations. The recommendations are based on the Historic Preservation Section's staff report as well as the testimony of the applicant and preservation organizations at the meeting.

Historic Preservation Commission Recommendations:

- a. *The site plans should be revised to delineate and note both the Environmental Setting and Impact Area for Melford, Historic Site 71B-016.*
- b. *Prior to approval of this Conceptual Site Plan, plans shall be revised so that proposed buildings do not obstruct the historic vista between the Melford House and the cemetery.*
- c. *Prior to approval of a Detailed Site Plan for this area, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the Impact Review Area follow the guidelines on page 91 of the CDP-8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.*
- d. *Prior to acceptance of any Detailed Site Plan for this development, through the Historic Area Work Permit process the applicant shall present a plan and timetable for the*

protection, stabilization, restoration and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site for approval by the HPC and Planning Board. The plan shall be approved (through a HAWP) before approval of the first DSP.

- e. Prior to or at the time of the first building permit application for property within CSP 06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the Historic Area Work Permit process. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed by the time 50 percent of these buildings have received building permits.*
- f. Prior to approval of any relevant applications the Historic Preservation Section should certify that all Quarterly Reports have been received in a timely manner and that Melford is being properly maintained.*
- g. Prior to acceptance of any Detailed Site Plan or new Preliminary Plat of subdivision for Melford, the applicant shall identify archaeological resources in the project area by conducting Phase I archaeological investigations.*

A qualified archeologist must conduct all investigations and follow The Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland (Shaffer and Cole, 1994) and the Planning Board's Guidelines for Archeological Review (2005). These investigations must be presented in a draft report following the same guidelines. Following approval of the draft report, four copies of the final report must be submitted to M-NCPPC Historic Preservation staff. Evidence of M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to acceptance of the development application.

The design of a Phase I archeological methodology should be appropriate to identify slave dwellings and burials. Documentary research should include an examination of known slave burials and dwellings in the surrounding area, their physical locations as related to known structures, as well as their cultural interrelationships. The field investigations should include a pedestrian survey to locate attributes such as surface depressions, fieldstones, and vegetation common in burial/cemetery environs.

If it is determined that potentially significant archaeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

- (1) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or*
- (2) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.*

***[Staff] Comment:** The recommendations above have been included in the recommendation section of this report except for the condition relating to the Phase I report. The applicant submitted a Phase I archaeology report and the Historic Preservation Section analyzed the Phase I report. Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations have been completed on the 63-acre

parcel, which is the area identified as undisturbed on the overall conceptual Site Plan. Staff has not completed the review of the Phase I draft report; however, the following is a summary. Three previously identified archeological sites are present on the subject property, 18PR30, 18PR164, and 18PR165. Phase I archeological investigations were carried out in five survey areas. Prehistoric site 18PR30 in Area D has been impacted by modern ground disturbance and no further work was recommended on this site. Staff concurs that no further archeological investigations are necessary on site 18PR30, as most of it has been impacted by vegetation clearance and grading and that no further archeological investigations are necessary in Areas B, C, D, and E.

Area A is the location of sites 18PR164, Melford house, and 18PR165, the Duckett Cemetery. Shovel test pits (STPs) in this area yielded 301 historic artifacts and four historic features. A surface inspection was made of the area around the extant cemetery and no additional burial features or depressions were noted outside of the gated area. However, no subsurface investigations were carried out in this area. Phase II archeological evaluation was recommended for Area A due to the presence of intact cultural features and soil deposits. Staff concurs that a Phase II archeological evaluation of the area around the Melford main house, 18PR164, and cemetery, 18PR165, is necessary. A Phase II scope of work should be submitted and approved prior to submission of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision. The Phase III investigations should be completed and approved prior to approval of any detailed site plan or further development plan.

Historic Preservation Section's Analysis

The District Council, in its original approval in 1982, approved A-9401 with conditions. Condition 6 concerned the environmental setting for Melford.

- 6. Prior to or as part of the submittal of a comprehensive design plan for the subject parcel, an environmental setting shall be determined for the historic site (Melford) to define the relationship between the site and the proposed development. Building heights, landscaping and open-space character of the development shall be determined to protect the character of the historic site.**

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

Block 1 of the Melford development includes the Environmental Setting and Impact Review Area of Melford. Melford is a two-part brick and stone plantation house, constructed in the 1840s for the Duckett family; it is distinguished by a two-story semicircular projecting bay and parapetted double chimney at one gable end, and has interior decorative details in the Greek Revival style. Because of its outstanding architectural characteristics, Melford was listed in the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

The Environmental Setting of the Melford Historic Site is in two parts: 2.7158 acres including the house and immediate grounds, and the non-contiguous 1.1309-acre cemetery parcel. This setting and a 12.75 acre Impact Review Area were determined by the HPC in 1986 as part of CDP-8601 (page 80). The first part includes, in addition to the house, two 19th-century outbuildings and a 20th-century pumphouse, and terraced gardens stretching to the east of the house. The cemetery parcel includes the 19th-century burial ground of the Duckett family. The 12.75-acre impact review area includes both parts of the Environmental Setting and the lower-lying land between them, per Planning Board Resolution 99-28(A).

MIE Properties had met with the HPC in April 2002 and agreed to develop a Preservation Plan and Maintenance Recommendations Plan, as the Melford House had become vacant and there was no intention of finding a new caretaker/tenant in the near future. The Historic Preservation Commission reviewed the applicant's Preservation Plan for Melford in November of 2002. The Heritage Resource Group prepared the plan for MIE. Its purpose was to make recommendations for the repair and maintenance of the buildings and grounds in the short term and to make long-term recommendations for the next three to five years. At the November 2002 meeting, the applicant committed to preparing quarterly reports describing the condition of the Melford House and grounds with an explanation of plans and status of any work on the property. The HPC encouraged the owner to work closely with staff regarding any work performed on the house.

