

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Prince George's County Redevelopment Authority is the owner of a 25.16-acre parcel of land known as Tax Map 80 Grid E-3, said property being in the 6<sup>th</sup> Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Mixed-Use Town Center and Development District Overlay; and

WHEREAS, on July 31, 2015, Prince George's County Redevelopment Authority filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan for 221 lots and 26 parcels for the development of 700 multifamily dwelling units (DUs); and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Subdivision Plan, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-15005 for Suitland Town Center was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on November 19, 2015, for its review and action in accordance with the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, the staff of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission recommended November 19, 2015 of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on November 19, 2015, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-15005, including a Variation(s) to Sections 24-122(a) and 24-128(b)(12) with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS), the plan shall be revised to make the following technical corrections:
  - a. Revise the PPS to reorient Lots 18 through 24, Block E, so that they are parallel with the townhouse sticks for Lots 12-17 and 25-30, Block E, instead of perpendicular, or revise the PPS to demonstrate adequate buffering between Lots 18-24, Block E, and the proposed apartment housing for the elderly.
  - b. Remove all right-of-way dedication along the northern side of Parcel A, Block J.
  - c. Separate Parcel A, Block E and Parcel A, Block F such that land area designated for open space is in a designated parcel and distinct from land area designated for private alleys.

- d. Add appropriate plat references for previous Suitland Road right-of-way dedication and provide the existing right-of-way width on the plan.
- e. Replace all development standards from the PPS plan, except the following:

Townhouse Lots:

Interior Lot:

Minimum Lot Size: \*960 square feet  
Minimum Lot Width: 16 feet

End-Unit Lot:

Minimum Lot Size: 1,190 square feet  
Minimum Lot Width: 21 feet

Maximum Number of Townhouses in a Stick: 11

Single-Family Detached Lots:

Minimum Lot Size: 8,180 square feet  
Minimum Lot Width: 47 feet

\* No more than seven (7) interior townhouse lots may be less than the minimum size standard for interior lots of 960 square feet, and no less than 912 square feet.

- f. Revise the applicants Recreational Facility Cost Estimate dated October 15, 2015 to exclude the Urban Park located on Block I and any proposed facilities on Block G, and add the parcel numbers to the table, adjusting the total cost estimate and “Value Above Requirement” calculation, provide the dimensions of the pools and place it as an insert on the PPS.
- g. Increase lineweight of public right-of-way dedication areas.
- h. Revise all plans showing the proposed layout to demonstrate the provision of a turnaround on Parcels C and F, Block D. Label alleys and the single private street.
- i. Revise all plans showing the proposed layout to demonstrate no vehicular connection between the alley for the townhouse lots in Block E and the parking lot for the age-restricted multifamily building.
- j. Add a note that states:

“At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall grant a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along all public streets and a 10’ PUE along either side of all private roads, or a PUE acceptable to the applicable public utility providers as shown on a utility plan

submitted with the final plat. Documentation shall be provided by the applicant demonstrating the concurrence of the public utility providers.”

- k. Revise all references to “90,000” proposed square feet of commercial retail use on the PPS to “80,331” square feet and all references to “45,000” proposed square feet of public space (arts center) to “50,000.”
  - l. Provide a revised Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Exhibit 8 which shows that Pod C as described in the TIS includes Parcel A, Block J and Parcel B, Block B.
  - m. Revise the density on the PPS to add separate columns for the proposed density for the 221 townhouses and single-family detached dwellings, and the proposed density for the 700 multifamily dwellings.
  - n. Revise Lot 43, Block E to show a minimum lot width of 21 feet.
2. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 21525-2015 00 and any subsequent revisions.
  3. At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall grant a ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) along all public streets and a ten feet PUE along either side of all private roads, or a PUE acceptable to the applicable public utility providers as shown on a dry utility plan submitted with the final plat. Documentation shall be provided by the applicant demonstrating the concurrence of the public utility providers.
  4. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a conceptual dry utility plan for the record.
  5. The applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the private on-site recreational facilities in accordance with the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*.
  6. Prior to the approval of the final plats for the townhouse or single-family dwelling unit lots, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit three original recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) for construction of the recreational facilities. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George’s County Land Records and the liber/folio reflected on the final plat prior to recordation. The RFA shall include the following facilities associated with the townhouse and single family dwelling lots as reflected on the approved PPS:
    - a. Two passive urban areas, one each in Blocks Parcels C and F
    - b. One Open Play Area in Block D.

7. Prior to approval of building permits for the townhouse or single-family dwelling unit lots, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for construction of the recreational facilities associated with those lots and parcels. The facilities bonded shall be in accordance with the recorded recreational facilities agreement referenced on the record plat for those lots.
8. Prior to the approval of the final plats for the multifamily development on Parcel A, Block A or Parcels A and B, Block B, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit three original recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to the Development Review Division (DRD) for construction of the recreational facilities. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the Prince George's County Land Records and the liber/folio reflected on the final plat prior to recordation. The RFA shall include the following facilities associated with the multifamily dwellings as listed on the approved PPS:
  - a. Parcel A, Block A – One Fitness/Yoga Room, One Swimming Pool with deck.
  - b. Parcels A and B, Block B – One Fitness/Yoga Room, One Swimming Pool with deck.
9. Prior to approval of building permits for the multifamily development on Parcel A, Block A and Parcels A and B, Block B, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee for the construction of the recreational facilities on the associated parcels. The facilities bonded shall be in accordance with the recorded recreational facilities agreement referenced on the record plat for those parcels.
10. Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that a homeowners association (HOA) has been established and that the common areas approved on the PPS have been conveyed to the HOA.
11. Prior to approval of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall convey to the homeowners association (HOA) land. Land to be conveyed shall be subject to the following:
  - a. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property prior to conveyance, and all disturbed areas shall have a full stand of grass or other vegetation upon completion of any phase, section, or the entire project.
  - b. The conveyed land shall not suffer the disposition of construction materials, soil filling, other than the placement of fill material associated with permitted grading operation that are consistent with the permit and minimum soil class requirements, discarded plant materials, refuse, or similar waste matter.
  - c. Any disturbance of land to be conveyed to a HOA shall be in accordance with an approved permit site plan. This shall include, but not be limited to, the location of

sediment control measures, tree removal, temporary or permanent stormwater management facilities, utility placement, and stormdrain outfalls.

- d. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to a HOA.

The location and design of drainage outfalls that adversely impact property to be conveyed shall be reviewed and approved by the Development Review Division in accordance with the approved permit site plan.

12. Prior to approval of any building permit for Parcel A, Block H for a use other than apartment housing for the elderly, the permit plan shall conform to the trip cap approved with this PPS or a new PPS with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities shall be required.
13. Prior to approval of building permits, in conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* and the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*, the permit plan shall demonstrate the following improvements within the dedicated public right-of-way, unless modified by DPIE or DPW&T:
  - a. A five-foot-wide bicycle lane along Huron Avenue in the southbound direction from Suitland Road to Porter Avenue.
  - b. Standard sidewalks with ADA accessible curb ramps along all rights-of-way within the subject site.
  - c. 118 street lights throughout the subject site.
  - d. 204 shade trees in the public right-of-way.

