



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*

## DETAILED SITE PLAN

## DSP-07011

Application	General Data
<b>Project Name:</b> WOODMORE TOWNE CENTRE (INGLEWOOD NORTH)  <b>Location:</b> NORTHEAST QUADRANT OF CAPITAL BELTWAY AND LANDOVER ROAD (MD 202)  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> Petrie/ELG Inglewood, LLC 170 Jennifer Road, Suite 300 Annapolis, MD 21401  WTC Venture, LLC 9701 Apollo Drive, Suite 400 Upper Marlboro, MD 20774	Date Accepted: 06/05/2007
	Planning Board Action Limit: 10/04/2007
	Plan Acreage: 244.67
	Zone: M-X-T
	Dwelling Units: N/A
	Square Footage: N/A
	Planning Area: 73
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 05
	Municipality: Glenarden
	200-Scale Base Map: 204NE08

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Detailed site plan for infrastructure, including mass grading, retaining walls, street construction, stormwater management, water, sewer, stormdrain and other utilities.	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 03/07/2007 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 06/19/2007

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Lareuse/Reed	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan for Infrastructure DSP-07011  
Woodmore Town Center

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan for infrastructure for the subject property and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. Conformance with the Zoning Ordinance:
  - (1) Section 27-285(b)(3), Required Findings for a Detailed Site Plan for Infrastructure.
  - (2) The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-X-T Zone.
- b. Conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C.
- c. Conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006.
- d. Conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-06016.
- e. Conformance to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
- f. Conformance to the *Landscape Manual*.
- g. Referrals.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for infrastructure, including rough grading, stormwater management facilities, the extension of water and sewer to the site, and the paving of the main roadways in the M-X-T (Mixed-Use Transportation-Oriented) Zone.

2. **Development Data Summary**

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>PROPOSED</b>
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Infrastructure
Acreage	244.67	244.67
Lots	0	0
Parcels	17	17
Square Footage/GFA	0	0
Dwelling Units:	N/A	N/A

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 5. More specifically, the property is located on the north side of Landover Road (MD 202), approximately 550 feet northwest of its intersection with Saint Josephs Drive, immediately adjacent to and east of the Capital Beltway (I-495/95).

4. **Surroundings and Use:**

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

East: The property is bounded on the east by two portions of a new single-family detached subdivision that is known as Balk Hill, dissected by a new extension of Campus Way North that will terminate at the eastern edge of the subject property.

South: The property directly to the south is the Saint Josephs Roman Catholic Parish Center. Also, along the southern edge of the subject property is the currently terminated Saint Josephs Drive and vacant property in the M-X-T Zone.

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

5. **Previous Approvals:** On March 14, 1988, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C, rezoning the subject property from the R-R to the M-X-T Zone subject to 11 conditions. On January 23, 2006, the District Council approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006, which proposed 900-1,100 residential units, including single-family detached units, single-family attached units (townhouses), multifamily units, stacked condominiums (stacked townhouses), 400,000-1,000,000 square feet of retail and 400,000-1,000,000 square feet of office subject to 25 conditions and 1 consideration. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was approved subject to 40 conditions on October 26, 2006. The plan proposed 1,079 dwelling units, 750,000 square feet of commercial retail, 1,000,000 square feet of commercial office and a 360-room hotel on 375 residential lots, 39 commercial lots and 17 parcels. The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan approval (20908-2003-01) valid through April 18, 2008.

6. **Design Features:** The detailed site plan for infrastructure proposes three access points to the subject site: one from the southeast via Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, a 110-foot right-of-way; another from the east via an extension of Campus Way North, a 90-foot right-of-way; and from

the west via a connection to Glenarden Parkway. An additional access point is proposed in the future via the connection of the Evarts Street overpass of I-495/95; however this connection is not included in this detailed site plan application, but proposes Evarts Street as ending in a cul-de-sac design. Campus Way North and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard converge at a roundabout at the core of the site, dividing the development into four quadrants and establishing a strong visual axis. Circulation within the site is organized by the provision of four roundabouts. The roundabouts link the project to the surrounding community; the feature is employed in the design of nearby Balk Hill and is proposed in the off-site improvement of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard immediately adjacent to the subject site. In the western portion of the project, Ruby Lockhart Boulevard forks into Evarts Street to the south, which, subject to a future detailed site plan, will be extended, passing over the Capital Beltway and connecting on its western side; and Tower Place to the north, which will be partially constructed under this DSP and extended in the future. Each of the aforementioned roads includes a five- to eight-foot sidewalk on each side. Crosswalks are provided at intersections and are articulated with interlocking pavers as detailed on the plans. Each roundabout features a two-foot-wide brick perimeter arch Belgian block edging and an extensively landscaped center island designed with deciduous and evergreen shrubs, perennials and grasses. Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and Campus Way incorporate ten-foot landscaped medians. Two steel girder bridges are proposed within the development: one on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and another on Tower Place. Specific details have not been provided for the proposed bridges.

Rough grading is proposed for the secondary roadways that will directly serve most of the residential, retail and office uses within the development. The proposed layout establishes a natural hierarchy of streets, which organizes the varied uses within the project.

The roadway system will be public rights-of-way except where alleys serving single-family dwellings are shown, which will be part of the lands of the future homeowners association. It is the staff's understanding that the roadways associated with the residential development will be primarily owned and maintained by the City of Glenarden. The remaining roadway system will be designed under the review of the Department of Public Works and Transportation and will be inspected by the same, but will be maintained by the commercial entity.

A combination of underground and surface stormwater management facilities is proposed.

The Department of Environmental Resources approved the Stormwater Management Concept (20908-2003-1) on April 18, 2005.

Several retaining walls are proposed in various locations within the development. Typical details are provided for these walls, and the height of each wall is indicated on the plans. All retaining walls, including those of significant size on the site will be constructed as part of the approval of this infrastructure plan. The major walls are located in three specific sites on the property, which are designed to create flat areas of the site for development and for the protection of the natural features on the site. The walls vary in size from two to approximately 35 feet in height. Some of the walls will be visible from the entrance into the development and from the Capital Beltway. The details proposed for the walls are shown as a typical key stone wall design. The applicant has provided details and specifications of the walls in a blue/grey color, shown as "Westchester." The top of these walls will require safety elements to protect vehicles and pedestrians from falling over the top of the wall. The safety barriers include a typical guardrail, rail barrier, masonry parapet and chain-link fencing.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. Concurrent with the subject detailed site plan, the applicant has submitted a request to the District Council to amend or delete certain conditions attached to the rezoning of this property. The District Council heard the case on July 9, 2007 and their final action is anticipated to be taken on July 23, 2007. The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A 9613-C, approved on March 18, 1988, and applicable conditions of approval. The following conditions warrant discussion and relate to the review of the subject detailed site plan:

**4. Development regulations shall at a minimum conform with regulations for the I-3 Zone, except in the area the applicant designated as a “Central Business District”.**

Comment: This condition applies to the office portion of the project and would be applicable upon submission of an application for a detailed site plan for the development of the office component; however, this condition is proposed to be deleted in the applicant’s request to amend conditions as stated in letter dated March 30, 2007, Edward C. Gibbs, Jr., to Redis Floyd.

**5. Buildings located on lots that abut residentially zoned properties shall not exceed the height limit in that zone, unless a determination is made by the Planning Board that mitigating factors such as setbacks, topography and vegetation are sufficient to buffer the views from adjacent residential lands.**

Comment: This condition is not applicable at this time since no buildings are proposed and would be addressed in the review of future detailed site plans for the residential portion of the site; however, this condition is proposed to be deleted in the applicant’s request to amend Conditions as stated in letter dated March 30, 2007, Edward C. Gibbs, Jr., to Redis Floyd.