The Ottery Group prepared a Condition Assessment and update to the Maintenance and Preservation Plan in February 2005. Quarterly Reports have been received through April 2006.

In September 2003, the HPC also reviewed and made recommendations to the Planning Board on Specific Design Plan 0310. The recommendations were that 1) plans be revised so that proposed buildings do not obstruct the historic vista between the Melford House and the cemetery; 2) detailed elevation drawings and cross sectional views be submitted as required by Resolution 99-28(A); and 3) Plans for new construction within the Impact Review Area follow the guidelines on page 91 of CDP-8601 document. The applicant withdrew the application.

Historic Preservation Staff Findings

- a. The submission states specific ways the applicant will be in compliance with the county's Guidelines for Historic Preservation for Parcel 1, which includes Melford. The applicant states that currently, both the Melford House and the cemetery are hard to access and that this plan will include paths, open spaces and streets that will allow county residents to easily visit and learn of their significance. The applicant also states that the buildings planned to be adjacent to the Environmental Setting and within the Impact Review Area will be designed to complement the Melford House, and that only minimal on-street parking spaces will be in clear view of the Melford House. Both the HPC and Planning Board will approve any interpretive plaques or signage to be placed near the historic site for wording and design.
- b. The applicant states that restoration efforts will focus on the retention of existing architectural characteristics and natural features. It is noteworthy that in order to promote

local awareness of local historic heritage, the applicant has renamed this development using the subject property's historic name. The applicant plans to preserve the Melford House and Cemetery and utilize them as a focal point for the development. The circulation network is designed on axis with Melford House to ensure views and access are preserved.

- c. The applicant's site plan shows new streets within the Impact Review Area. The plan also shows 60 three-story residential condominiums facing Melford. Six of these units are within the site line between Melford and the cemetery. Across Curry Drive a four story mixed-use building is shown which will contain 13,000 GSF of retail with multifamily above. A Town Commons is shown to the south of this building, visually linking Melford and the Patuxent River.
- d. The subject Conceptual Site Plan proposes only formal fronts of small groupings of townhouses facing the historic structures, all of which would be visible from the Historic Site and would have an adverse impact on the views to and from both parts of the Environmental Setting.
- e. The view from the cemetery is directly into the parking lot. This view should be buffered.
- f. The design guidelines proposed should be further refined at the detailed site plan stage. Specifically, the architecture directly adjacent to Melford should be reviewed for compatibility with Melford and include design elements of the proposed façades. The elevations of buildings should be designed in a manner compatible with the traditional, balanced character of Melford. A generally balanced window arrangement common to buildings of the mid nineteenth century should be employed. Sheathing materials should be limited to an approved palette and brick veneers that reflect the colour, design, size and arrangement of brick as traditionally found in Prince George's County. The use of non-traditional bricks in light colours and the combination of brick colors and sizes within a single structure should be prohibited. Special attention should be paid to the material and pitch of roofs visible from Melford. Non-traditional roof slopes should not be allowed, and large expanses of roof should be mitigated with the introduction of cross-gables or dormers. The design of chimneys, decks and railings visible from the Historic Site shall be carefully considered. All chimneys should be of masonry construction. Deck and balcony railings, flush railings and other vertical elements of porches, decks and balconies visible from Melford should be compatible with its traditional architectural character and constructed of finished lumber that is painted to match the trim colours used on the associated building. Pressure treated dimensional lumber should only be used for horizontal elements of porches, decks and balconies.

Conclusions

- a. Protection of the views between Melford and the cemetery was one of the conditions of approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-98076 (Resolution 99-28(A)) The conceptual site plan was revised to protect these views, specifically, plans were revised so that buildings that obstruct the historic vista are not proposed for the area between the Melford house and the cemetery.
 - b. Consideration should be given to providing limited buffering around the boundaries of the two parts of the Melford Environmental Setting.
 - c. New construction within the Impact Review Area should follow the guidelines on page 91 of CDP 8601 (1986) document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center. [Note: Staff had not yet located copies of these guidelines at the time the staff report was written. They will be provided to the Planning Board prior to the public hearing.]
 - d. Quarterly reports should continue to be submitted by St. Johns Properties, Inc. until restoration is completed, so that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and staff may monitor the condition of the Melford house, grounds and cemetery.
17. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual plan for a 259-acre site with a 262,921,740 square feet commercial/retail area and 866 residential dwelling units. The development is proposed to be located at the northwest quadrant of the intersection of US-301 and John Hanson Highway. This referral is being provided in response to a request by staff and is for informational basis as there are no required adequate public facility findings for conceptual site plans.

Fire and Rescue Facilities

The Prince George's County Planning Department has determined that this plan is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station Bowie Company 39 using the Seven-Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map provided by the Prince George's County Fire Department.

Police Facilities

The proposed development is within the service area for Police District II Bowie. The police facilities test is done on a countywide basis in accordance with the policies of the Planning Board. There is 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George's County Police and the latest population estimate is 825,520. Using the 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, it calculates to 116,398 square feet of space for police. The current amount of space, 267,660 square feet is above the guideline.

School Facilities

The applicant’s proposal calls for 866 dwelling units. These dwelling units are projected to yield 208 elementary school students, 52 middle school students and 104 high school students. The following table indicates how the three assigned schools’ capacities would be impacted by this project.