The following minimum improvements shall be demonstrated on the Special Permit on-site:

- a. 28 indoor bicycle parking racks.
  - b. 10 outdoor bicycle parking racks at locations convenient to building entrances.
  - c. 21 benches throughout the subject site.
  - d. 21 trash receptacles throughout the subject site.
14. Prior to the approval of building permits, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that the following required adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities as designated below or as modified by DPW&T/DPIE/DPR/MDSHA, in accordance with Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations, have (a) full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the applicable operating agency's access permit process, and (c)

have an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate operating agency, or demonstrate that these specific improvements are included in a council resolution for a TIF bond or other financing sources (including General Obligation Bonds) for infrastructure improvements:

a. **Intersection of Lacy and Lewis Avenues:**

- (1) Install one curb ramp that meets ADA guidelines at the northeast corner of the intersection, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (2) Install new high-visibility crosswalk markings at north and east legs of intersection, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (3) Install standard sidewalks along the northeast corner of the intersection, unless modified by DPW&T.

b. **Intersection of Homer and Porter Avenues:**

- (1) Install curb ramps at all corners that meet ADA guidelines, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (2) Install high-visibility crosswalk pavement markings on all legs of intersection, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (3) Install 250 linear feet of standard five-foot wide sidewalk on the north side of Homer Avenue, west of Porter Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (4) Install 150 linear feet of standard five-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of Homer Avenue, west of Porter Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T.

c. **Intersection of Huron and Porter Avenues:**

- (1) Install 2 curb ramps that meet ADA guidelines on the northwest and southwest corners of the intersection, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (2) Install high visibility crosswalk pavement markings on the west leg of the intersection, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (3) Install 150 linear feet of standard five-foot wide sidewalk on the north side of Huron Avenue, west of Porter Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T;
- (4) Install 30 linear feet of standard five-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of Huron Avenue, west of Porter Avenue; unless modified by DPW&T.

- d. **Intersection of Suitland and Silver Hill Roads:**
  - (1) Update all crosswalk pavement markings, unless modified by MDSHA;
  - (2) Replace all red brick pavement crosswalk, unless modified by MDSHA.
- e. **Huron Avenue:**
  - (1) Install a five-foot wide bicycle lane Bicycle Lane along Huron Avenue in the northbound direction, between Suitland Road and Porter Avenue, unless modified by DPW&T.
- f. **Homer Avenue:**
  - (1) Install Share the Road Signage on Homer Avenue.
- g. **Suitland Road:**
  - (1) Install high-visibility pavement markings crossing Suitland Road at existing crossing, unless modified by MDSHA;
  - (2) Install rectangular rapid flashing beacon and appropriate signage in each direction of Suitland Road at crossing, unless modified by MDSHA.
- 15. Prior to signature approval of the PPS, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a revised BPIS exhibit that illustrates in detail the location and limits of all off-site BPIS improvements, including all off-site sidewalk construction, ADA ramps, pedestrian signals, crosswalk improvements, pavement markings and signage.
- 16. Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant, their heirs, successors and or assignees shall vacate the dedicated public rights-of-way as reflected on the approved PPS, in accordance with Section 24-112 of the Subdivision Regulations.
- 17. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 364 AM peak-hour trips and 446 PM peak-hour trips. Any development generating an impact (net new trips) greater than that identified herein above shall require a new PPS with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
- 18. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate the following public rights-of-way, as shown on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision:
  - a. 40 feet from centerline along Suitland Road.
  - b. 90-foot right-of-way for Street 'G' between Street 'B' and Suitland Road, within the boundary of the PPS.

- c. 60-foot right-of-way for Street ‘A.’
  - d. 60-foot right-of-way for Street ‘B.’
  - e. 50-foot right-of-way for Street ‘C.’
  - f. 50-60-foot right-of-way for Street ‘D.’
  - g. 50-foot right-of-way for Street ‘E.’
  - h. 50-foot right of way for Street ‘G’ from Street ‘B’ to Street ‘E.’
  - i. 5 feet of right-of-way for Lewis Avenue along Parcel A and Lots 1–9, Block D.
19. The applicant, their heirs, successors and or assigns shall dedicate public right-of-way in accordance with the approved PPS in phase with development for Street ‘A’ with the platting of Parcel A, Block A and additional right-of-way dedication along Street ‘G’ with the platting of Parcel A, Block B.
20. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency’s access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency OR demonstrate that these specific improvements in a council resolution for a TIF bond or other financing sources (including General Obligation Bonds) for infrastructure improvements:
- a. Chelsea Way and MD 458
    - (1) Construcion of this intersection to include:
      - A left and three through lanes on the northbound approach. (MD 458)
      - A left and a right turn lane on the eastbound approach.
      - Two through and a shared through and right-turn lane on the southbound approach (MD 458)
    - (2) Conduct a traffic signal warrant study and install a traffic signal if deemed warranted and approved by SHA.
21. Prior to signature approval of the PPS and certification of the special permit site plan, the two plans shall be reconciled and found to be conforming.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the findings and reasons for the decision of the Prince George’s County Planning Board are as follows:

1. The subdivision, as modified with conditions, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George’s County Code and the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. **Background**—The subject property is located on Tax Map 80 in Grid E-3 and is composed of the following subdivisions of land all recorded in the County Land Records:



- Parcel A–Shopping Center for Suitland Realty Company, recorded in Plat Book WWW 19-78 in 1971
- Parcel A–First Addition to Suitland, recorded in Plat Book BB 14-100 in 1948
- Lots 1–12, Block D, Lots 1–24, Block D, Lots 1–15, Block F, and Lots 1–6 Block G – Suitland Manor, recorded in Plat Book BB 9-56 in 1942
- Lots 1–42, Block A, and Lots 1–53, Block C – Suitland Manor, recorded in Plat Book BB 9-29 in 1942
- Four deed-parcels recorded in the County Land Records in Liber 20342 at Folio 652 (Parcel 55), Liber 20342 at Liber 666 (Parcels 54 and 10), and Liber 6740 at Folio 657 (Parcel 53)

Parcel A: Shopping Center for Suitland Realty Company and the four deed-parcels are owned by private land owners; Mid Atlantic Real Est Investments Inc. (Parcel 55, 54, and 10) and VHG Associated Ltd. Partnership (Parcels 53 and A). The remaining property is owned by the Prince George’s County Redevelopment Authority. The property consists of 25.16 acres of land within the Mixed-Use Town Center (M-U-TC) Zone and the Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone implemented through the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA). The site is currently developed with 55,603 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) for retail uses. This preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) proposes the resubdivision of this property into 221 lots and 29 parcels for the development of 700 multifamily dwelling units (DUs), 219 townhouse DUs, two (2) single-family detached DUs, 80,331 square feet of GFA for retail uses, and 45,000 square feet of GFA for a public arts center. Pursuant to Section 24-107 of the Subdivision Regulations, no land shall be subdivided within the Regional District in Prince George’s County until the subdivider or his agent shall obtain approval of a PPS and final plat of subdivision, resulting in this application.

The Suitland Town Center development is generally triangular in form and is designed with three roadways forming the foundation and boundaries of the site: Suitland Road (an 80-foot-wide master plan collector roadway – C-415) which runs east-west along the southern boundary of the site, Huron Avenue (currently 50 feet wide) which runs primarily north-south along mostly the eastern boundary of the site; and Homer Avenue (currently 50 feet wide) which runs north south along the western portion of the site.

Three major land use areas are proposed within the development: (1) Multifamily and Commercial Retail (2) Public Arts Center and (3) Residential Single-Family Attached and Detached areas.

The Multifamily and Commercial Area is primarily located along Suitland Road and is composed of Parcel A, Block A (Multifamily), Parcels A and B, Block B (Multifamily and Commercial Retail), Parcel A, Block H (Age-Restricted Multifamily) which is north of Blocks A and B adjacent to the proposed single-family attached lots, and Parcel A, Block J (Commercial Retail)

which is the only portion of the development located on the eastern side of Huron Avenue. A total of 80,331 square feet of GFA for retail uses and 700 multifamily dwelling units are proposed on these parcel in a vertical mix of uses.

The Public Arts Center Area is located north of the proposed multifamily and commercial further north of Suitland Road, and situated on Parcels A and B, Block I on the east side of Huron Avenue. This area is to be retained by the County and developed as a public arts and recreation space. A proposed 45,000-square-foot arts center is to be located on Parcel A, Block I and an urban plaza is proposed for Parcel B, Block I.