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

Comment: No lots are proposed to have direct access to either Campus Way or Saint Josephs Drive. This condition requires that development generally be oriented inward toward internal streets rather than toward Campus Way and St. Josephs Drive. No development is proposed on this plan. However, the development was planned at the conceptual and preliminary plan stages to have as little development as possible having access oriented directly onto the primary streets traversing this site. The applicant has proposed a revised condition as part of the request to amend conditions that is currently pending final action by the District Council. The revised conditions states the following, as stated in a letter dated March 30, 2007 Gibbs to Floyd:

“Development within the retail town center should be oriented inward with access primarily from internal streets. Offices and hotels located along the site’s frontage on the Capital Beltway and at its entrance from St. Joseph’s Drive may be oriented toward the Capital Beltway and the project entrance, respectively. A connection shall be made from the single-family detached component to Glenarden Parkway. Individual building sites shall minimize access to Campus Way and St. Joseph’s Drive. The Planning Board and/or District Council, as appropriate, shall approve access points onto these thoroughfares at the time of detailed site plan approval.”

Comment: The revised conditions apply to this infrastructure plan in regard to the proposed vehicular connection from the single family detached development to Glenarden Parkway. The relationship of the development to the surrounding development and roadways as stated above shall be further analyzed at the time of detailed site plans for the construction of buildings.

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

Comment: Condition 7 (a)-(d) above specifies the level of transportation study and the findings to be made in connection with approval of the conceptual site plan and the preliminary plan of subdivision. The conditions above are proposed to be deleted in the request to amend conditions that is currently pending District Council review.

- e. **Each detailed site plan shall include a status report identifying the amount of approved development and status of corresponding required highway improvements. To approve a detailed site plan, the Planning Board shall find the plan is in conformance with the approved staging requirements.**

Comment: This condition requires the provision of a status report of the amount of approved development and the status of the corresponding transportation conditions. The current plan involves infrastructure only, and no development is either proposed on this plan or has approval under any previous plans. Given that no development is approved to this point and no development will be approved by this plan, there are no transportation improvements for which a status must be reported. This condition will be enforced as subsequent plans are reviewed. In turn, at this time it is determined that the Planning Board can find that the current plan is in accordance with the approved transportation staging requirements. Further, this condition is proposed to be retained in the applicant's request to amend conditions.

8. **Any retail component planned for the property shall be designed as an integral part of the mixed use development, be oriented to primarily serve the subject**

**development, and shall not be designed to serve as a neighborhood, community or village activity center.**

Comment: This condition does not apply at this time because no uses are proposed. This condition is proposed to be deleted in the applicant's request to amend conditions as stated in letter dated March 30, 2007, Edward C. Gibbs, Jr., to Redis Floyd.

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

Comment: This condition is not applicable at this time and will be addressed during the review of future detailed site plans, when the uses and structures are proposed. However, the condition is proposed to be deleted in the applicant's request to amend Conditions as stated in a letter dated March 30, 2007, Edward C. Gibbs, Jr., to Redis Floyd.

- 10. All buildings, except single-family dwellings, shall be fully equipped with automatic fire suppression systems in accordance with National Fire Protection Association Standard 13 and all applicable County laws.**

Comment: This condition is not applicable at this time because no building construction is proposed. It will be incorporated in the conditions of approval of all future detailed site plans. This condition is proposed to be retained in the applicant's request to amend conditions.

- 11. The District Council shall review for approval the Conceptual Site Plan, the Detailed Site Plan, and the preliminary plan of subdivision for the subject property.**

Comment: The District Council will review this and all future detailed site plans. This condition is proposed to be modified in the applicant's request to amend conditions, but will not impact the review of the detailed site plan by the District Council.

8. The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 and the applicable conditions of approval. The following conditions are relevant to the review of the detailed site plan:

- 2.a. At the time of submission of the first preliminary plan of subdivision for the project, the applicant and successors or assignees shall submit for approval a full traffic study, as required in the Planning Board's Adopted Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals. Staff and Planning Board shall thoroughly review the anticipated impacts of the project on major intersections within Glenarden. At the time of submission of the first detailed site plan, the applicant and successors or assignees shall submit for approval a study showing the effects of the proposed connection between the project and Glenarden Parkway, unless otherwise requested by the District Council. [emphasis added]**

Comment: This condition requires that the applicant submit a full traffic study at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision. This study was done, and includes two major intersections within or adjacent to the City of Glenarden. Further work was required at the time of the initial detailed site plan to perform a study showing the effects of the proposed connection between the project and Glenarden Parkway. This study was submitted on June 29, 2007, and the findings are acceptable and consistent with the findings made at the time of preliminary plan. Further review and recommendations will be made at such time that a future site plan that actually includes the street connection (construction) to Glenarden Parkway is submitted for review.

**11. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan:**

- a. The TCPI shall be revised to eliminate approximately six acres of woodland conservation from the 13.5 acre parcel to be dedicated to DPR. The off-site mitigation acreage shall be increased accordingly in the woodland conservation worksheet.**

Comment: This revision to the TCPI was made prior to certificate approval; however, the off-site mitigation acreage was changed in the -01 revision to the TCPI to a fee-in-lieu payment. The TCPI -01 revision included the site's woodland conservation requirement shown in the worksheet to be met with on-site preservation and a fee-in-lieu payment; the latter method replaced the off-site mitigation method.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to show a county-phased worksheet with phase one representing the proposed grading and infrastructure improvements in DSP-07011. The revised, county-phased worksheet cannot show a shortage regarding how the site's woodland conservation requirement will be addressed and the phased worksheet shall show the correct fee-in-lieu. The first phase in the revised worksheet shall be represented by the subject DSP and TCPII and include all proposed on and off-site clearing.

**12. At the time of detailed site plan review, if residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.**

Comment: The subject DSP is only for proposed grading and infrastructure improvements. This condition must be addressed when a DSP is submitted for the review of proposed buildings and the above condition should be modified to stipulate the review will be required at the time of a DSP for residential uses.

**Recommended Condition:** At the time of detailed site plan review for residential uses, if any residential buildings are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.

**14.c. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design. Such fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by DPW&T and/or the City of Glenarden as appropriate prior to or by the time of approval of the appropriate detailed site plan.**

Comment: The location and details of proposed light fixtures have been provided for the streets that are proposed to be completed under this application. A condition has been proposed below

requiring the review and approval of these fixtures by the City of Glenarden, as appropriate, prior to signature approval of this detailed site plan. The Environmental Planning Section requests that full cut-off and optic light fixtures be used in the commercial parking lots and residential areas to minimize night-light pollution. A condition has also been incorporated requiring the use of the approved fixture and/or coordinating fixtures throughout the development.

**14.d. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate access areas, such as, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily development, and the office/retail development.**

Comment: The central recreation area and entrances to the multifamily development and the office/retail development are not proposed with this infrastructure DSP. A condition has been included requiring that the appropriate future detailed site plan demonstrate conformance with this condition.

**14.e. A double row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along major boulevards on both sides of the sidewalks, if determined to be necessary. The inside row of trees are allowed to be located in the yard and may be used to fulfill Section 4.1 of the *Landscape Manual*. In addition, a double row of two and one half to three inch caliper trees shall be provided along the interior street which extends from the extension of Glenarden Parkway to the residential Pod F community center, which a road segment shall not be required to be a boulevard with median.**

Comment: The plans propose to create public streets that do not adhere to the typical DPW&T standards for development. The streets will be ultimately maintained by the applicant, not DPW&T. The staff has reviewed street cross sections and finds that the cross section proposed for Campus Way does not provide for an adequate landscape strip in which to plant shade trees along each edge of the right-of-way. The dimension is shown as three feet from the face of curb to the sidewalk. Therefore, the staff recommends that the plans be revised to increase the minimum right-of-way for Campus Way in order to provide for 5 feet from the face of curb to the sidewalk on both sides of the street in order to provide adequate planting area for street trees.

**14.g. The location of future pedestrian connections, crosswalks, and proposed locations for bus stops, shall be shown on the plans.**

Comment: Five-foot and eight-foot concrete sidewalks are shown on both sides of each roadway proposed to be paved. Crosswalks have been provided and are articulated with interlocking pavers. However, the plan shows no bus stops. Communications with the transit operators have indicated that these agencies cannot review the placement of bus stops until uses are actually proposed. Any of the streets shown on this plan can be modified with a bump-out to serve bus vehicles or a shelter to serve passengers once it is determined that it would be appropriate. Compliance with this condition will be checked as subsequent site plans are submitted.