Assigned School	Enrollment Sept 2005	Subject Site Student Yield	Total Enrollment	State Rated Capacity	Percent of Capacity
Yorktown Elementary	417	208	625	452	138
Samuel Ogle Middle	911	52	963	850	113
Bowie High	2,851	104	2,955	1,934	153

In addition, the subject application is subject to a school fee of \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between interstate highway 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 on 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. 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.

18. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed revised plans for Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-06002, and the Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/44/98-02, for the Melford site, stamped as received on December 4, 2006. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 and revised Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/44/98-02, with conditions. The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed plans for the site when it was zoned E-I-A and known as the University of Maryland Science and Technology Center.

Type I and Type II Tree Conservation Plans, (TCPI/44/98 and TCPII/36/99, respectively) are associated with the site based on previous approvals by the Planning Board of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-98076), Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP-8601) and several Specific Design Plans (SDP-0201, SDP-0203, SDP-0301 and SDP-0405) when the site was zoned E-I-A, a comprehensive design zone. Portions of the site have been developed with office and flex-warehouse buildings. The plan represents a –02 revision to TCPI/44/98 and is the first plan to show development on the southeastern portion of the property.

Development of the site is now proposed under the M-X-T zone requirements, which require a Conceptual Site Plan (CSP) and Detailed Site Plan (DSP). The scope of the CSP includes a hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development space, and residential pods for single and multifamily attached dwellings (townhouses and condominiums, respectively), and single-family detached dwellings. Residential uses were not allowed under the previous zoning of E-I-A.

The property is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of US 50 and MD 3/US 301, and contains 431.55 acres in the M-X-T zone. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain and severe slopes are found to occur on this property. The predominant soils found to occur, according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, include Adelphia, Collington, Mixed alluvial land, Ochlockonee and Shrewsbury. The Mixed alluvial land and the Adelphia soils have limitations with respect to high water tables and impeded drainage. The other soil series pose few difficulties to development. According to available information, Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. US 50 (John Hanson Highway) is an existing freeway and traffic-generated noise impacts are anticipated. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property; however, there are records of 'species of concern' known to occur within the vicinity of the site. There are no designated scenic and historic roads in the vicinity of this property. According to the adopted Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, all three network features (Regulated Areas, Evaluation Areas and Network Gaps) are present on the site. This property drains to an unnamed tributary located in the Patuxent River basin, is located directly adjacent to the Patuxent River, and is located in the Developing Tier in the adopted General Plan.

Environmental Review

- A. The TCPI and the CSP do not show the same layout. The illustrative plan shows the construction of many units in the northeastern corner of the site and the southeastern portion that are not consistent with the TCPI.

Recommended Condition: The illustrative plan provided with the CSP is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout with respect to the limits of disturbance or the placement of residential units. It will be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision.

- B. A revised TCPI was stamped as received on December 4, 2006. The TCPI is very hard to read. It is almost impossible to read the conceptual grading due to the various shading patterns. The patterns that mask the information underneath should be lightened or removed from all the sheets. The "existing tree line" that has been added to the plan is unclear because it is not possible to tell which side of the line contains the woods. It is, for the most part, correct; however, it needs to be revised in a few places. Staff Exhibit 'A' reflects the correct existing tree line. This plan was provided to the applicant's engineer in a meeting held on December 11, 2006.

The previously approved TCPI (March 6, 2003) does not show the clearing of the southeastern portion of the site nor has a development proposal for this portion of the site been reviewed previously. The woodlands that exist on the subject portions of the property were previously being used to meet the overall requirements until such time as development is proposed in this area. The shading used to represent **the previously**

approved clearing on the TCPII should be removed from the TCPI in favor of a limit of disturbance that reflects the currently proposed development.

As with all TCPIs that are associated with a CSP or CDP, the TCPI is subject to change with the preliminary plan application. A note is needed on the TCPI so that it is clear which approval it is associated with and so it is clear that additional revisions may be required during the review of the preliminary plan. The worksheet and associated tables on the plan need to be completed and updated to reflect the current proposal. The table on sheet 1 currently says there are only 21.44 acres of conservation proposed on-site while the worksheet shows 64.33 acres. After the plans have been revised, they must be signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared and checked the plans.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the CSP and TCPI, the TCPI shall be revised as follows:

- a. Revise the shading patterns so that the information underneath is legible;
 - b. Eliminate the pattern used to depict previously approved limits of disturbance and show only that limit of disturbance needed for the proposed development;
 - c. Eliminate all clearing not necessary for the conceptual construction of the features shown;
 - d. Revise the existing tree line per Staff Exhibit A;
 - e. Provide labels on each cleared area with the acreage and which land pod it is credited to; if cleared areas cross pods, divide them up so that the table on sheet 1 can be checked for correctness;
 - f. Revise the worksheet to reflect all cleared areas, preservation areas, etc.;
 - g. Revise the table on Sheet 1 to fill in all the boxes;
 - h. Add the following note: "This TCPI is associated with the approval of CSP-06002 and as such is conceptual in nature. It is subject to further revisions with the preliminary plan of subdivision application.";
 - i. Revise the plans to address all other comments; and
 - j. Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plans.
- C. The following design guidelines listed in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance are relevant to the current review. A statement regarding how the CSP is in conformance with these design guidelines has not been provided.

“(5) Green area.

- (vi) Green area should incorporate significant on-site natural features and woodland conservation requirements that enhance the physical and visual character of the site...”**

“(7) Grading.