The remaining portion of the property is designated for 219 townhouse and two single-family detached dwelling unit lots, to be located north of the commercial, multifamily, and public use areas and adjacent to the existing single-family residential community to the north and east of the subject site. The proposed layout of the townhouse lots provides for clusters of townhouses which generally front along public streets and are to be served by shared alleys. The two single-family detached dwellings are located at the northern most portion of the subject site and are proposed as a transition from the townhouses to the adjacent existing single-family residential neighborhood. The applicant has committed to developing these two lots with net zero dwellings. The dense, urban style of development that is proposed for this development has presented several design constraints for the provision of public utility easements within the subdivision. Therefore, the applicant has filed a variation to the Subdivision Regulations to provide alternative public utility easements, which is **APPROVED** and discussed further.

The site is located within the area of the 2006 *Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plan* (Suitland Development Plan). Neither the M-U-TC Zone nor the Suitland Development Plan contain lot standards which can be applied to this development. Development of this site is not subject to a detailed site plan. Therefore, minimum lot standards have been approved with this PPS and shall be reflected on the plan. The minimum lot standards are provided below:

**Townhouse Lots:**

**Interior Lot:**

**Minimum Lot Size: \*960 square feet**

**Minimum Lot Width: 16 feet**

**End-Unit Lot:**

**Minimum Lot Size: 1,190 square feet**

**Minimum Lot Width: 21 feet**

**Maximum Number of Townhouses in a Stick: 11**

**Single-Family Detached Lots:**

**Minimum Lot Size: 8,180 square feet**

**Minimum Lot Width: 46 feet**

\*Seven lots are proposed with a minimum lot size of 912 square feet below the proposed minimum requirement for interior lots. This is supported and conditioned to limit the

number of interior lots that are less than the minimum size standard to seven.

Several existing public rights-of-way are proposed to be vacated and relocated with this preliminary plan of subdivision in accordance with Section 24-112 of the Subdivision Regulations at the time of final plat. The redesign of the interior street pattern creates a more functional circulation pattern for the type and quantity of proposed dwelling units. Vacation of these public rights-of-way are conditioned and discussed further.

3. **Setting**—The subject site is located at the north side of Suitland Road, approximately 425 feet northwest of its intersection with Silver Hill Road. Northwest of the site is Mixed-Use Town Center and Development District Overlay (M-U-TC/D-D-O) zoned property developed with commercial uses, R-18 zoned property upon which Suitland Elementary School is located, and R-55 zoned property developed with single-family dwellings. Northeast of the site is R-55 zoned property developed with single-family dwellings. Southeast of the site is M-U-TC/D-D-O zoned property developed with commercial uses. Southwest of the site is M-U-TC/D-D-O zoned property owned by the federal government.
4. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS application and the proposed development.

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Zone	M-U-TC/D-D-O	M-U-TC/D-D-O
Use(s)	55,603 square feet of GFA for retail uses	*700 multifamily DUs, 219 townhouse DUs, two (2) single-family detached DUs, 80,331 square feet of GFA for retail uses, 50,000 square feet of GFA for a public arts center
Acreage	25.16	25.16
Lots	152	221
Outlots	0	0
Parcels	6	29
Dwelling Units	0	921
Public Safety	No	No
Variance	No	No
Variation(s)	No	Yes 24-122(a) 24-128(b)(12)

\*Of the proposed 700 multifamily DUs, 137 are proposed as apartment housing for the elderly.

Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, this case was heard before the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) on August 14, 2015. As discussed in the report and as required by Section 24-113(b) of the Subdivision Regulations, the requested variation to Section 24-122(a) was accepted on October 15, 2015, no less than 30 days prior to the Planning Board hearing date, and heard on October 23, 2015 at the SDRC meeting.

5. **Community Planning**—This site is located within the Established Communities growth policy area of the Prince George’s County Growth Policy Map in the *Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George’s 2035). As described in Plan Prince George’s 2035, established communities should have context-sensitive infill and low- to medium-density development. This property is located in the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA), 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 4 Master Plan), and the 2006 *Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plan* (Suitland Development Plan). The Development Plan establishes design standards and guidelines that govern development within the M-U-TC Zone. The Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan and SMA places Development District Overlay that regulates uses permitted within the M-U-TC boundary.

#### **Planning Issues**

The subject property is located within the Joint Base Andrews Interim Land Use Control (ILUC) impact area. The property is within Imaginary Surface F, establishing a height limit of 500 feet above the runway surface. This property is outside of the 65 dBA noise contours and is not in an Accident Potential Zone, therefore, no controls on use or density are required.

The application, with its proposed mix of uses, is consistent with the land use recommendations of Plan Prince George’s 2035, the Subregion 4 Master Plan, the Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA, the Suitland Development Plan and the permitted uses in the M-U-TC/D-D-O Zones.

6. **Urban Design**—The 2006 *Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plan* (Suitland Development Plan) provides a community endorsed land use vision for the area and establishes specific design standards and guidelines for development of the town center. The design standards and guidelines of the Suitland M-U-TC are organized into five major parts, each covering a different aspect or development area of the Suitland Development Plan. The five parts include design standards and guidelines for Commercial District, Residential District, Public Space, Parking and Loading, as well as Signage. The Commercial and Residential District Standards are further organized into three sections: Site Design, Building Design, and Streetscape. The proposed development includes a large site that straddles both the commercial and residential districts and contains uses that require approval of a Special Permit in accordance with Section 27-239.02 of the Zoning Ordinance.

As stated on Page 23 of the 2006 *Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Zone Development Plan*, the design standards replace requirements that are set forth in the Zoning Ordinance and the Landscape Manual. Subdivisions shall be reviewed for compliance with relevant standards such as those affecting circulation. The Urban Design Section has provided the following comments in **BOLD** pertaining to standards and guidelines that are relevant to the review of this PPS (comments are provided underneath each section):

- **The preliminary plan of subdivision includes development standards for both residential and commercial districts. The Urban Design Section has concerns about the minimum lot size, maximum lot coverage and minimum lot width standards in**

**the residential district. The minimum lot size is proposed at 928 square feet, the maximum lot coverage at 77 percent and the minimum lot width at 16 feet. Even though the Planning Board approved smaller townhouse lots than those included in this application, the prior approvals are in more urbanized areas in the county with good public transit services. The subject site, however, is more than half a mile away from the Suitland Metro Station and there is limited bus service along Suitland Road. Future residents on this site will still rely mainly on automobile as a main form of transportation. The townhouse with minimum 16 feet width can only accommodate one car garage and the M-U-TC standards of 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit that will need to be provided on the driveway, which should be a minimum 15 feet in length. The minimum lot size of 928 square feet with a minimum five-foot rear setback can only achieves a maximum lot coverage of 65 percent. The Urban Design recommends to increase the minimum lot size to 960 square feet, and reduce the maximum lot coverage to 65 percent. The minimum lot width of 16 feet should be limited to internal lots only and the minimum corner lot width should be provided at 18 feet. Two car garages should be provided for 20 percent of the units.**

As previously stated, the proposed development is located within one mile of the Suitland Metro Station and directly adjacent to an existing residential neighborhood and commercial uses. The subdivision is designed to transition from more dense commercial, multifamily, and public arts center uses closer to Suitland Road and Silver Hill Road, to more dense townhouse clusters with lot sizes that range from 912 to 1,689 square feet in the center of the community (Blocks C, E, and F), and finally to less dense townhouse and single-family detached lots ranging in lot size from 1,240 to 2,520 square feet for townhouse lots and a minimum of 8,184 square feet for the two single-family detached lots (Blocks D and G) where the site abuts existing residential single family lots. The median proposed lot size for townhouse lots in the community is 1,716 square feet, well above the minimum lot size requirement suggested by the Urban Design Section of 960 square feet. Furthermore, only seven (7) lots are below the suggested minimum (Lots 11-14, Block C and Lots 25-27, Block F) which is supported. Therefore, it is conditioned that the minimum lot size for interior lots be 960 square feet with the exception of the seven lots referred to above, and 1,190 square feet for end-unit lots. Additionally, the minimum lot width shall be 16 feet for interior lots and 21 feet for end-unit lots. One lot (Lot 43, Block E), an end-unit lot, is shown to have a 20-foot-wide lot width and shall be revised to provide the minimum width of 21 feet prior to signature approval of the plan.