**15. Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision and detailed site plan, the plans shall reflect the total number of single family detached residential units. No more than 30 percent shall have lot frontages of 50 feet at the street line.**

Comment: The plans show schematically the layout of lots, but for the residential development, a detailed site plan for the development of the lots including the building pads for the units must be approved prior to final plat. It should be emphasized that approval of the subject detailed site plan showing a schematic lot layout is not a sufficient basis upon which to approve final plats for the

single-family lot areas of this development. For this reason, staff conclude that the condition above does not apply to this DSP for infrastructure.

**16. The following transportation-related conditions shall be fulfilled:**

- a. The applicant, its successors and/or assignees, shall complete the following improvements:**
  - i. Construct Campus Way North extended from its current planned terminus at the boundary of the subject property through the site to the proposed Evert Road bridge as a four lane divided highway, approximately 3,000 linear feet.**
  - ii. Add a 4<sup>th</sup> thru lane along Maryland Route 202, from Lottsford Road to the northbound I-95 ramp, approximately 3,600 linear feet.**
  - iii. Add a 4<sup>th</sup> thru lane along Maryland Route 202, from I-95 to Lottsford Road, approximately 3,600 linear feet.**
  - iv. Add a double left turn lane along Maryland Route 202 to northbound St. Joseph's Drive, approximately 900 linear feet.**
  - v. Rebuild and install the traffic signal at the intersection of Maryland Route 202 and St. Joseph's Drive.**
  - vi. Reconstruct St. Joseph's Drive from Maryland Route 202 to Ruby Lockhart Drive to six lanes in width.**
  - vii. In addition to making the improvements set forth above, the applicant, its successors or assignees, shall pay a Road Club fee. The amount of this fee shall be determined at the time of the approval of the first preliminary subdivision plan filed for this property. This amount shall be determined at the time of the approval of the first preliminary subdivision plan filed for this property. This amount shall be paid at building permit on a pro-rata bases. In determining this amount, the applicant shall receive a credit for any road improvements which it is making at its expense and which are part of the regional improvements identified in the MD 202 Corridor Study.**
  - viii. The timing for the construction of required transportation improvements shall be determined at the time of preliminary subdivision plan approval.**

Comment: This condition enumerates several conditions that were determined to be necessary for adequacy at the time of conceptual site plan review. Subcondition (vii) requires that the amount of the road club fee be determined at the time of preliminary plan. This is further discussed later in this memorandum. Subcondition (viii) requires that the timing for the construction of the improvements in (i) through (vi) be determined at the time of preliminary plan. All of these improvements will be required at the time of building permit for Phase I.

- 16.b. The cross sections along any public streets to be maintained by the City of Glenarden must have approval of the City of Glenarden prior to detailed site plan approval. Such approval shall not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned or delayed.**

Comment: This condition requires that cross-sections for city streets must be approved by the city. This requirement is enforceable at the time of detailed site plan. None of the proposed street construction covered by the subject plan for infrastructure will be inspected, dedicated to, or maintained by the City of Glenarden. Once site plans for areas that will be served by city streets are submitted, this condition will be enforced.

- 17. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:**

- a. Provide the master plan trail along the public roadways extending from Campus Way North to office area “E” as indicated on the submitted CSP.**
- b. Provide the urban pedestrian walkways as indicated on the submitted CSP. The width of the sidewalk within these walkways should be no less than eight feet in areas of street trees, planters, or pedestrian amenities.**
- c. Provide sidewalks or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.**
- d. Provide the trail connection through the park and/or school site from Campus Way North to the pedestrian walkway south of area “C.”**
- e. A more specific analysis of all trail and sidewalk connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional segments of trail or sidewalk may be recommended at that time.**

Comment: Each of the requirements above will be addressed in the review of future detailed site plans for those specific areas.

- 18. The applicant shall undertake the following actions regarding public parks:**

- a. Dedication to the Commission of 13.5± acres as shown on Department of Parks and Recreation Exhibit “A.”**

Comment: Department of Parks and Recreation staff has reviewed the submitted infrastructure plan, including mass grading, street grading, street trees and lighting, utilities, stormwater management, retaining walls, and proposed lot lines, etc. The subject infrastructure plan includes the land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for an active urban park.

The applicant’s proposal for the size of the land area to be dedicated to M-NCPPC is reduced from the size that was required in the approval of the CSP. The preliminary plan of subdivision proposed—and was approved with—the size of the acreage as 11.73 acres, which was shown on the DPR Exhibit A. The plans indicate a park size of 11.73 acres. The Department of Parks and Recreation recommends the following condition to address this issue:

The applicant shall submit revised plans acceptable to the Department of Parks and Recreation that demonstrate conveyance of 11.73 acres of parkland to M-NCPPC. If found acceptable, these plans shall be approved prior to certificate approval of DSP 07011.

Comment: The plans show the dedication of 11.73 acres of parkland, so a condition to revise the plans is not necessary. Additionally, since the Planning Board approved the 11.73 acres at the time of the preliminary plan of subdivision, there is no need for further review by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

- d. A concept plan showing the location and design of the recreational facilities on dedicated parkland shall be submitted to DPR for review 60 days prior to submission of the preliminary plan for the residential portion of the development.**

Comment: The Department of Parks and Recreation provided the following comment regarding this condition:

“This applicant had submitted a park concept plan to DPR for review prior to submission of the Preliminary Plan 4-06016. The Planning Board required revision of the concept plan prior to certificate approval of the preliminary plan. However, this did not occur.”

The Parks Department recommends that this requirement be fulfilled prior to certificate approval of the plans.

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

Comment: After the approval of Preliminary Plan 4-06016 by the Planning Board, an inter-agency meeting, including representatives from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE), reviewed the proposed impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) and expanded buffers in the letter of justification dated August 18, 2006. Any future impacts other than those approved by the Planning Board in Preliminary Plan 4-06016 must be reviewed with a revised preliminary plan of subdivision.

**Recommended Condition:** Any future impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area and expanded buffers other than those conceptually approved by the Planning Board with Preliminary Plan 4-06016 shall require a revised preliminary plan application.

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

Comment: The consideration above should be addressed at the time of the DSP for the development of the main street proposed in the commercial retail area of the site.

9. The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-06016 and the applicable conditions of approval. The following conditions are relevant to the review of the detailed site plan:

- 6. The two crossings of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard over the environmental features on the site, as shown on the preliminary subdivision plan, shall provide for four travel lanes, five-foot bike lanes in each direction, and a five-foot sidewalk on each side. This shall be confirmed at the time of detailed site plan, and the right-of-way for Ruby Lockhart Boulevard shall be adjusted accordingly if necessary.**

Comment: The two crossings of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard over the environmental features has provided for the four travel lanes, five -foot bike lanes in each direction, and an eight-foot sidewalk on each side.

- 9. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved at the time of approval of the DSP.**

Comment: Submittal of DSP-07011 included a Type II tree conservation plan to address this condition. However, because the DSP is only for proposed grading and infrastructure improvements, a note must be located below the standard M-NCPPC TCPII signature approval block on all sheets of the plan.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to remove the extraneous information shown on the plans, such as buildings or parking compounds that are not to be constructed with this plan.

- 10. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 20908-2003-01, and any subsequent revisions.**

Comment: The current plan submittal included the stormwater management concept approval letter issued on April 18, 2005. A note on the letter reads "Revision Pending." Any required revision that significantly departs from the limits of disturbance on the approved TCPI shall require Planning Board review of a revised preliminary plan and TCPI.

**Recommended Condition:** Any required revision to stormwater management concept plan 20908-2003 that significantly departs from the limits of disturbance on the approved TCPI shall require Planning Board review of a revised preliminary plan and TCPI.

- 12. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan and approved CSP-03006, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:**

- a. Provide six-foot wide trail along the west side of Tower Place.**

Comment: This condition has been fulfilled through an alternative design, proposing five-foot-wide sidewalks on both sides of Tower Place and designated bike lanes on both sides of the street. This is actually a preferred alternative so that the pedestrians and the bicyclists are in separate designated areas.

- b. Provide the urban pedestrian walkways on both sides of Ruby Lockhart Drive within the town center.**

Comment: Eight-foot-wide sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides of Ruby Lockhart Drive are shown on the plans.