- (A) Grading should be performed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural and cultural resources on the site and on adjacent sites. To the extent practicable, grading should minimize environmental impacts.”**

“(11) Townhouses and three-family dwellings

- (A) Open space areas, particularly areas separating the rears of buildings containing townhouses, should retain, to the extent possible, single or small groups of mature trees. In areas where trees are not proposed to be retained, the applicant shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or the District Council, as applicable, that specific site conditions warrant the clearing of the area. Preservation of individual trees should take into account the viability of the trees after the development of the site.”**

There are several areas where the proposed clearing and grading shown on the TCPI is excessive and not necessary for the development proposed. While these areas may have been approved for clearing previously under a plan to mass grade the site for the construction of the stormwater management ponds, any area that is now subject to the design guidelines for a CSP (and CR-11) should be reconsidered – especially because these areas were never cleared. CR-11-2006 describes the areas of “significant on-site natural features” addressed in 27-274 as the 100 foot-wide stream buffers and the 150 foot-wide floodplain buffer. A 150 foot-wide building setback also contributes to the preservation of the natural features of the site.

Recommended Condition: Prior to signature approval of the CSP and at least 30 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCPI associated with the CSP shall be revised to remove all buildings, roads, trails and other amenities from the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain. Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbance to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where these buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested wherever possible. The TCPI associated with the preliminary plan will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management

outfalls as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans and shall be honored.

- D. The area at the headwaters of the “linear wetland” in the middle of the site has been shown on all previous approvals to be protected. The current plan shows an additional 1.45 acres of clearing and the elimination of the 1.24 acres of afforestation shown on the previously approved TCPII in this area. In order to protect this precious headwaters area, and to be consistent with previous approvals, future revisions to the TCPI should evaluate how this area can be protected.

Recommended Condition: During the review of the TCPI associated with the preliminary plan, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.

- E. The Maryland Department of Natural Resources Wildlife and Heritage Division issued a letter dated May 18, 2001, that states that there are no records of rare, threatened or endangered plants or animals within this project site. A MDNR database indicates that there are recent records of species of concern known to occur within the vicinity of the site; however, the portions of the subject property currently under review would not be likely to support the species listed. Much of the subject property currently under review, while presently wooded, has been disturbed over the course of the last few decades as indicated by the presence of Virginia pine and the small diameter of the trees on-site. The site that is “in the vicinity” is likely the Nash Woods property located west of the subject property across US 301. If any regulated species are present on the site, they would be located within the areas proposed for preservation: the streams, wetlands, floodplain and their associated buffers.

*[Staff] Comment: No additional information is required with regard to rare, threatened or endangered species.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

19. The staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002. Our review considered the recommendations of the CR-11-2006, the approved Master Plan And Sectional Map Amendment For Bowie And Vicinity for Planning Area 71B, the Land Preservation and Recreational Program for Prince George’s County, current zoning and subdivision regulations, and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.

The subject property is located in the northeast quadrant of intersection of Robert Crain Highway (US 301) and John Hanson Highway (US 50) in the City of Bowie. The 2006 approved Bowie and Vicinity Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Area 71B rezoned the property (259 acres) from the E-I-A Zone to M-X-T. The property adjoins Patuxent River (on the east) and includes the floodplain along the river. The applicant proposes mixed-use, high-density development

consisting of a mixture of office, research and development, retail, hotel and residential (single family detached, single family attached, multi family, senior housing, live/work units) uses.

The applicant proposes 866 residential units, which will generate approximately 2165 new residents in the community. The approved Master Plan describes the vision of the plan as providing a variety of safe public parks, plazas, and open spaces for recreation, relaxation and socialization in proximity to the community they serve. The goal of the master plan is to provide parks and recreation acreage that complies with standards set by the National Recreation and Parks Association, the State of Maryland, and the 2002 Prince George's County General Plan.

The standards referenced above call for the provision of 15-acres of local parkland for every thousand residents. The standards also recommend an additional 20 acres of regional parkland for every thousand residents. Only 13 acres of parkland per one thousand residents are currently available in the Bowie area. Staff has performed some very general analysis using available information. By applying the above-mentioned standards, staff concludes that 32 acres of additional local and 43 acres of additional regional parkland will be needed to serve the anticipated population of the new development.

DPR staff met with applicant and developed a mutually acceptable package of public park and recreation needed to serve new residents and surrounding community. The applicant agreed to dedicate the 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer adjoining the Patuxent River to M-NCPPC for incorporation into the Patuxent River Park system. The applicant further agreed to construction of a master planned trail as shown on park exhibit and trailhead facilities including a park access road and gravel parking lot. In addition, the applicant offered a contribution of \$250,000 for the construction of the regional athletic complex at Green Branch Community Park located south of US 50, next to Prince George's Stadium. This contribution will accelerate the design and construction of the phase one of the project.

The approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity includes specific design guidelines pertaining to Melford. The plan states that development at Melford shall conform to the following standards and guidelines:

- (3) **The conceptual site plan shall have an integrated network of open space, public or private and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.**

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant proposes a network of private and public open space. DPR staff recommends dedication of parkland as shown on attached Exhibit "A."

DPR staff recommends construction of the master plan trail along the Patuxent River, park access and a trailhead parking lot on dedicated parkland to complement the private recreational facilities package. Boardwalks, bridges, observation points, and education stations shall be considered along the trail at the time of review and approval of the detailed site plan.

- (4) **The community shall be focused upon an open space network consisting of the Melford house and its historic vista, and other public spaces, which are surrounded**

by a combination of commercial, civic, cultural or recreational facilities. The network shall be designed with adequate amenities to function as fully shared space for the entire community.

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant showed an open space network including Melford house and its historic vista, but the concept plan has not provided full information to determine the adequacy of recreational amenities in the open space. DPR staff believes that recreational amenities in the open space should be reviewed and approved at the time of the detailed site plan (DSP).