Concerning lot coverage, no guidance is provided in the Development Plan or M-U-TC Zone Standards. Moreover, lot coverage is not a standard typically used in the review of townhouse development, and is not recommended. For the two single family dwelling lots (Lot 20 and 21, Block G) a lot coverage requirement is also not recommended because the lots are rear load alley lots that will require a significant vehicular paved area to support the dwelling.

The applicant has indicated that the two single-family dwelling unit lots are to be developed as zero net impact homes. Overall, there are a number of development standards proposed by the applicant that are not necessary with the establishment of a minimum lot size, and lot width.

The applicant has indicated that 156 of the 219 (71%) townhouses will be two-car garages.

- **The M-U-TC standards (under Site Design-Utilities and Service) for both commercial and residential districts require that all new development sites place utility lines underground or relocate them to the rear of the property. The proposed alley design will enable this preliminary plan to meet this requirement.**

As stated in the Urban Design memorandum, alleyways have been provided throughout the development which would support the use of underground utility lines within the rears of the lots, or as approved by the utilities for locations for underground utilities.

- **The preliminary plan of subdivision utilizes alley in the site design of the townhouse units. The M-U-TC standards (under Public Space- Streetscape/Alleys) requires that all alleys be 22 feet in width with 18 feet of pavement in order to provide secondary pedestrian or service access to the rear of lots. The plan shows conformance with the required alley width. However, some alleys are longer than the 150 feet that will require turn-around capacity be provided the end of the alleys. There are two alleys that exceed the 150-foot limit. They are Parcels C and F in block D. The applicant must revise the plan to either shorten the alley or provide turn-around capacity at time of Special Permit site plan review.**

Prior to signature approval of the PPS, all plans showing proposed layout shall demonstrate the provision of a turnaround on Parcels C and F, Block D.

- **The M-U-TC standards (under Parking and Loading-Circulation and Parking Area Design) require that curb cuts onto “Neighborhood Street” be located no closer than 20 feet to the point-of-curvature of an intersection so that they will not create a traffic hazard. Even though this standard is closely related to site design and should be reviewed at time of Special Permit site plan, the requirement indirectly impacts on the width of the lots when they are located at the intersection of streets. For example, Lot 9, Block G, Lot 10, Block C, Lots 39 and 40, Block F cannot meet this M-U-TC standard.**

The standard listed above is found on page 42 of the Development Plan and is a recommendation, and not a requirement, as it employs the word “should” instead of “shall” or must.” Furthermore, the majority of the townhomes will have access only to an alley, and not a street. The Transportation Planning Section and the DPIE have recommended approval of the proposed layout.

- **The M-U-TC standards (under Streetscape-Sidewalks) for residential district require six to eight-foot wide sidewalks to be provided on both sides of the streets and should be buffered from vehicular traffic by a minimum six-foot wide landscape strip. The applicant indicated on the Special Permit plan that a narrow sidewalk of five feet will be provided. The departure from the required width of the sidewalks must be approved by the Planning Board at time of Special Permit approval.**

The proposed sidewalks within the subject site are located in the public rights-of-way, which are under the authority of the County for permitting and construction. Parcel D, Block D, is the only private street proposed. Therefore, sidewalks adjacent to the private street on this parcel shall conform to this M-U-TC standard and be constructed to a minimum width of six feet. It is also recommended to the extent practicable that all sidewalks within the public ROW conform to this standard, unless otherwise modified by DPIE.

#### **Conformance to the 2014 Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (Sector Plan)**

The 2014 Southern Green Line Sector Plan establishes development policies and design standards for new development that are more permissive than those of the Suitland M-U-TC Zone in terms of building height, and building setback from the street. The sector plan also recommends retaining the Suitland M-U-TC Zone, but outlines specific recommendations to amend the Suitland M-U-TC Development Plan that include replacing the M-U-TC development concept with the sector plan future land use map, and revisions to the applicability section, setback, parking, and height and bulk requirements.

Except for additional use restrictions that are also applicable to the Suitland M-U-TC area, no additional development standards have been established through this Sector Plan that are applicable to this project. The proposed uses in this application are permitted uses in accordance with the zoning.

#### **Conformance to the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**

Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance (TCC), requires a minimum percentage of the site to be covered by tree canopy for any development projects that propose more than 5,000 square feet or greater of gross floor area or disturbance and require a grading permit. The subject site is zoned M-U-TC and is required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area to be covered by tree canopy. Compliance with this requirement will be further evaluated at the time of Special Permit review.

#### **Other Urban Design Issues**

The PPS shows two locations where the proposed public arts center building (Block I) and age-restricted multifamily parcels (Parcel A, Block H) are directly abutting the rear or sides of the proposed townhouse lots. The treatment of those areas for appropriate landscaping and buffering is important and will be further evaluated prior to signature approval of the SP.

However, the spatial relationships between the lotting and parcel layout, including street locations will not change to accommodate landscaping. Landscaping will be added to the existing spaces as appropriate with the special permit.

In regards to the multifamily building, the age-restricted building is adjacent to townhouses in Block E. Furthermore, the rear of the townhouses on Lots 18–24, Block E would be visible from the parking for this multifamily building. The Development Plan standards (under Site Design-Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening) for residential district require that a landscaped yard of no more than 20 feet in width, with a minimum of 80 plants per 100 linear feet of the adjacent property line should be provided where multifamily uses abut single-family detached dwellings. Although no single-family detached dwellings are proposed in this block, appropriate separation should be provided between the two uses. All plans depicting the proposed layout shall be revised to show no vehicular connection between the alley for the townhouse lots in Block E and the parking lot for the age-restricted multifamily building. The applicant shall revise the PPS to reorient Lots 18 through 24, Block E, so that they are parallel with the townhouse sticks for Lots 12–17 and 25–30, Block E, instead of perpendicular, or revise the PPS to demonstrate adequate buffering between Lots 18–24, Block E, and the proposed age-restricted building.

In regards to the public arts center, appropriate landscape buffering shall be provided between the arts center and abutting townhouse lots and will be reviewed with the Special Permit, and again the spatial relationships between the lotting and parcel layout, including street locations will not change to accommodate landscaping. Landscaping will be added to the existing spaces as appropriate with the special permit.

7. **Environmental**—The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed PPS 4-15005, stamped as received by the Environmental Planning Section July 31, 2015. The Environmental Planning Section approved a Natural Resource Inventory Equivalency Letter, NRI-038-2015 and Woodland Conservation Exemption Letter, S-029-15, for this project area on February 20, 2015. No other environmental reviews or tree conservation plan approvals have occurred on this site. The project is subject to the environmental regulations of Subtitle 24, 25 and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010 and February 1, 2012, because the application is for a new preliminary plan.

According to mapping research and as documented on the approved NRI, there are no regulated environmental features, woodlands or specimen trees present on-site. This site slopes towards the northeast and drains to the Henson Creek sub-watershed. The predominant soils found to occur on-site, according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS), are the Beltsville-Urban land complex, Sassafras-Urban land complex and Urban Land. According to available information, Marlboro clay and Christiana complex are not identified on the property. According to the Sensitive Species Project Review Area (SSSPRA) layer prepared by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered (RTE) species on or in the vicinity of this property. The site has frontage on Homer Avenue, a local road and Suitland Road, a master planned collector road. Only roads classified as arterial or higher are generally evaluated for traffic-generated noise impacts when adjacent residential uses are proposed. There are no



designated scenic or historic roads adjacent to the site. According to the approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan, the site contains no Regulated, Evaluation or Network Gap Areas within the designated network of the plan.

**Conformance to Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan**

The site is now located within the Established Communities Area of the Growth Policy Map and Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by Plan Prince George's 2035.

**Master Plan Conformance**

The subject property is located within the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 4 Master Plan). The site is also located within the 2014 Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA). The Southern Green Line Sector Plan contains no Environmental Infrastructure recommendations or guidelines. The Environmental Infrastructure section of the Subregion 4 Master Plan contains goals, policies and strategies. The following guidelines have been determined to be applicable to the current project. The text in **BOLD** is the text from the master plan and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance.