- c. **Provide sidewalks or wide sidewalks, as shown on the preliminary plan, along both sides of all internal roads.**

Comment: For all streets shown to be constructed on the subject application, the standard or wider sidewalks are proposed.

- d. **At the time of detailed site plan, provide specifications and graphics of the planned pedestrian crossings of Ruby Lockhart Drive between the residential component of the development and the town center. These graphics should address the location and design of the crossings, as well as surface materials, lighting, signage, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features. These crossings should be approved by the Planning Department and the Department of Public Works and Transportation. If necessary, additional crossing options may be considered to ensure safe pedestrian access between the residential development and the town center.**

Comment: At the time of the preliminary plan, staff expressed concern regarding pedestrian safety across Ruby Lockhart Drive between the single-family residential development and the Town Center. This was noted in Condition 12d of 4-06016. Ruby Lockhart Drive is shown as a 110-foot right-of-way. Traffic circles are shown at intersections. This major roadway will separate the residential component of the development from the town center, and staff is concerned about the pedestrian safety for those walking to the town center across this road. Unlike traffic lights, which stop traffic in certain directions to allow pedestrians an opportunity to cross, traffic circles are often not as easily negotiated on foot. Traffic frequently continues to move at a fairly fast, consistent speed, and motorists are occupied with where they want to be in the circle and what other motorists are doing. This can make for a difficult or dangerous situation for pedestrian.

Crosswalks are provided at all legs of intersections and traffic circles. These crosswalks are wide and consist of a contrasting surface material. Pedestrian refuges are provided at most crossings of Ruby Lockhart Drive in the form of medians or islands. However, some of the crosswalks do not include pedestrian refuges and in some areas, islands are provided around the traffic circle, but at the wrong location to serve as a pedestrian refuge. Current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidelines stress the importance of providing pedestrian refuges at crosswalks covering longer distances or multiple lanes of traffic:

“Medians and islands reduce the crossing distance from the curb and allow pedestrians to cross during smaller gaps in traffic. Medians and islands are useful to pedestrians who are unable to judge distances accurately. Medians and islands also help people with slow walking speeds cross long intersections with short signal cycles. Because medians and islands separate traffic into channels going in specific directions, they require crossing pedestrians to watch for traffic coming in only one direction.” (FHWA, Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, Part I of II, Page 57).

Due to the width of the right-of-way along Ruby Lockhart Drive, pedestrian refuges are appropriate at all crosswalk locations along Ruby Lockhart Drive. Although refuges have been provided at most crosswalk locations, two additional locations need to be addressed. More

specifically, a pedestrian refuge is needed at the eastern crosswalk of Ruby Lockhart Drive at the traffic circle (DSP Sheet 3). It is also preferable to have a refuge in the crosswalk across the southern side of the traffic circle as right-turning traffic will not have to stop. Pedestrian refuges are provided at all crossings of the traffic circles on Sheet 5 and Sheet 9. The median along Ruby Lockhart Drive also serves as a pedestrian refuge at several crosswalk locations. It appears that crosswalks will need to be provided at the traffic circle on Sheet 2, but this is beyond the scope of the subject application.

- 21. At the time of final plat approval for those portions of the property including Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and Campus Way North, the applicant, heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall dedicate to M-NCPPC 11.73± acres as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit “A.”**

Comment: It appears from the condition above that the DSP is consistent with the Preliminary plan that proposed and was approved as 11.73 acres.

- 26. Within 60 days from the date of approval of the preliminary plan, DPR shall notify the applicant in writing of certain minor revisions to the park concept plan to include possible relocation of the restroom facility, conceptual landscaping and design of the pedestrian access/plaza area. The applicant shall submit an amended park concept plan to DPR for its review and approval prior to certification of the preliminary plan. Stormwater management for the park shall be provided off of the park site. The detailed site plan for the park, when submitted, shall include a detailed landscape plan.**

Comment: Subdivision staff failed to address this amended concept plan prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and the applicant are at odds over some of the proposed “minor revisions.” This failure on the part of Subdivision staff does not excuse the applicant from their obligation to produce an acceptable park concept plan, which is recommended to be fulfilled prior to signature approval of the subject application.

- 27. All bridges constructed on this site that cross streams shall be designed using piers to reduce impacts. The DSP shall include a detail showing the proposed design, including side views and areas of disturbance needed for construction.**

Comment: The subject DSP contains two detail sheets for the proposed bridges; however, these details do not address the latter part of the second sentence of this condition regarding side views. The TCPII does not include detail sheets for the two proposed bridges and does not provide limits of disturbance for the construction of the bridge piers.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to include a detail of the proposed bridges showing the proposed side views and areas of disturbance needed for construction.

- 29. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.**

Comment: Due to numerous PMA and expanded buffer impacts approved in Preliminary Plan 4-06016, this condition is reiterated as it relates to the DSP for proposed grading and infrastructure improvements.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams, or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.

**30. All future tree conservation plans shall show woodland conservation on-site to be no less than 10 percent of the net tract area.**

Comment: This condition is addressed in the current TCPII worksheet because the site has a net tract area of 231.71 acres and the proposed on-site tree preservation is 24.10 acres, or slightly more than the required 10 percent.

**33. Prior to acceptance of the first detailed site plan, the package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Phase II noise study that reflects the proposed building and grading locations shown on the DSP. A separate sheet within the DSP shall show all unmitigated noise contours and mitigated contours at a scale that clearly shows the noise mitigation measures proposed.**

Comment: The subject DSP is only for proposed grading and infrastructure improvements. The DSP and TCPII for proposed buildings must address this condition. If a revised Phase II noise study is not included in the submittal package, the detailed site plan should not be accepted for processing. The above condition should be modified to make these further stipulations.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to acceptance of DSP-07011 for proposed buildings, the package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Phase II noise study that reflects the proposed building and grading locations shown on the DSP. A separate sheet within the DSP shall show all unmitigated noise contours and mitigated contours at a scale that clearly shows the noise mitigation measures proposed.

**36. The DSP and TCPII shall show all required landscape buffers between stormwater management ponds as required in the stormwater concept approval.**

Comment: The current DSP and TCPII do not address this condition because landscape buffers are not shown on these plans. Condition 36 should be addressed at the time of review of the DSP and TCPII which include landscape plans for SWM ponds. Delaying this required review should allow for the pending revisions to the concept stormwater management plan to be shown on the plans as required.

**Recommended Condition:** At the time of the review of DSP for proposed buildings, the DSP and TCPII shall show all required landscape buffers between stormwater management ponds that are required as part of the stormwater concept approval.

**37. Stormwater from Lots 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 48 Block E and Lot 17 of Block F shall be conveyed in such a manner as to ensure it does not drain onto adjoining properties.**

Comment: The plans do not show how the drainage of these lots will occur to divert water from draining into the adjacent properties.

**38. A 20-foot wide, 80 percent opacity year round buffer is to be provided at the rear of Lots 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28 and 48 Block E and Lot 17 of Block F.**

Comment: The plans do not demonstrate that the above condition can be met. The lots referenced above have frontage on Road C and back-up to existing single-family detached dwellings. A retaining wall is proposed along the rear of the proposed Lots 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, Block E, that will reach a maximum of ten feet in height. Staff are concerned that the future residential structures will tower over the existing homes located on the adjacent properties. Staff recommend that the plans be revised to incorporate a greater lot depth for all of the lots mentioned above, which will impact the layout of Road C as shown on the plans. A greater lot depth will allow for the 20-foot-wide buffer (referenced in Condition 38 above) to be placed at the top of the retaining wall, will allow for the creation of a usable rear yard for the future residents of those specific lots, and will create a greater distance between the house and the rear property line, thereby improving the relationships of the new residential structures, in regard to height, to the existing community. Therefore, the staff recommends that the lot depth of Lots 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, Block E be a minimum of 150 feet. Lots 48 Block E and Lot 17 Block F appear to be designed in such a manner that the impacts of the future units on the adjacent properties will be compatible, without towering over the existing units.