(5) The community shall contain additional linked open space in the form of squares, greens, parks, and trails that are accessible, safe and comfortable. The open space should provide a variety of visual and physical experiences. Some of these open spaces should be bordered by buildings and be visible from streets and buildings.

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant shows pocket private parks on the plan and in the statement of justification; the applicant mentions that there will be also space for a traditional clubhouse to serve the proposed residential development.

(29) Community recreational facilities shall take full advantage of environmental features on and adjacent to the property and shall include extensive trail and boardwalk system. These recreational facilities may also include educational features for the general public and public schools, such as kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, with curriculum available to schools for use in specific locations.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets] and ~~strike through~~ indicate deleted language

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant proposes a trail network on private property and on property to be dedicated to the M-NCPPC and the City of Bowie. DPR staff believes that the public parkland along the Patuxent River will become a destination point not only for the residents and employees and guests of Melford but to the general public and public schools in the area as well. The recreational facilities package, including educational features such as kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, should be reviewed and approved at the time of DSP.

(30) The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.

*[Staff] Comment: The applicant did not indicate on the plan which of the roads will be private and which will be city maintained roads. Either a public road should be extended to the dedicated parkland or a public access easement should be recorded from the US 301 to

the dedicated parkland to provide public access to the park over private streets.

The subject CSP-06002 includes a 100-year floodplain on the east side of the property to be dedicated to the M-NCPPC. DPR Exhibit "A" attached to this memorandum shows the area to be conveyed to M-NCPPC.

The master plan recommends hiker/biker equestrian trail construction along the Patuxent River. The applicant agreed to construction of a hiker/biker and equestrian trail in the 100-year floodplain buffer area. Since it may not be desirable (because of environmental features of the site) to build the trail on land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC, the applicant agreed to construct the trails in the easement on private property at a location agreeable to DPR. The specific location of the trail shall be established at the DSP stage review and approved when additional information is available to evaluate if the trail can be built on dedicated parkland or if it must be built in the easement on private property.

Conclusion

The DPR staff concludes that the applicant has fully demonstrated that the proposed development addresses the recommendations of the approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Bowie and Vicinity for Planning Area 71B, the Land Preservation and Recreational Program for Prince George's County, current zoning and subdivision regulations, and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

In summary, DPR staff believes that combination of private and public recreational facilities, parkland dedication as shown on attached DPR Exhibit "A", the construction of the master planned trail and trail connectors on dedicated parkland and in trail easements (when the trail cannot be constructed on parkland) and the provision of trailhead facilities, kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points and education stations and contribution of \$250,000 for the construction of off-site public recreational facilities addresses the recreational needs of the new residents.

The Department of Parks and Recreation staff recommends to the Planning Board the following conditions of approval for Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002:

- a. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan (DSP). The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
- b. The dedication of 108± acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and

floodplain buffer to the M-NCPPC as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit "A."

- c. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to conditions 1 through 9 of attached Exhibit "B".
 - d. The applicant shall construct a 10-foot-wide asphalt surface hiker/biker/equestrian trail along the Patuxent River. DPR staff shall determine the exact location of the trail at the time of the DSP review and approval. The trail shall be located on dedicated parkland and/or in an easement where appropriate. The trail shall be connected to trailhead facilities on dedicated parkland. The applicant shall construct the master planned trail in phase with development.
 - e. Prior to certificate approval of the CSP-06002, the applicant shall revise the plan to show the conceptual trail layout of the master planned trail on dedicated parkland.
 - f. The applicant shall construct eight-foot-wide asphalt trail connectors from the neighborhoods to the master planned trail along the Patuxent River. The location of the trail connectors shall be determined at the time of DSP.
 - g. The applicant shall construct an access road and gravel parking at the public access/trailhead. The specific location and size of the parking lot shall be determined at the time of DSP.
 - h. Prior to the approval of the first final plat for the project, the applicant shall make a monetary contribution in amount of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex.
 - i. Prior to issuance of the 50 percent of the residential building permits, all public recreation facilities shall be constructed.
 - j. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the public park.
 - k. The applicant shall submit three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFAs) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
 - l. The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
20. The Community Planning Division found that the application is consistent with the 2002 *General*

Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier. CSP-06002 is located in the Developing Tier. The vision for the Developing Tier is to maintain a pattern of low- to moderate-density suburban residential communities, distinct commercial Centers, and employment areas that are increasingly transit serviceable.

The 2006 *Bowie & Vicinity Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, 74B* rezoned the property from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone. The 2006 *Approved Bowie & Vicinity Master Plan* recommends mixed-use development for the Melford property. It recommends the area be developed with a moderate- to high-density mixture of office, employment, retail, hotel, residential and parkland/open space uses (p.12, the master plan, p.40, CR-11-2006). The plan recommends that the component for residential development be provided in the range of 20 percent to 30 percent of the total development and the component for office/employment/retail/hotel development be provided in the range of 70 percent to 80 percent. The residential component shall be no greater than 866 dwelling units. The residential component shall include single-family attached residential (6 to 11 dwellings per acre), multifamily residential (at up to 30 dwellings per acre), senior housing units (p.40, CR-11-2006) and live/work units. This application conforms to the land use recommendations for mixed-use development of the 2006 *Approved Bowie & Vicinity Master Plan*. However, the proposal has a few minor inconsistencies with the master plan's Melford illustrative concept map.

*[Staff] Comment: The proposal is consistent with the master plan's guidelines. However, the applicant has not provided enough information for staff to evaluate the percentage of senior housing stated per CR-11-2006 on page 40.

Land Use Patterns

Plan Recommendations: The Melford illustrative concept map in the master plan shows office development north of US 50. It shows higher residential development in the midst of the property.