**Policy 1: Protect, preserve and enhance the green infrastructure network in Subregion 4.**

**Policy 2: Minimize the impacts of development on the green infrastructure network and SCA's.**

The site contains no areas within the 2005 *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*. No woodlands or regulated environmental features area located on-site. This site's impacts will not directly impact SCA's with Subregion 4.

**Policy 3: Restore and enhance water quality in areas that have been degraded, and preserve water quality in areas not degraded.**

The applicant proposes rainwater harvesting, micro-bioretenion trenches and extended detention facilities to handle stormwater management for the entire project. These trenches are located in the open areas behind the proposed residential units. There are bio-planters along both Suitland Road and the unnamed interior road which have commercial uses fronting on them. The current regulations required that stormwater management be addressed through water quality and quantity using Environmental Site Design (ESD) to the fullest extent practicable.

**Policy 4: Improve the base information needed for the county to undertake and support stream restoration and mitigation projects.**

The subject site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory that provides and account of the existing conditions of the site. There are no regulated environmental features on-site.

**Policy 5: Require on-site management of stormwater through the use of environmentally sensitive stormwater management techniques (i.e., fully implement the requirements of ESD) for all development and redevelopment projects.**

The applicant proposes rainwater harvesting, micro-bioretenion trenches and extended detention facilities to handle stormwater management for the entire project. These trenches are located in the open areas behind the proposed residential units. There are bio-planters along both Suitland Road and the unnamed interior road which have commercial uses fronting on them. The current regulations required that stormwater management be addressed through water quality and quantity using Environmental Site Design (ESD) to the fullest extent practicable. This concept has been approved by the Department of Permitting, Inspection and Enforcement (DPIE).

**Policy 6: Assure that adequate stream buffers are maintained and enhanced and utilized design measures to protect water quality.**

The subject site has an approved Natural Resources Inventory that provides an account of the existing conditions of the site. There are no regulated environmental features on-site.

**Policy 7: Reduce air pollution to support public health and wellness by placing a high priority on transit-oriented development and transportation demand management (TDM) projects and programs.**

Air Quality is a regional issue that is currently being addressed by the Council of Governments.

**Policy 8: Reduce adverse noise impacts so that the State of Maryland's noise standards are met.**

The site has frontage on Suitland Road, which is a master planned collector roadway that does not generate enough traffic to produce noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn. The site has several other minor collector roadways that are not identified as master planned roadways which are located on-site.

**Policy 9: Implement environmental sensitive building techniques that reduce overall energy consumption.**

**Policy 11: Increase the county's capacity to support sustainable development.**

The development applications for the subject property which require architectural approval should incorporate green building techniques and the use of environmentally sensitive building techniques to reduce overall energy consumption. The use of green building techniques and energy conservation techniques should be encouraged and implemented to the greatest extent possible. The applicant has committed to develop Lots 20, 21, and Block G as net zero dwellings.

**Policy 12: Ensure that the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area is protected to the maximum extent possible through the implementation of water quality and other related measures.**

The subject property is not located in the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area (CBCA).

**Policy 13: Preserve, restore, and enhance the existing tree canopy.**

Subtitle 25 Division 3 requires the site to provide a ten percent tree canopy coverage. Tree Canopy Coverage (TCC) will be addressed by the Urban Design Section at the time of the Detail Site Plan review.

The site is exempt from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has less than 10,000 square feet of woodland and no previously approved Tree Conservation Plan.

**Policy 14: Improve the county's capacity to support increases in the tree canopy.**

Tree Canopy Coverage will be reviewed with the Special Permit

**Conformance with the 2005 Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan**

The subject property is not located within the designated Green Infrastructure Network.

8. **Stormwater Management**—DPIE has approved a Stormwater Management Concept Plan, (SWM-21525-2015-00), to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. The applicant proposes a mixture of bio-retention planters, bio-retention trenches along with rainwater harvesting to handle stormwater management for the entire project. Additionally, a stormwater management fee for on-site attenuation/quality control measures is required. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 21525-2015-00 and any subsequent revisions.

The 2010 *Approved Water Resources Functional Master Plan* contains policies and strategies related to the sustainability, protection, and preservation of drinking water, stormwater, and wastewater systems within the County, on a countywide level. These policies are not intended to be implemented on individual properties or projects, and instead will be reviewed periodically on a countywide level. As such, each property reviewed and found to be consistent with the various countywide and area master plans; County ordinances for stormwater management, 100-year floodplain, and woodland conservation; and programs implemented by DPIE; the Prince George's County Health Department; the Prince George's County Department of the Environment (DoE); the Prince George's Soil Conservation District; the M-NCPPC, Planning Department; and the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC) are also deemed to be consistent with this functional master plan.

9. **Parks and Recreation**—The subject property is not directly adjacent to any existing M-NCPPC owned property; however; several existing parks are in the vicinity of the proposed development. The surrounding parks and recreation facilities include:

- Shadyside Park: Approximately 500 feet to the northwest and undeveloped.
- Bradbury Park Building: Approximately three quarters ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) of a mile to the northwest which contains a community recreation building, playground, basketball courts and ballfields.
- Suitland Park: Approximately one-half ( $\frac{1}{2}$ ) mile to the southeast which contains a playground, basketball courts, a softball field, and walking trails.
- William Beanes Community Center: Approximately three quarters ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) of mile to the southeast and contains a community center in conjunction with the elementary school, tennis courts and ballfields.

Based on the development plans as submitted, the total new development will generate a projected residential population of 2,394 new residents to the area. Pursuant to Section 24-134(a)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, residential subdivisions shall dedicate 15 percent of the land to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) for public parks when the density exceeds 12 dwelling units per acre. The proposed density of this development is 36.6 dwellings per acre for all dwellings, therefore the requirement for Mandatory Dedication would equate to 3.77 acres of land. Density of the town house units are approximately 19 dwelling units an acre, but for this calculation the multifamily is included.

The applicant is proposing to fulfill the mandatory dedication requirement by providing private on-site recreational facilities in accordance with Section 24-135(b). Private recreational facilities may be approved by the Planning Board provided that the facilities will be superior, or equivalent, to those that would have been provided under the provisions of Mandatory Dedication. Further, the facilities shall be properly developed and maintained to the benefit of future residents through covenants, and a Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA), with this instrument being legally binding upon the subdivider and his heirs, successors and assignees.

Based on the projected population for the development, the applicant is required to provide \$902,481.45 of recreational facilities for the future residents. The applicant has provided a list of facilities to be provided, which includes two swimming pools with decks and two fitness/yoga rooms to be utilized for the multifamily development, and 50,000 square feet of open space for passive and open play area to be utilized for the townhouse and single-family detached dwellings. The total cost of the facilities is estimated to be \$1.2 million. It is determined that the provision of private recreational facilities in lieu of Park Dedication is appropriate for this development. Additionally, the proposed public arts center will be developed with a 30,000-square-foot urban park and the subject site is adjacent to an elementary school with public recreation facilities during non-school hours. Appropriate triggers for the construction of the proposed private on-site recreational facilities will be set forth in the RFA. The recreation facility cost estimate provided by the applicant also included an urban park to be located on Block I and a small amount of open space on Block G which will be constructed. However, these improvements are not required to be included in the RFA because they are over and above the minimum value.

The proposed land uses are expected to be developed in phases. The conditions for the RFA's and bonding of the on-site recreational facilities should allow for phasing also. Prior to approval of a final plat for the townhouse or single-family dwelling unit lots, the applicant shall submit an RFA for approval for the 47,000 square feet of open space elements to be constructed in phase with development, and post the bond for those facilities prior to the issuance of the first building permit. Prior to the first final plat for the multifamily development on Parcel A, Block A or Parcels A and B, Block B, the applicant shall submit an RFA for approval, and post a bond for the facilities listed in the October 15, 2015 Recreational Facilities Cost Estimate provided by the applicant, as amended prior to signature approval. The recreational facilities proposed by the applicant for Parcel A, Block H for the housing for the elderly are over and above that required for the fulfillment of mandatory dedication and will be provided with the building permits, but not require bonding and an RFA. The applicant has proposed recreational facilities in excess of what is required.