**40. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, the TCPI shall be revised to show the use of fee-in-lieu for that portion of the requirement above the threshold not met on-site at a rate of \$0.30 per square foot. The off-site mitigation shall include the balance of the threshold plus the acreage that was formerly on the parcel to be dedicated to the Department of Parks and Recreation per condition 11a. of the Notice of Final Decision of the District Council, dated February 15, 2006. These funds shall be used only for the costs associated with afforestation/reforestation, woodland site acquisition, and site preparation on public or private lands for establishing woodlands within the City of Glenarden.**

Comment: The worksheet on the current TCPII is the state's worksheet and not a worksheet used in Prince George's County. The plan's current worksheet has a shortage regarding the site's woodland conservation requirement and no fee-in-lieu is shown to address Condition 40. A phased county TCPII worksheet must be used instead of the state worksheet. The revised phased worksheet cannot show a shortage regarding how the site's woodland conservation requirement will be met and the phased worksheet must show the correct fee-in-lieu. The first phase in the revised worksheet should be represented by the subject DSP and TCPII and all proposed on and off-site clearing.

10. The detailed site plan is in general conformance with the requirements of a detailed site plan in the M-X-T Zone, outlined in Section 27-544 of the Zoning Ordinance. These requirements address the compatibility of uses and design elements of proposed development, which are not applicable at this time since no structures are proposed.
11. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/013/05-01.

The site has a woodland conservation threshold (WCT) of 15 percent or 34.76 acres as required by the zone and a woodland conservation requirement of 94.10 acres based on the proposed clearing. A total of 24.10 acres of on-site preservation is proposed. Because a state worksheet is shown on the current plan as mentioned in the Compliance with Prior Approvals section of this memo, there is a shortage of 70.00 acres when a county worksheet is prepared by the Environmental Planning Section. Before the CSP was approved, some site design, infrastructure improvements and related connections were not determined and the Planning Board recognized that the original TCPI with the CSP was conceptual. Because of the significant revisions during the review of the revised TCPI to include infrastructure, it was determined that although the woodland conservation threshold would remain at 15 percent and appropriately shown on the TCPI worksheet, a minimum of 10 percent of the net tract must be met on-site as woodland conservation. The remaining requirement could be met off-site or with fee-in lieu. The revised TCPII worksheet must continue to show a woodland conservation threshold of 15 percent.

The current plan has been reviewed and numerous revisions are necessary. There are four specimen trees identified in the Specimen Tree Table identified to remain at post development (specimen trees #1, and #16-18). All four of these trees are within 100 feet of the proposed limits of disturbance. In the table, protective tree fencing is shown as the preservation method during grading activity. The plan does not have a symbol on it to show the protective fencing adjacent to the specimen trees to remain at post development. Show this proposed feature on the plan with a corresponding symbol in the legend. Specimen tree #17 is located inside the proposed limits of disturbance. Revise the table to show this tree as being removed because it is stated to be in poor condition. For the three remaining specimen trees, add a symbol to the plan for each tree's critical root zone with a corresponding symbol in the legend. The plan shows areas where streams are located on-site; however, the stream buffer symbol in the legend is shown only on sheet 23 of the 24 sheets of the plan. Revise all sheets of the plan where the stream buffer symbol must be shown in relation to streams on-site as found on, but not limited to, sheets 2, 7, 9 and 10. Sheets 18 and 19 are missing from the plan set. According to the NRI, there are steep slopes associated with highly erodible soils and severe slopes in the areas covered by sheets 18 and 19; however, these features are not shown on the coversheet for sheets 18 and 19 of the plan. Submit sheets 18 and 19 of the plan set and ensure that all of the relevant revisions as they relate to sheets 18 and 19 must be shown when the plan set is revised.

The legend has one feature identified as the existing tree line and on other sheets the same symbol is shown as the proposed tree line. The limits of disturbance are shown on a TCPII to demonstrate the future edge of wooded areas. Eliminate the proposed tree line and only show the proposed limits of disturbance (LOD). The existing tree line must be shown consistently on each sheet of the plan and in the legend. The proposed LOD has gaps in it in several locations on the plan. For example, on sheet 2, the proposed LOD is problematic in relation to two proposed, unidentified rectangular features at Ruby Lockhart Drive. These features appear to be the proposed bridge abutments; however, these are not labeled. Show all proposed structures related to the LOD and identify them in the legend. The plan has other sheets with similar unidentified rip rap-like features that do not have corresponding symbols in the legend. Some of these features appear to be areas of rip rap for drainage and possibly bioretention. Sheet 6 has an unidentified symbol shown parallel to the Capital Beltway. All existing and proposed features must be clearly labeled on the plan for the intended purpose with a corresponding symbol in the legend.

The DSP and the TCPII have been reviewed for purposes of comparison. Revise the key map on each plan set so that, for example, sheet 23 of the DSP is the same as sheet 23 of the TCPII. The scope of the plan review is mass grading, streets, street trees, lighting, utilities, stormwater management, retaining walls and proposed lot lines. However, the current plan shows proposed buildings. The TCPII for the proposed scope of work should look similar to the DSP because the latter plan does not show proposed buildings, or the TCPII must be revised to distinguish between what features are proposed in the current approval and what features will be part of future phases. Show the same features on the DSP and TCPII. Provide a title on each sheet of the TCPII to read as follows: "TCPII for infrastructure only." The DSP has several more sheets than the TCPII. These additional sheets show proposed off-site connections for streets and utilities and any proposed clearing must be noted in the worksheet. This aspect is especially important in the TCPII plan set as it relates to the proposed LOD. Both plans must include corresponding sheets for these proposed off-site connections for streets and utilities. The related clearing must be reflected in the worksheet. Both plans show the proposed locations of numerous retaining walls. However, none of the proposed retaining walls on both plans show the ground level elevations and the proposed top of the wall elevations.

Not all of the proposed woodland treatments are clearly or correctly identified on the plan, and some tree preservation areas have utility easements located on them. For example, on sheet 4, the proposed limits of disturbance are shown inside Woodland Preservation Area F. The limits of disturbance must be adjusted and shown along the outer edge of this treatment. Woodland Treatment Areas K and B on sheet 11 and 17, respectively, show proposed utility easements (sheet 11 for a water line and sheet 17 for a sewer line). Proposed utility easements cannot be shown inside these treatment areas that count toward the site's woodland conservation requirement. On sheet 24 in relation to Woodland Preservation Area C, label the triangular wooded area outside the limits of disturbance for its intended purpose (i.e., woodland saved, not counted). Show this proposed treatment to the closest 1/100<sup>th</sup> of an acre with a graphic symbol in the legend and on the plan. After these adjustments have been made to these treatments, revise the worksheet accordingly.

The three standard TCPII notes on detail sheet 25 are outdated. Provide all of the current standard TCPII notes and the applicable optional notes as these relate to the plan set. Sheet 25 also does not have the required edge management notes and these should be provided on detail sheet 25.

The TCPII contains proposed on-site woodland preservation treatments labeled as areas A-Q. These areas contain a total of 24.10 acres of proposed on-site tree preservation. None of the required signage in relation to all of the proposed tree preservation areas has been shown on the plan. Show the location of the required woodland preservation area signage with a corresponding symbol in the legend. The signage must be shown at the required spacing along the outer edges of these areas.

Provide the standard M-NCPPC TCPII signature approval block on each sheet of the plan and type in TCPII/053/07 in the appropriate space. Remove the soils layer from the plan and its corresponding symbol in the legend.

After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.

The Environmental Planning Section recommends conditions relating to revisions to the TCP II be adopted, as stated in the recommendation section of this report.

12. The detailed site plan is not subject to the *Landscape Manual* at this time, since this application is for infrastructure only, indicates street tree planting only, and does not provide for the fine grading of the site.
13. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the following agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. In a memorandum dated June 22, 2007, the **Community Planning Division** indicated that the application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the Largo-Lottsford and Vicinity Master Plan (1990) for mixed-use-transportation-oriented development. The community planner noted that although the proposed plan addresses most, if not all, of the connectivity issues raised in the Community Planning Division's review of the conceptual site plan for this site (CSP-03006), adequacy of the public infrastructure network should be ensured through coordination with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation and Department of Environmental Resources.
- b. In a memorandum dated July 3, 2007, the **Subdivision Section** identified the conditions of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02117 that apply to the review of this detailed site plan and the companion final plat. The Subdivision Section has reviewed the Detailed Site Plan submitted for Woodmore Town Centre, DSP-07011, and offers the following comments:

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was reviewed for the creation of 375 residential lots, 34 commercial lots and 17 parcels. On September 21, 2006, the Planning Board approved the preliminary plan with conditions found in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212. That approval remains valid until September 21, 2012, or until a final plat is approved. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/13/05, was included in the approval of CSP-03006 and underwent an -01 revision during the review of Preliminary Plan 4-06016.