Applicant's proposal: The applicant's proposal shows R&D buildings for the area immediately north of John Hanson Highway (US 50) and provides single-family attached residential development and a public use the midst of the property. It adds offices to the central area.

*[Staff] Comment: These changes do not impair the integrity of the Melford Illustrative Concept.

21. The application was sent to the City of Bowie and the following letter dated April 4, 2006, G. Frederick Robinson, Mayor, to Chairman Parker, contains the City's recommendation for this project:

“The City has received notice of a Conceptual Site Plan (CSP) filed by St. John Properties for mixed-use development on 334 acres of land located in the northeast quadrant of US 50/301 and MD 3 at the site now known as Melford (i.e. the Maryland

Science and Technology Center). The plan includes 2,622,740 square feet of employment use, including a 200,000 square foot hotel/conference center and 65,000 square feet of retail and restaurant uses. The plan also includes 866 dwelling units (including 20-25 percent senior units).

“While some of the uses proposed in the CSP are permissible under the City's covenants on the property, residential use is not. Therefore, the developer cannot implement the plan, as proposed. The City Council finds that the proposed development plan should not be approved because it cannot be implemented due to the conflict with City covenants. The City therefore recommends DISAPPROVAL of CSP 06002 for Melford.”

- 22. At the Planning Board hearing, a number of residents of the Sherwood Manor Subdivision testified in opposition to the case, incorporating exhibits (Opponent Exhibits No. 1-13) into the record.
- 23. As required by Section 27-276(b), the CSP represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

*24. The applicant submitted the following proposed development standards for consideration:

	<u>SFA</u>	<u>SFD</u>	<u>MF</u>
<u>Unit Count</u>	<u>341~316</u>	<u>25~50</u>	<u>500</u>
<u>Unit Size</u>	<u>2,400–2,600 sf</u>	<u>3,000–4,000 sf</u>	<u>1,000 sf</u>
<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>1,200–2,400 sf</u>	<u>4,700–50,500 sf</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Minimum width at front street R-O-W.</u>	<u>20'</u>	<u>55'</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Minimum Frontage on Cul-de-sacs</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>45'</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u>	<u>65%-85%</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>90%</u>
<u>Minimum Setback from R-O-W.</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>
<u>Minimum Side Setback</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>

<u>Minimum Rear Setback</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>None</u>
<u>Minimum Corner Setback to Side Street R-O-W.</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>
<u>Maximum Residential Building Height</u>	<u>40'</u>	<u>35'</u>	<u>50'</u>
<u>Minimum Green Area</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>10%</u>

***[Staff] Comment:** The proposal appears to meet the requirements of CR-11-2006 in regard to guideline number 7. The staff suggests that the minimum finished living area for the single-family detached be increased slightly to accommodate a minimum of 20 percent of the units with a minimum finished living area of 4,000 square feet. In order to address building height issues, the staff recommends an additional five feet in the height of buildings for the single-family detached units.

In regard to the single-family attached units, the minimum lot size is subject to Section 27-548, which requires not less than 1,800 square feet of area. The lot coverage for the single-family attached should be adjusted to conform to the R-T regulations that govern yard area. Setbacks for the single-family units should be increased to 20 feet, if there are front load garages proposed, in order to allow for on-lot parking. In order to address building height issues, the staff recommends an additional five feet in the height of buildings for the single-family attached units as well.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

In regard to the multifamily units, which category should also include dwelling types other than a single-family units such as two-over-two (stacked townhouse) units, the lot coverage should be reduced to no more than 80 percent and the green area should not be less than 20 percent. However, if the application for detailed site plan is for an urban, densely designed portion of the project that includes structured parking, then the applicant's proposal of 90 percent lot coverage and 10 percent green area should be acceptable. The building height of multifamily should be increased to 60 feet.

As has been the accepted process for the development of standards at the early phases of the development review process, the staff does recommend that a standard note be attached to the proposed chart that allows for variations to the standards on a case-by-case basis.

*25. The application indicates that there will be some private recreational facilities for the site, as shown on the recreational plan, but the identification of those facilities is somewhat vague, as the plan uses terminology that is not consistent with the Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines. Therefore the staff recommends that the plans be revised prior to signature approval to be consistent with those guidelines and to indicate a timing element for the construction. Further, at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision, a determination of the appropriateness of providing indoor recreational facilities and/or community meeting space, and a timing element associated with their construction, should be addressed.

*26. The Maryland Department of Planning (MDP) sent a letter dated November 28, 2006, to Chairman Parker requesting the opportunity to review the conceptual site plan application. A copy of the application was sent to the MDP. As of the writing of this report, no comments have been submitted to this office.

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/44/98-02), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 2,774 AM or 3,593 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified herein above shall require a revision to the CSP with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

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

(A) At MD 3/MD 450/gas station access intersection

The applicant shall provide an additional northbound and southbound through lane. Pursuant to SHA requirements, the additional southbound through lane shall begin at the Patuxent River Bridge, and extend 2,000 feet south of MD 450. Similarly, the additional northbound through lane shall begin 2,000 feet south of MD 450, and extend to the Patuxent River Bridge, north of MD 450.

(B) At US 301/Gov. Bridge Road/Harbor Way intersection

The applicant shall provide an additional exclusive left turn lane on the eastbound approach. The overall lane use for this approach shall be two left turn lanes and a shared left-through-right lane.

3. The site plans should be revised to delineate and note both the Environmental Setting and Impact Area for Melford, Historic Site 71B-016.
4. Applicable detailed site plans shall demonstrate that proposed buildings do not obstruct the historic vista of the Melford House.

5. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan for this area, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the impact review area follow the guidelines on page 91 of the CDP-8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.
6. Prior to acceptance of any detailed site plan for this development, through the historic area work permit process the applicant shall present a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site for approval by the HPC and Planning Board. The plan shall be approved (through a HAWP) before approval of the first DSP.
7. At the time of detail site plan for the development Melford Historic Site, outbuildings, and cemetery shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical architectural character. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize any adverse impacts to the historic site
8. Prior to issuance of building permits for the overall property within CSP-06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the historic area work permit process. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed prior to the release of 50 percent of the buildings for the residential units located within Block 1.
9. Prior to approval of any preliminary plan or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that Melford is being properly maintained.
10. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with guideline 3 of CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks should be considered.
11. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate and shown on all affected DSPs.
12. Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the Lower Pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and should be in conformance with guidelines 29 and 30 of CR-11-2006.
13. The illustrative plan provided with the CSP is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout with respect to the limits of disturbance or the placement of residential units. The CSP shall be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision, and the detailed site plans.

14. Prior to signature approval of the CSP and TCPI, the TCPI shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Revise the shading patterns so that the information underneath is legible;
 - b. Eliminate the pattern used to depict previously approved limits of disturbance and show only that limit of disturbance needed for the proposed development;
 - c. Eliminate all clearing not necessary for the conceptual construction of the features shown;
 - d. Revise the existing tree line per Staff Exhibit A (2006 Aerial);
 - e. Provide labels on each cleared area with the acreage and which land pod it is credited to; if cleared areas cross pods, divide them up so that the table on sheet 1 can be checked for correctness;
 - f. Revise the worksheet to reflect all cleared areas, preservation areas, etc.;
 - g. Revise the table on Sheet 1 to fill in all the boxes;
 - h. Add the following note: "This TCPI is associated with the approval of CSP-06002 and as such is conceptual in nature. It is subject to further revisions with the preliminary plan of subdivision application.";
 - i. Revise the plans to address all other comments; and
 - j. Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plans.
15. Prior to signature approval of the CSP and at least 30 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCPI shall be revised to remove all buildings, roads, trails and other amenities from the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain. Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbance to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where these buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested wherever possible. The TCPI associated with the preliminary plan will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans and shall be honored.
16. During the review of the TCPI associated with the preliminary plan, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.
17. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan, a new preliminary plan of subdivision for the proposed residential development shall be approved.

18. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan (DSP). The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
19. The applicant shall dedicate 108± acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer to the M-NCPPC as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit "A".
20. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to conditions 1 through 9 of attached Exhibit "B".
21. The applicant shall construct a ten-foot-wide asphalt surface hiker/biker/equestrian trail along the Patuxent River. DPR staff shall determine the exact location of the trail at the time of the DSP review and approval. The trail shall be located on dedicated parkland and/or in an easement where appropriate. The trail shall be connected to trailhead facilities on dedicated parkland.
22. Prior to certificate approval of the CSP-06002, the applicant shall revise the plan to show the conceptual trail layout of the master planned trail on dedicated parkland.
23. The applicant shall construct 8-foot-wide asphalt trail connectors from the neighborhoods to the master planned trail along the Patuxent River. The location of the trail connectors shall be determined at the time of DSP.
24. The applicant shall construct an access road and gravel parking at the public access/trailhead. The specific location and size of the parking lot shall be determined at the time of DSP.
25. Prior to approval of the first final plat for the project, the applicant shall make a monetary contribution in the amount of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex.
26. Prior to issuance of the 50 percent of the residential building permits, all public recreation facilities shall be constructed.
27. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the public park.
28. The applicant shall submit three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by the DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

29. The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
30. Prior to the approval of the Preliminary Plan and Detailed site plan, the following shall be demonstrated:
 - a. A minimum of 20 percent of the units shall be senior housing and a maximum of 25 percent of the units shall be senior housing, in both the single-family attached units and the multifamily units.
 - b. All residential development proposals shall demonstrate that interior noise levels will conform to State of Maryland (COMAR) noise regulations.
 - c. Development plans shall show the minimization of impervious surfaces through various phases of the project. Early phases of the project may use surface parking and later phases of development will seek to reclaim the surface parking by the use of structured parking to the maximum extent possible.
 - d. Streams shall have a 100-foot natural buffer and a 150 foot-wide building and parking setback. There shall be a 150-foot buffer on the 100-year floodplain. If a utility must be extended into any buffer, than an equal area of natural buffer alternative shall be retained on the community property.
 - e. Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested in cooperation with the appropriate utility.
 - f. Community recreational facilities shall take full advantage of environmental features on and adjacent to the property, and shall include extensive trail and boardwalk systems. These recreational facilities may also include educational features for the general public and public schools, such as kiosks along the trails, boardwalks at observation points, and education stations, with curriculum available to schools for use in specific locations.
 - g. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and link the uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.
31. Prior to the to submission of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for evaluating the resource at the Phase II level. In accordance with the *Guidelines for Archeological Review*, if a Phase II archeological evaluation is necessary, the applicant shall submit a research design for approval by Historic Preservation staff. After the work is completed, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated to MHT Standards, prior to approval of the preliminary plan.

32. If a site has been identified as significant and potentially eligible to be listed as a historic site or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the applicant shall provide a plan for:
- a. Avoiding and preserving the resource in place, or for
 - b. Phase III data recovery investigations and interpretation.

Phase III Data Recovery investigations may not begin until Historic Preservation staff have given written approval of the research design. The Phase III (Treatment/Data Recovery) final report must be reviewed and be determined to have complied with the *Guidelines for Archeological Review* prior to approval of any grading permits within 50 feet of the perimeter of the site.

33. Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan for each of the following uses, the plans shall demonstrate conformance to the following guidelines:
- a. Retail uses shall be designed to:
 - i. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.
 - ii. Create outdoor amenities, such as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners high quality street furniture and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.
 - iii. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes and customized shopfronts to create a street-like rhythm.
 - iv. Provide attractive, quality facades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC and other unsightly functions.
 - v. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street front experiences to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment[; a]. All uses are connected by sidewalks; crosswalks run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks are wide, appealing, shaded and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways are separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, on-street parallel parking and/or structures; walking distances through parking lots are minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings, and walkways are made more

pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.

- vi. Screen parking from the streets and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.
- vii. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, and/or landscape islands.
- viii. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, direct and indirect, high quality, energy efficient lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.
- ix. Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards and requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners, which shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to the existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.
- x. Temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior facades of a building shall not be permitted.
- xi. Design retail pad sites to be compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.
- xii. Green areas or public plazas should be provided between pad sites.
- xiii. Restaurants should have attractive outdoor seating areas with views of the public spaces/lakes or other natural features.

b. Residential uses shall meet the following design standards:

Single-family detached:

- i. There shall be a range of lot sizes, with a minimum square footage on any lot of three thousand (3,000) square feet of finished living space.
- ii. At least 20 percent of the houses shall be a minimum of 4,000 square feet of finished living space.
- iii. Garages should not dominate the streetscape, and all garages should either be detached, or located in the rear (accessible by alleys or driveways), attached and set back a minimum of eight feet from the façade, or attached and oriented for side entry access.

Multifamily and single-family attached:

- i. Building design and materials shall be high quality, enduring and distinctive.
 - ii. Use of siding should be limited.
 - iii. A significant number of amenities, such as are typically provided for luxury projects shall be provided.
34. Any additional research and development type flex space and/or warehouses shall be limited to not more than ten percent of total non-residential space. Generally this flex space is intended as an interim use, which shall be redeveloped predominantly with office use, as market conditions permit. When an area is initially developed as research/development, flex space and/or warehouses, that area should be the first considered for redevelopment when market conditions permit new office development. The long-term goal is that all of the non-residential uses would be office with retail (including a main street) and hotel.
 35. Any detailed site plan (DSP) for new research and development type “flex space” shall be limited to not more than 10 percent of total non-residential space (excluding existing research and development) within the M-X-T zone.
 36. All stream channels on the site should be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.
 37. A minimum of fifty percent of parking for multifamily uses shall be structured parking.
 38. Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:
 - a. The design of the stormwater management ponds shall show them as amenities with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.
 - b. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site illustrating the history of the area.
 - c. The proposed lighting system shall include the use of full cut-off lighting systems with limited light spill over.
 39. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the coversheet shall be revised to clearly indicate the limits of the application.
 40. Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot wide landscape buffer between the development and US 50, if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.

41. The mixed-use ratio of the design plans shall be the following, based on the total gross floor area for residential and Employment/Office/Retail/Hotel combined:

	Minimum	Maximum
Residential	20%	30%
Office/Employment/Retail/Hotel	70%	80%

The residential component shall be no greater than 866 dwelling units.

*42. The following standards shall apply to the development:

	<u>SFA</u>	<u>SFD</u>	<u>MF</u>
<u>Unit Count</u>	<u>341~316</u>	<u>25~50</u>	<u>500</u>
<u>Unit Size</u>	<u>2,400–2,600 sf</u>	<u>3,000–4,000 sf</u>	<u>1,000 sf</u>
<u>Lot Size</u>	<u>1,800–2,400 sf</u>	<u>4,700–50,500 sf</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Minimum width at front street R-O-W</u>	<u>20'</u>	<u>55'</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Minimum Frontage on Cul-de-sacs</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>45'</u>	<u>N/A</u>
<u>Maximum Lot Coverage</u>	<u>400 sf yard area</u>	<u>40%</u>	<u>80%*</u>
<u>Minimum Setback from R-O-W.</u>	<u>10**</u>	<u>10**</u>	<u>10'</u>
<u>Minimum Side Setback</u>	<u>None</u>	<u>10****</u>	<u>10'</u>
<u>Minimum Rear Setback</u>	<u>None****</u>	<u>None****</u>	<u>None****</u>
<u>Minimum Corner Setback to Side Street R-O-W</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>	<u>10'</u>
<u>Maximum Residential Building Height</u>	<u>45'</u>	<u>40'</u>	<u>60'</u>
<u>Minimum Green Area</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>20%*****</u>

Footnote: Variations to the standards may be permitted on a case-by-case basis by the Planning Board at the time of detailed site plan if circumstances warrant.

±* Maximum lot coverage for multifamily development with structured parking may be increased to 90 percent.

±** Setbacks from the R-O-W shall increase to 20 feet if the products are proposed as front-loaded garages.

±*** Side yard setbacks may be reduced to 7 feet for lots less than 6,000 square feet.

±**** To be determined at detailed site plan.

±***** Minimum green area may be reduced to 10 percent if structured parking is proposed.

*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

±indicates change beside existing asterisk

- *43. Prior to signature approval, the recreational plan shall be revised to be consistent with the Parks and Recreational Facilities Guidelines and to indicate a proposed schedule for the construction of those facilities.
- *44. Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision, a determination of the appropriateness of providing indoor recreational facilities and/or a community meeting space for use by the overall community, and a timing element associated with the construction, shall be addressed.

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 Clark, with Commissioners Eley, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 11, 2007, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 15th day of February 2007.

R. Bruce Crawford
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

R
BC:FJG:SL:bjjs

PGCPB No. 07-09(C)
File No. CSP-06002
Page 55

*Denotes Correction
Underlining indicates new language