10. **Trails**—This PPS has been reviewed for conformance with Sections 24-123 and 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations, the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT)*, the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA)*, and the 2006 *Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plan (Suitland Development Plan)* in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. Due to the site's location within the Suitland Regional Transit District Center (per the Adequate Public Facility Review Map of Plan Prince George's 2035), the application is subject to the requirements of Prince George's County Council Bill CB-2-2012 and the associated "Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 2, 2013."

**Conformance to the Sector Plan, Development Plan, and MPOT**

One master plan trail directly impacts the subject property. Suitland Road is designated as a bicycle corridor in the MPOT. The MPOT includes the following recommendation for Suitland Road:

- **Suitland Road Sidewalks and Designated Bike Lanes:** An attractive streetscape with continuous sidewalks, on-road bicycle facilities, and pedestrian safety features are needed along Suitland Road. Suitland Road provides access to the Suitland Federal Center, Suitland Community Park, and several nearby school facilities. (MPOT, page 29)

Another master plan trail is near the subject property, but does not directly impact proposed development. Silver Hill Road is designated as a bicycle corridor in the MPOT. The MPOT includes the following recommendation for Silver Hill Road:

- **Silver Hill Road Sidewalks and Designated Bike Lanes:** These improvements will enhance access to the Suitland Metro, the Suitland Federal Center, several commercial areas, and Francis Scott Key Elementary School. Sidewalks exist along many segments of Silver Hill Road. Existing sidewalks are narrow and placed immediately behind the curb. Sidewalks should be at least six feet wide and be incorporated into a pedestrian-friendly streetscape with amenities and safety features. (MPOT, page 22)

The MPOT contains a section on Complete Streets which provides guidance on accommodating all modes of transportation as new roads are constructed or frontage improvements are made. It also includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

**POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.**

**POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.**

The Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA also provides key recommendations for bicycle, pedestrian and trail facilities. These recommendations reaffirm and expand upon the recommendations of the MPOT. The relevant recommendations are copied below from Table 25 of the Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA:

- **Suitland Road:** Construct median refuge and curb extensions and install flashing beacon. Add bike lanes (Southern Green Line Sector Plan, page 120).
- **Suitland-Silver Hill Greenway:** Add off-street multi-use trail along the Federal Campus frontage, across the Suitland Parkway, along Smithsonian frontage to Old Silver Hill Road and to MD 5 and Iverson Mall. The Suitland-Silver Hill Greenway off-street trail would greatly enhance the pedestrian and bicycle environment, improving access to the Metro station and connection between neighborhoods (Southern Green Line Sector Plan, page 120).
- **Silver Hill Road:** Add bike lanes. This roadway is proposed to have bike lanes in the MPOT, but unless the roadway is subject to lane reductions it may not be possible to provide space for bike lanes. High speed traffic will remain a challenge to use this road by bicyclists (Sector Plan, page 120).

Additionally, the Suitland Development Plan includes the following strategies related to bicyclist and pedestrian improvements:

- Provide a multimodal transportation system consisting of public rail and bus service, pedestrian paths, bicycling opportunities, and automobile access.
- Establish a hiker/biker network with accessibility throughout the area.
- Provide bicycle lanes and a pedestrian path network.
- Maximize the pedestrian connectivity of all public spaces and public parking sites.

Pertaining to the recommendation and strategies stated above, the subject site currently includes sidewalks along both sides of Homer Avenue between Chelsea Way and Suitland Road as well as along both sides of Huron Avenue between Chelsea Way and the businesses fronting Suitland Road. Additionally there are sidewalks along both sides of Lewis and Hudson Avenues, and along Suitland Road, which front the subject site.

Furthermore, the PPS demonstrates a comprehensive planned sidewalk network that will serve the subject site. The applicant has proposed a new street geometry within the subject site, including altering Lewis and Hudson Avenues and building new roads that will increase the access throughout the site. This new street geometry resembles a grid network and will contribute to the walkability of the site. The submitted BPIS enumerates the on-site pedestrian and bicycle improvements, which is further discussed. These on-site improvements (with the public ROW and on private property) include:

- Five-foot concrete sidewalk along all rights-of-way within the project boundaries, approximately 12,235 feet of sidewalk
- 33 concrete sidewalk ramps
- Five-foot paved bicycle lane along Huron Avenue
- 19 pedestrian benches and two built-in pedestrian benches
- 21 trash receptacles
- 10 bicycle racks
- 28 bicycle racks inside an indoor bicycle parking facility
- 118 streetlights
- 204 shade trees in the public right-of-way

The on-site improvements (within the entire development boundary) will contribute to creating a bicyclist and pedestrian friendly environment. The applicant can implement the following recommendations to further improve walking and bicycling within the subject site:

- Install Share the Road signage on Homer Avenue. Share the Road signage will help alert motorists entering the subject site that they have entered a multimodal area and should drive accordingly.
- Install two high visibility crosswalks crossing Huron Avenue within the subject site. Crosswalk locations are subject to review and modification by Department of Permitting,

Inspections, and Enforcement (DPIE) and Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T).

- Install two high-visibility crosswalks crossing Homer Avenue within the subject site. Crosswalk locations are subject to review and modification by DPIE and DPW&T.

**Conformance to Section 24-124.01 (Adequate Public Pedestrian and Bikeway Facilities)**

The property is located within the Suitland Regional Transit District Center per the Adequate Public Facility Review Map of Plan Prince George's 2035. This PPS is therefore subject to the adequate public facilities review procedures that are described in Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations, which applies to any development project requiring the subdivision or re-subdivision of land within centers and corridors. The Prince George's County Planning Board shall require the developer/property owner to construct adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities (to the extent that such facilities do not already exist) throughout the subdivision and within one-half mile walking or biking distance of the subdivision if the Planning Board finds that there is a demonstrated nexus to require the applicant to connect a pedestrian or bikeway facility to a nearby destination, including a public school, park, shopping center, or line of transit within available public rights-of-way.

Section 24-124.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations requires that a demonstrated nexus be found with the subject application in order for the Planning Board to require the construction of off-site pedestrian and bikeway facilities.

This section is copied below, and the demonstrated nexus between each of the proffered off-site improvements and the subject application is summarized below.

- (c) **As part of any development project requiring the subdivision or re-subdivision of land within Centers and Corridors, the Planning Board shall require the developer/property owner to construct adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities (to the extent such facilities do not already exist) throughout the subdivision and within one-half mile walking or biking distance of the subdivision if the Board finds that there is a demonstrated nexus to require the applicant to connect a pedestrian or bikeway facility to a nearby destination, including a public school, park, shopping center, or line of transit within available public rights of way. The cost of the additional off-site pedestrian or bikeway facilities shall not exceed thirty-five cents (\$0.35) per gross square foot of proposed retail or commercial development proposed in the application and Three Hundred Dollars (\$300.00) per unit of residential development proposed in the application, indexed for inflation.**

There is a strong nexus between the subject application and the proffered off-site improvements. The improvements proposed will increase pedestrian and bicyclist access and level of comfort in the area, and directly benefit the future residents and employees of the subject site in a number of ways. The improvements as shown in the BPIS and associated exhibit and the associated impacts of each improvement are described below:



**Item 1:** Pedestrian intersection improvements at the intersection of Lacy and Lewis Avenues, will enhance the existing intersection, which has only two crosswalks, and two sidewalks. The improvements will provide not only crosswalks, but a new curb ramp and sidewalks. These improvements will increase the opportunity for comfortable walking between the subject site and the residential neighborhood to the north.

This includes improving the walking environment to Suitland Elementary school, which is located at the intersection.