Conformance with PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212 (Preliminary Plan 4-06016)

The lot layout, road configuration and points of access are in conformance with that shown on the approved preliminary plan. The proposed public utility easements (PUE) are confusing, however. The plan must clearly show an unobstructed ten foot PUE parallel and contiguous to all public and private rights of way. PUEs must also be included along or within all access easements across the commercial lots. Therefore, the staff recommends that the plans be clarified prior to signature approval of the plans, to clearly address the locations of public utility easements associated with the for the implementation of any roadways and or private drives that provide access to the development. Further, any refinements to the location and servicing of the individual uses on lot shall be addressed prior to final plat of subdivision, if it is determined, in

accordance with Section 27-270(5), that is allows for the final platting of property prior to detailed site plan approval if the technical staff determines that the site plan approval will not affect the final plat approval.

- c. In a memorandum dated June 22, 2007, the **Transportation Planning Section** addressed the conditions of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-02117 that pertain to trails. The trails planner provided the following analysis:

“Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Proposed On Submitted DSP for Infrastructure:

- A. Standard sidewalks along both sides of St. Joseph’s Drive
- B. Eight-foot wide sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides of Ruby Lockhart Drive
- C. Standard sidewalks along both sides of Campus Way North (extended). This master plan trail corridor is enhanced through the provision of a park trail on the adjacent M-NCPPC parkland to the south of Campus Way North, as shown on the Open Space Diagram of CSP-03006. However, the approved CSP Open Space Diagram provides a depiction of the recreational facilities for the site, including an eight foot wide trail along the east side of Campus Way north extended. The plans should be revised to show the proposed five foot wide sidewalk as eight feet, within the right-of-way along the east side of Campus Way North.
- D. Eight-foot sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides of Evarts Street.
- E. Standard sidewalks and designated bike lanes along Tower Place

The sidewalks, wide sidewalks, and bike lanes meet the intent of the prior approvals. Pedestrian and bicycle accommodations will be provided along the Campus Way North corridor, as recommended in the master plan. The trail on the adjacent parkland is beyond the scope of the subject application, but will be a segment of this connection. Ruby Lockhart Drive and Evarts Street have wide sidewalks and designated bike lanes and will accommodate pedestrians and on-road cyclists along these major corridors. Evarts Street will be a future connection to planned development on the former Landover Mall site. No additional sidewalk connections or bicycle accommodations are recommended at this time, although additional connectors may be recommended at the time the residential component is reviewed.

Sidewalk Connectivity:

Both the CSP and Preliminary Plan require sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads within the Woodmore Towne Center. The submitted DSP includes standard or wide sidewalks along both sides of the roads included in the infrastructure package.

Trail Recommendations:

In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan, CSP-03006, and 4-06016, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:

- (1) Provide the eight-foot wide sidewalks, and designated bike lanes along the entire length of Ruby Lockhart Drive as shown on the submitted DSP.
- (2) Provide standard sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides of Tower Place as shown on the submitted DSP.
- (3) Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of St. Joseph's Drive as shown on the submitted DSP.
- (4) Provide five foot wide sidewalk along the west side of Campus Way North and an eight foot wide sidewalk along the east side of Campus Way North.
- (5) Provide pedestrian refuges at all crosswalks along the traffic circle on Sheet 3.

Comment: The above recommendations have been incorporated as conditions of approval of this detailed site plan.

- d. In a memorandum dated May 1, 2007, the **Environmental Planning Section** indicated the following:

The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the Detailed Site Plan submitted for Woodmore Town Centre, DSP-07011, and the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07, stamped as received on June 8, 2007. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-07011 and TCPII/053/07 subject to the conditions found at the end of this memorandum.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C, which was approved with conditions by the District Council on March 14, 1988. The Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006, on September 29, 2005. The Board's conditions of approval are found in PGCPB No. 05-205. The Notice of Final Decision of the District Council for CSP-03006 is dated February 15, 2006. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was reviewed for the creation of 375 lots for single-family attached and detached dwellings, multifamily attached dwelling units and the commercial portion where 39 lots were proposed. On September 21, 2006, the Planning Board approved the preliminary plan with conditions found in PGCPB No. 06-212. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/13/05, was included in the approval of CSP-03006 and underwent an -01 revision during the review of Preliminary Plan 4-06016.

A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07, was submitted with DSP-07011. The scope of review in DSP-07011 is for infrastructure improvements including mass grading, streets, street trees, lighting, utilities, stormwater management, retaining walls and proposed lot lines.

## Site Description

This 244.67-acre site in the M-X-T zone is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202), and the Capital Beltway (I-495). The site is approximately 94 percent wooded. Regulated environmental features are associated with the site including: streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes with highly erodible soils and severe slopes. Landover Road (MD 202), future Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, a planned arterial road, and the Capital Beltway (I-95/495) have been identified as transportation-related noise generators and noise impacts are anticipated. Nine soil series are found to occur at the site according to the Prince George's County Soil Survey. These soils include: Adelphia, Bibb, Collington, Monmouth, Ochlochnee, Shrewsbury, Silty and Clayey Land and Sunnyside. Although some of these soils have limitations with respect to drainage and infiltration, those limitations will have the greatest significance during the construction phase of any development on this property and will not impact the layout of the proposed uses. Based on available information, Marlboro clay is not found at this location. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in vicinity of the site. According to available information from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program staff, rare, threatened and endangered species are not found in vicinity of the site. According to the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, the site is not within the designated network. The site is located in the headwaters of Cabin Branch in the Anacostia River Basin; and also in the Bald Hill Branch and Southwestern Branch watersheds of the Patuxent River Basin. The site is also in the Largo-Lottsford Planning Area and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the approved General Plan.

## Environmental Review

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

- A. A staff signed natural resources inventory (NRI/021/06) was included in the preliminary plan submittal. The TCPII has been reviewed in relation to the signed NRI regarding the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) delineation on the NRI. The PMA delineation on the current TCPII appears to be in conformance with this feature on the signed NRI.

A detailed forest stand delineation (FSD) was conducted in August 2003. A revised FSD was prepared in June 2005. During the review of CSP-03006, the revised FSD was found to fulfill all technical requirements. No further information regarding the FSD is necessary.

A total of 11 forest stands (Stands F-1 to F-11) were identified in the revised FSD. Nineteen specimen trees are located on the site and these are identified in a Specimen Tree Table on the current TCPII. Of the 11 forest stands, Stand F-9 has high priority retention due to the environmental features within the stand's boundaries. These features include streams, wetlands and areas of 100-year floodplain. Stand F-9 contains approximately 24.0 acres and is dominated by ash and red maple.

**Comment:** No further revisions are required to the TCPII regarding the PMA delineation.

- B. Retaining walls are shown in some areas to be constructed within the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) and adjacent to preservation areas where sufficient space has not been provided for construction. Because the retaining walls are so tall, at least 20 feet of cleared area is needed between the wall and any preservation area.

**Recommended Condition:**

Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to eliminate impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) for proposed retaining walls as shown on, but not limited to, sheets 5 and 16. The plans shall be revised to provide a minimum of 20 feet of cleared, work area on the preservation side of all proposed retaining walls, either by adjusting the limits of disturbance or the retaining wall accordingly in relation to these areas.

- f. In a memorandum dated June 29, 2007, the **Department of Parks and Recreation** indicated the following:

The staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the above referenced detailed site plan for infrastructure for conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance No.13-1988 (Basic Plan A-9613-C), Conceptual Site Plan SP-03006, Preliminary Plan 4-06016, Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, the Land Preservation and Recreation Program for Prince George’s County, and current zoning and subdivision regulations as they pertain to public parks and recreation.

The Department of Parks and Recreation staff reviewed the submitted infrastructure plan and provided the following comments in regard to previous conditions that have not been discussed previously in this report:

- i. **No stormwater management facilities, or tree conservation or utility easements, shall be proposed on land owned by or to be conveyed to M-NCPPC without the prior written consent of DPR. DPR shall review and approve the location and/or design of these features. If such proposals are approved by DPR, a performance bond, maintenance and easement agreements shall be required prior to the issuance of grading permits.**

Comment: The applicant proposes a stormwater management pond on dedicated parkland. DPR staff finds this proposal problematic and unacceptable. It would limit the amount of usable parkland available for active recreational by 0.8 acres and result in park layout inferior to what could otherwise be provided. It may limit the ability of DPR to provide other facilities, such as playgrounds, a picnic area or public art in the park at a later date. In addition, Preliminary Plan 4-0601, Condition 26 requires that stormwater management for the park be provided off of the park site (see below).

- 24. The applicant shall construct the following recreational facilities on the dedicated parkland: one 360-foot x 225-foot artificial turf soccer/football field, a 100 space parking lot, a pavilion, a restroom facility and an architectural fence.**

Comment: The applicant submitted an infrastructure plan which includes a proposal for the mass grading of the parkland and construction of the SWM Pond at the location designated for a 100-space parking compound on a park concept plan. A 100-space parking lot cannot be provided where originally planned and relocation of it would negatively impact the planned park layout for proposed recreational facilities. In addition, in the future it will limit the ability of the department to provide other needed recreational facilities on parkland.

- 26. Within 60 days from the date of approval of the preliminary plan, DPR shall notify the applicant in writing of certain minor revisions to the park concept plan to include possible relocation of the restroom facility, conceptual landscaping and design of the pedestrian assess/plaza area. The applicant shall submit an amended park concept plan to DPR for its review and approval prior to certification of the preliminary plan. Stormwater management for the park shall be provided off of the park site. The detailed site plan for the park, when submitted shall include a detailed landscape plan.**

Comment: DPR staff notified the applicant in writing on January 31, 2007, of certain minor revisions to the applicant's park concept plan. Unfortunately, the applicant did not respond to revisions proposed by DPR, either with a revised plan or with comments regarding the proposed revisions. According to the Department of Parks and Recreation, the applicant must revise the concept plan to address DPR concerns and remove the SWM Pond from the park site to avoid the potential negative impacts mentioned above.

Department of Parks and Recreation staff has reviewed the submitted infrastructure plan; including mass grading, streets grading, street trees and lighting, utilities, stormwater management, retaining walls and proposed lot lines, etc. The subject infrastructure plan includes the land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC for an active urban park.

Since the applicant did not comply with Condition 26 of the Preliminary Plan 4-06016 (above), which required that the applicant shall submit an amended park concept plan to DPR for review and approval prior to certification of the preliminary plan, DPR staff was forced to evaluate the impacts of the proposed infrastructure plan on dedicated parkland and future recreational facilities based on the applicant's originally submitted concept plan (see attached Exhibit "B"). In addition, the applicant's proposal to place the SWM pond on dedicated parkland at the location identified for a 100-space parking lot violates Condition 26 of the Preliminary Plan, which requires that stormwater management for the park shall be provided off of the park site.

DPR staff believes that having an acceptable park concept plan in hand is essential to review of the impacts on a future public park. The concept plan provides information about vehicular and pedestrian circulation on and off the parkland, grading on the parkland, location of the recreational facilities, setbacks and buffers, shows relationships to surrounding residential neighborhoods and to the future hospice facility. The concept plan should be revised and submitted as soon as possible.

DPR staff noticed that the sidewalk along the east side of Campus Way Drive adjacent to the parkland is only five-feet-wide, but along the Ruby Lockhart Drive it is eight-feet-wide. DPR staff believes that the five-foot-wide sidewalk along Campus Way Drive should be expanded to eight feet in order to provide uniform urban setting along the parkland and accommodate the residents, employees and guest of the Woodmore Town Centre.

In summary, the Department of Parks and Recreation recommend that approval of the detailed site plan for infrastructure DSP-07011 be subject to the following conditions:

- a. Prior to certification of the DSP-07011, the applicant shall submit to DPR, for review and approval, the park concept plan which addresses DPR concerns listed in DPR's letter of January 31, 2007.

Comment: This condition has been included in the recommendation section of the report, but since the staff does not have a copy of the January 31, 2007, letter, as of the writing of this report, the condition has been modified accordingly.

- b. The applicant shall revise the plans to remove the SWM Pond from the parkland. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPR staff, if appropriate, prior to certification of the DSP-07011.

Comment: This condition is contained within the recommendation section of this report.

- c. The applicant shall submit revised plans acceptable to the Department of Parks and Recreation that demonstrate conveyance of 11.73 acres of parkland to the M-NCPPC. If found acceptable, these plans shall be approved prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011.

Comment: This condition is not necessary because the plans already indicate 11.73 acres of land to be dedicated to M-NCPPC and a similar condition of the Preliminary Plan 4-06016, Condition 21, states the same.

- d. An additional safe pedestrian crossing of Campus Way North shall be provided between Ruby Lockhart Drive and Road "G."

Comment: The plans are incomplete at this time due to the preliminary nature of an Infrastructure plan. The location of the crosswalk at this time is premature, due to a lack of information on the development of the park and the future development along Campus Way North, within the residential portion of the development. The staff is concerned that the location of a cross walk at this time could result in a dangerous situation. Therefore, until the development of the project has been reviewed fully for the east and west sides of Campus Way North, the staff suggest that this issue be addressed at a later date.

- e. The sidewalk along east side of Campus Way North next to parkland shall be expanded to 8-foot-wide sidewalk.

Comment: This condition is contained within the recommendation section of this report.

- g. At the time the staff report was written, the **Department of Environmental Resources (DER)** had not yet offered comment on the subject project.
- h. The **Department of Public Works and Transportation** had offered comment on the subject project in a memorandum dated July 3, 2007, Abraham to Lareuse (attached).
- i. In a memorandum dated June 18, 2007, the **State Highway Administration (SHA)** indicated that it has no objection to the approval of the subject detailed site plan. However, the applicant will need to obtain a utility permit from SHA's District 3 Engineer for the proposed 12-inch sewer line connection across I-495. In addition the bridge proposed over I-495 connecting Everts Street, a county-owned roadway, will not be owned by SHA and must be maintained via an agreement between the applicant and Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).
- j. In a memorandum dated June 19, 2007, the **Office of Soil Conservation**, Prince George's County indicated that they had no comment.
- k. In a memorandum dated May 23, 2007, the **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)** indicated that water is available and sewer extension will be required in order to serve the site. The WSSC reviewer indicated that an on-site plan review package should be submitted. The reviewer commented that although WSSC records show a planned hotel and bank for the subject site, the plans do not propose any structures.
- l. In an email dated June 25, 2007, **PEPCO** indicated that a 10-foot public utility easement must be established on both sides of all roadways, in which a condition is included in the recommendation section of this report.
- m. In a memorandum dated June 20, 2007, the **City of Glenarden** indicated that it was reserving final comment on the project until revised plans had been received. The City's recommendations were as follows:

"The City of Glenarden would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the June 8, 2007, detailed site plan for infrastructure and Type II TCP. The following are our comments at this point. The Mayor and Council are reserving their final recommendation, which will be addressed to the Chairman of the Planning Board after receipt of revised and updated plan submissions. The following are our comments at this point.

**"RECOMMENDATIONS**

- "1. The Mayor and Council are requesting at least one week after date of submission to review the revisions to the SWM plans to be and the final plans for the roadways.
- "2. Applicant should present detail for retaining walls in residential portion of the site to let us know whether they intend to use keystone walls or some other kind of walls. Once designated, the City wishes to review and comment on said walls, or indicate that they are keystone walls.
- "3. Keystone wall final selection of face block should complement the architecture of the shopping center.