**Items 2 and 3:** Intersection improvements at Homer and Porter Avenues and Huron and Porter Avenues, respectively, will improve the walking environment along Porter Avenue. Although Homer Avenue has four curb ramps, none of the ramps meet American with Disabilities Act (ADA) guidelines. At the intersection of Huron and Porter Avenues, there are no curb ramps, crosswalks, or any sidewalks that connect to the intersection – there is one sidewalk on Huron Avenue that ends nearly 30 feet before the intersection. These improvements will provide necessary pedestrian facilities for future residents and visitors of the subject site and connections between the subject site and the residential neighborhood to the east. Additionally, the new sidewalks will provide more comfortable pedestrian space that connects to the subject site.

**Item 4:** New crosswalks at the intersection of Suitland and Silver Hill Roads, will replace and update the existing red brick paver crosswalks at all legs of the intersection. The intersection is the largest intersection in the area. Silver Hill Road is nearly 100 feet wide at the intersection. Using a brick paver style crosswalk help signal to motorists that the crosswalk is different from the road way and should not be used as queuing space. It also emphasizes that pedestrians may be crossing at that location.

**Item 5:** A five-foot paved bicycle lane along the northbound side of Huron Avenue, will complement the on-site bicycle lane improvement in the south bound direction. Although these bicycle lanes will parallel shared lane markings on Silver Hill Road, the lower speed limits and expected volumes will make this facility more comfortable for bicyclists. Additionally, the bike lanes will signal to people living, working, or visiting the subject site and the surrounding area that bicycling is an encouraged mode of transportation.

**Item 6:** Crossing improvements on Suitland Road, will improve the existing crosswalk crossing Suitland Road at an entrance to the subject site and at a pedestrian access point to the federal center. The flashing beacon, which is activated by pedestrians, will reinforce motorist awareness of pedestrians crossing. The re-striped crosswalk will signal to pedestrians where to cross the street. This crossing is expected to be used by federal center employees crossing Suitland Road as well as by residents and visitors to the subject site traveling to the federal center, the metrorail station, or other destinations south of the subject site.

The Planning Board finds that there is a strong nexus between the subject site and the proffered off-site improvements. These off-site improvements will contribute to improving the walking and bicycling environment in the subject site and in the surrounding area. Additionally, the pending off-site improvements will further improve the comfort and safety of pedestrians and bicyclists traveling along Suitland Road.

County Council Bill CB-2-2012 requires that the Planning Board make a finding of adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities at the time of Preliminary Plan. Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations is applicable to PPS within designated Centers and Corridors. The subject application is located within the designated Suitland Regional Transit District Center, as depicted in the Map of Transportation Service Areas of the General Plan. CB-2-2012 also included specific guidance on the criteria for determining adequacy, as well as what steps can be taken if inadequacies need to be addressed.

**(b) Except for applications for development projects proposing five (5) or fewer units or otherwise proposing development of 5,000 or fewer square feet of gross floor area, before any preliminary plan may be approved for land lying, in whole or part, within County Centers and Corridors, the Planning Board shall find that there will be adequate public pedestrian and bikeway facilities to serve the proposed subdivision and the surrounding area.**

**(1) The finding of adequate public pedestrian facilities shall, at a minimum, include the following criteria:**

**(A) The degree to which the sidewalks, streetlights, street trees, street furniture, and other streetscape features recommended in the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and applicable area master plans or sector plans have been constructed or implemented in the area.**

The MPOT provides guidance regarding building Complete Streets for new developments. This includes building facilities for all modes, building roads in a grid network, and providing sidewalks on both sides of the road. According to the layout exhibit and the BPIS provided by the applicant, the subject site will provide sidewalks along both sides of new road construction, and the roads will be redesigned into a semi-grid network. These improvements will help address the recommendations list in the MPOT. The new street network will provide better access between Homer and Huron Avenue and will contribute to the area's walk-ability. The MPOT does not provide any specific pedestrian recommendations for the subject site.

*The 2014 Approved Southern Green Line Station Area Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment identifies a pedestrian refuge and pedestrian*

signal at the Suitland Road crossing. While the applicant has not proffered a pedestrian median refuge, the applicant has proposed new crosswalk pavement markings and a flashing beacon, both of which will contribute to the area's pedestrian adequacy.

The on- and off-site improvements proffered by the applicant will provide additional sidewalks where there are currently none, and pedestrian amenities such as benches, trash receptacles, and lighting within the subject site. These will contribute to the type of pedestrian environment discussed in Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations. Currently, there is a sidewalk on Suitland Road and sidewalks within the subject site, but there are no other pedestrian amenities. The MPOT further recommends providing continuous sidewalks along roadways, creating a comprehensive sidewalk network within planned centers, and improving pedestrian safety. The on- and off-site sidewalks proffered by the applicant will provide sidewalks along all rights-of-way and contribute to a comprehensive sidewalk recommended by the Complete Streets element of the MPOT and required by Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations.

- (B) The presence of elements that make it safer, easier, and more inviting for pedestrians to traverse the area (e.g., adequate street lighting, sufficiently wide sidewalks on both sides of the street buffered by planting strips, marked crosswalks, advance stop lines and yield markings, “bulb-out” curb extensions, crossing signals, pedestrian refuge medians, street trees, benches, sheltered commuter bus stops, trash receptacles, and signage).**

The layout exhibit provided by the applicant shows a complete sidewalk network internal to the subject site. The internal sidewalk network is provided along all rights-of-way and will allow for convenient walking throughout of the subject site. These improvements will provide pedestrians with safe places to walk within the subject site. Additionally, the BPIS provided by the applicant list additional pedestrian amenities including benches, trash receptacles, lighting, and trees throughout the site. These amenities will increase pedestrian comfort and safety while traveling throughout the subject site. The street furniture, trees, and lighting will provide additional comfort for pedestrians within the subject site.

The applicant has also proffered new or updated crosswalks at five intersections near the subject site, a flashing pedestrian crossing beacon on Suitland Road, and new sidewalks as off-site improvements.

These improvements will help create a safer and more inviting pedestrian environment.

**(2) The finding of adequate public bikeway facilities shall, at a minimum, include the following criteria:**

**(A) The degree to which the bike lanes, bikeways, and trails recommended in the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and applicable area master plans or sector plans have been constructed or implemented in the area;**

The MPOT designates the Suitland and Silver Hill Roads as planned bicycle facilities with bike lanes. Currently there are no bicycle facilities along Suitland Road and there are shared roadway pavement markings on Silver Hill Road. There are no bicycle lanes, or shared roadway pavement markings currently within the subject site. The applicant has proffered bicycle lanes on Huron Avenue, a road parallel to Silver Hill Road. These bike lanes will likely supplement the shared lane markings on Silver Hill Road. Share the road signage along Homer Avenue is a condition of approval, which will alert motorists to expect bicyclists on the road.

**(B) the presence of specially marked and striped bike lanes or paved shoulders in which bikers can safely travel without unnecessarily conflicting with pedestrians or motorized vehicles;**

On-the subject site, the applicant has proffered dedicated bicycle lanes along Huron Avenue, where there currently are no bicycle facilities. This bicycle lane would provide additional bicycle access to and throughout the site and reduce potential travel conflicts with both pedestrians and motor vehicles. Additionally, the bicycle lane on Huron Avenue proffered by the applicant will supplement the shared lane markings on Silver Hill Road, which the MPOT designates as a planned bike lane. It appears that the current “curb to curb” space along Silver Hill Road does not include sufficient space for full bicycle lanes, but shared lane markings will accommodate bicycle traffic consistent with the Bicycle Policy and Design Guidelines of the Maryland State Highway Administration.

**(C) the degree to which protected bicycle lanes, on-street vehicle parking, medians, or other physical buffers exist to make it safer or more inviting for bicyclists to traverse the area; and**

Currently, there are no bicycle facilities on site and the only off-site facilities are shared lane markings along Silver Hill Road. The proffered bicycle lane on Huron Avenue will provide bicyclists with dedicated

space to travel through the subject site with less potential for conflict with motor vehicles. The pending proffered bicycle improvement on the south side of Suitland Road will provide a bicycle facility that is completely separated from motor vehicle traffic. The MPOT calls for bicycle lanes along Suitland Road and along Silver Hill Road. Striping bike lanes can be considered comprehensively by the SHA at the time of road resurfacing or improvements.