- “4. More detail should be provided in later DSP plans so that the City can be sure that street lighting complements the architecture, and blends well with site furniture.
  - “5. Roadway plans and cross sections should be modified to incorporate changes agreed upon at the DPW&T meeting of June 12, 2007. Amended plans should be presented to the City for review.
  - “6. Revise planting lists to include plant material that is to be placed in the medians and along roadway that has a higher tolerance for salt and winter conditions as well as high sun. The City wishes to review the revised plans.
  - “7. TCP II plan should reflect the condition of the preliminary plan approval requiring that the City of Glenarden receive the fee-in-lieu payment, and should also reflect the amount of the fee-in-lieu.
  - “8. No final plan of the park has been presented for review as required by the preliminary plan.
  - “9. Temporary sign(s) should be shown on the DSP, to include sight distance, location, dimensions, color, mounting height and materials, and height of letters.”
12. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan satisfies the site design guidelines as contained in Section 27-274, prevents off-site property damage, and prevents environmental degradation to safeguard the public’s health, safety, welfare, and economic well-being for grading, reforestation, woodland conservation, drainage, erosion, and pollution discharge.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE DSP-07011 and TCPII/053/07, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to signature approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
  - a. Revise the plans to indicate the keystone VERSA-LOK retaining wall system to be the “Mosaic Weathered” style in the “Westchester” color in those portions of the development where proposed retaining walls are determined to be highly visible from roads, residential or other public areas. The Applicant shall work with Urban Design staff to identify which walls will receive this treatment and appropriate barrier type. Exact materials shall be approved by Urban Design staff as designee of the Planning Board.
  - b. The lighting fixtures shown on the plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Glenarden and the Urban Design Section. The lighting plan shall indicate the use of full cut-off optic light fixtures to minimize light pollution.
  - c. The plans shall show a public utility easement along all roadways, public and private.

- d. Steel girder bridges shall be revised to provide the proposed side elevations, including the details and specifications of the protective barrier system, as depicted in photographic images proffered by the applicant dated March 30, 2007.
  - e. The plans shall be revised to provide 150 foot lot depth on Lots 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, Block E, and adjustment of Road C as appropriate.
  - f. The plans shall be revised to show the proposed five foot wide sidewalk as eight feet, within the right-of-way along the east side of Campus Way North and to provide a minimum of five feet on each side of Campus Way North from the face of the curb to the sidewalk.
2. Prior to the approval of any future detailed site plans, impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area and expanded buffers other than those conceptually approved by the Planning Board with Preliminary Plan 4-06016, shall require a revised preliminary plan application.
  3. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to remove the extraneous information shown on the plans, such as parking compounds and buildings that are not proposed to be built with the subject application.
  4. Any required revision to Stormwater Management Concept Plan #20908-2003 that significantly departs from the limits of disturbance on the approved TCPI, shall require Planning Board review of a revised preliminary plan and TCPI.
  5. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to include a detail of the proposed bridges clarifying the areas of disturbance needed for construction.
  6. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
  7. Prior to acceptance of a DSP for residential buildings impacted by the 65 DBA noise contour, the package shall include a revised Phase II noise study that reflects the proposed building location and grading shown on the DSP. A separate sheet within the DSP shall show all unmitigated noise contours and mitigated contours at a scale that clearly shows the noise mitigation measures proposed for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas in order to meet the state noise standards.
  8. At the time of DSP for any portion of the site including stormwater management ponds, the DSP and TCPII shall show all required landscaping around the stormwater management ponds that are required as part of the stormwater concept/technical approval.
  9. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to show Prince George's County phased worksheet with phase one representing the proposed grading and infrastructure improvements in DSP-07011. The revised worksheet cannot show a shortage regarding how the site's woodland conservation requirement will be addressed and the phased worksheet shall show the correct fee-in-lieu. The first phase in the revised worksheet shall be represented by the subject DSP and TCPII and include all proposed on and off-site clearing.
  10. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

- a. Provide a symbol in the legend and show on the plan the special preservation treatment fencing for the three specimen trees to remain at post development.
- b. Show Specimen Tree #17 as to be removed.
- c. Add a critical root zone symbol to the legend and show this symbol in relation to each of the trees to be preserved.
- d. Show the stream buffer symbol in relation to this feature on each applicable sheet of the plans.
- e. Include sheets 18 and 19 to the plan set and make all the applicable revisions, including the steep slopes on highly erodible soils and severe slopes symbols.
- f. Consistently label the existing tree line and eliminate the proposed tree line label in the legend.
- g. On sheet 6 identify the existing feature shown with an unlabeled symbol located parallel to the Capital Beltway. Provide a corresponding symbol in the legend.
- h. Adjust the proposed limits of disturbance symbol so there are no gaps in it.
- i. On sheet 2 adjust the limits of disturbance symbol in relation to the two proposed rectangular features at Ruby Lockhart Drive so there is access to these features. Show all proposed structures related to the limits of disturbance.
- j. Ensure the limits of disturbance is in conformance with the TCPI.
- k. Label all proposed bridge abutments, rip rap features, and other similar features (i.e. for bioretention) on each sheet of the plans. Provide a corresponding symbol in the legend for these features.
- l. Revise the key map so the plan set sheets correspond with the sheets in the DSP-07011 plan set.
- m. Remove the proposed buildings symbols or revise the TCPII to distinguish between what features are proposed in the current approval and what features will be part of future plans. Show these features the same on the DSP and TCPII.
- n. Provide a title on each sheet of the plan to read as follows: "TCPII for infrastructure only."
- o. Provide the additional sheets to the plan set for proposed off-site connections for streets and utilities and the related limits of disturbance. Adjust the worksheet as necessary to compensate for the off-site clearing.
- p. Provide the proposed bottom and top elevations for all the retaining walls.
- q. On sheet 4 adjust the limits of disturbance in relation to Woodland Preservation Area F so this symbol is along the proposed outer edge of this area.

- r. On sheet 11 adjust the portion of Woodland Preservation Area K to exclude the proposed water line easement.
  - s. On sheet 17 adjust Woodland Preservation Area B to exclude the proposed sewer line easement.
  - t. On sheet 24 label the proposed woodland treatment area adjacent to Woodland Preservation Area C that is outside the limits of disturbance (i.e., woodland saved, not counted). Show this treatment to the closest 1/100<sup>th</sup> of an acre and use a graphic symbol on the plan and in the legend.
  - u. Adjust the phased worksheet after these woodland treatment revisions are addressed.
  - v. Provide the current standard TCPII notes and remove the three TCPII notes shown on sheet 25. Include all of the applicable optional TCPII notes with the standard notes.
  - w. Provide the required edge management notes on sheet 25.
  - x. Show all of the required woodland conservation area signage with a corresponding symbol in the legend in relation to the outer edges of Woodland Preservation Areas A-Q. Locate the signage at the required spacing.
  - y. Provide the standard M-NCPPC TCPII signature approval block on each sheet of the plan and type in "TCPII/053/07" in the appropriate space.
  - z. Remove the soils layer from the plan and its corresponding symbol from the legend.
  - aa. Revise the TCPII worksheet as necessary.
  - bb. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.
11. Prior to certification of the DSP-07011, the applicant shall submit to DPR, for review and approval, the park concept plan which addresses DPR concerns communicated to the applicant following and pursuant to conditions of Preliminary Plan 4-06016.
  12. The applicant shall revise the plans to remove the SWM Pond from the parkland. The plan shall be reviewed and approved by DPR staff, if appropriate, prior to certification of the DSP-07011.
  13. The applicant shall submit revised plans acceptable to the Department of Parks and Recreation that demonstrate conveyance of approximately 11.73 acres of parkland to M-NCPPC.
  14. An additional safe pedestrian crossing of Campus Way North shall be provided between Ruby Lockhart Drive and Road "G."
  15. The sidewalk along the east side of Campus Way North next to parkland shall be expanded to 8-foot-wide sidewalk.

16. In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan, CSP-03006, and 4-06016, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:
- a. Provide the eight-foot wide sidewalks, and designated bike lanes along the entire length of Ruby Lockhart Drive as shown on the submitted DSP.
  - b. Provide standard sidewalks and designated bike lanes along both sides of Tower Place as shown on the submitted DSP.
  - c. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of St. Joseph's Drive as shown on the submitted DSP.
  - d. Provide bollards and the details and specifications at the pedestrian refuge at the eastern crosswalk along the traffic circle on Sheet 3.