**(D) the availability of safe, accessible, and adequate bicycle parking at transit stops, commercial areas, employment centers, and other places where vehicle parking, visitors, and/or patrons are normally anticipated.**

The submitted BPIS indicates that ten outdoor bicycle racks and 28 indoor bicycle racks will be installed as part of the development. These racks will contribute to bicyclist facility adequacy at the subject site and appear to be sufficient to serve the future residents, employees, and guests of the subject site.

Based on the evaluation above, this applicant meets the required findings for adequate public pedestrian and bikeway facilities, subject to the conditions outlined herein. The subject application will provide much needed sidewalk improvements within and outside of the subject site. The off-site improvements exceed the \$307,800 cost cap. Although the bicyclist and pedestrian improvements along Suitland Road are still pending, the application under consideration dramatically improves the pedestrian and bicyclist environment within the limits of the subject site and provides needed off-site improvements within the limits of the legislation.

The Redevelopment Authority has indicated that the required transportation improvements will be funded through the issuance of Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) Bonds (or other financing sources including General Obligation Bonds) to be approved by the Prince George's County Council or the County Executive and listed within the subsequent council resolution. Inclusion of these specific improvements into the council resolution for the bonds will satisfy the requirement of having full financial assurances, having been permitted for construction through the applicable operating agency's access permit process, and having an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate operating agency as required in Section 24-124 and 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Based on the foregoing analysis, the PPS meets the required findings for adequate public pedestrian and bikeway, subject to conditions.

11. **Transportation**—The property is located at the northern quadrant of Silver Hill Road (MD 458) and Suitland Road in Suitland. The applicant is proposing a mixed-use development consisting of residential, retail and commercial and public uses.

The application is supported by a traffic impact study (TIS) and updated traffic counts (September 2015) were provided by the applicant. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted consistent with the “Guidelines.” This development will generate 364 (98 in; 266 out) AM peak-hour trips and 446 (267 in; 179 out) PM peak-hour trips. These rates were determined by using the “Guidelines.”

The traffic generated by the proposed preliminary plan would impact the following intersections:

- MD 4 and Silver Hill Road (MD 458)
- MD 458 and Royal Plaza Drive
- MD 458 and Brooks Drive
- MD 458 and Porter Avenue
- MD 458 and Park Lane
- MD 458 and MD 218
- MD 218 and Huron Avenue
- MD 218 and Homer Avenue
- MD 458 and Swann Road
- MD 458 and Navy Day Drive
- MD 458 and Chelsea Way

The subject property is located within the Transportation Service Area (TSA) 1, as defined in the *Plan Prince George’s 2035 Approved General Plan*, as well as the *2009 Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

- a. **Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better;
- b. **Unsignalized intersections:** The procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. A three-part process is employed for two-way stop-controlled intersections: (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using the *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure; (b) the maximum approach volume on the minor streets is computed if delay exceeds 50 seconds, (c) if delay exceeds 50 seconds and at least one approach volume exceeds 100, the CLV is computed. A two-part process is employed for all-way stop-controlled intersections: (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using the *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure; (b) if delay exceeds 50 seconds, the CLV is computed. Once the CLV exceeds 1,150 for either type of intersection, this is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

The following table indicates the intersections deemed critical to the site, along with the levels of service for each intersection:

<b>EXISTING CONDITIONS</b>		
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>AM</b>	<b>PM</b>
	(LOS/CLV/Delay)	(LOS/CLV/Delay)
MD 4 and Silver Hill Road (MD 458)	B/1,011	C/1,226
MD 458 and Royal Plaza Drive	A/967	A/758
MD 458 and Brooks Drive	A/835	A/832
MD 458 and Porter Avenue *	16.6 seconds	17.0 seconds
MD 458 and Park Lane *	13.4 seconds	10.9 seconds
MD 458 and MD 218	B/1,121	C/1,229
MD 218 and Huron Avenue *	17.2 seconds	14.5 seconds
MD 218 and Homer Avenue	15.7 seconds	18.8 seconds
MD 458 and Swann Road	C/1,179	E/1,541
MD 458 and Navy Day Drive	A/989	B/1,028
* Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level-of-service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A level-of-service "E" which is deemed acceptable corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1600 or less is deemed acceptable as per the "Guidelines."		

A second analysis was done to evaluate the impact under background conditions. The TIS identified five background developments whose impact would affect some or all of the study intersections. Additionally, the TIS applied a one percent growth factor along MD 4 as well as a 0.5% growth along all other routes. Under those parameters, the analysis revealed the following results:

<b>BACKGROUND CONDITIONS</b>		
<b>Intersection</b>	<b>AM</b>	<b>PM</b>
	(LOS/CLV/Delay)	(LOS/CLV/Delay)
MD 4 and Silver Hill Road (MD 458)	B/1,044	C/1,292
MD 458 and Royal Plaza Drive	B/1,016	A/813
MD 458 and Brooks Drive	B/1,074	C/1,166
MD 458 and Porter Avenue	20.5 seconds	21.7 seconds
<i>MD 458 and Park Lane</i>	<i>eliminated under future condition</i>	
MD 458 and MD 218	C/1,186	D/1,341
MD 218 and Huron Avenue	18.0 seconds	11.5 seconds
MD 218 and Homer Avenue	17.2 seconds	22.3 seconds
MD 458 and Swann Road	C/1,248	<b>F/1,625</b>
MD 458 and Navy Day Drive	B/1,026	B/1,083
MD 458 and Chelsea Way **	A/658	A/828
** Future intersection.		

The third analysis was based background conditions plus site-generated trips. The site traffic was based on the following land uses:

Trip Generation Rates	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
(1) Trips/Single-Family Detached Unit <i>(Per County's Guidelines)</i>	0.15	0.60	0.75	0.59	0.31	0.90
(2) Trips/Single-Family Attached Unit <i>(Per County's Guidelines)</i>	0.14	0.56	0.70	0.52	0.28	0.80
(3) Trips/Multifamily Dwelling Unit <i>(Per County's Guidelines)</i>	0.10	0.42	0.52	0.39	0.21	0.60
(4) Trips/1,000 Sq. Ft. Shopping Center <i>(Per ITE Land Use Code 820 using fitted curve)</i>	1.05	0.65	1.70	3.09	3.35	6.44
(5) Trips/Senior Housing Multifamily Dwelling Unit <i>(Per County's Guidelines)</i>	0.05	0.08	0.13	0.10	0.06	0.16
(6) Trips/1,000 Sq. Ft. Performing Arts/Civic Space <i>(Per ITE LU Code 495 with adjustment per Scoping)</i>	0.45	0.23	0.68	0.45	0.47	0.92
<b>Trip Generation</b>						
<b>Pod A (Blocks C,D,E,F and G)</b>						
Trips/219 SFA & 2 SF DU	31	124	155	115	62	177
- TOD Trip Credit (30%)	-9	-37	-46	-35	-19	-54
- Int. Trip Capture per ITE (3% AM/10% PM)	-1	-4	-5	-12	-6	-18
<b>Net Trips Pod A</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>83</b>	<b>104</b>	<b>68</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Pod B (Block H)</b>						
Trips/137 Senior Housing MF DU	7	11	18	14	8	22
- TOD Trip Credit (30%)	-2	-3	-5	-4	-2	-6
- Int. Trip Capture per ITE (3% AM/10% PM)	-	-	-	-1	-1	-2
<b>Net Trips Pod B</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Pod C (Block B)</b>						
Trips/348 MF DU						
Trips/80,331 Sq. Ft. Retail	35	146	181	136	73	209
- TOD Trip Credit (30%) [Res. & Retail]	84	52	136	248	269	517
- Int. Trip Capture per ITE (3% AM/10% PM)	-36	-59	-95	-115	-103	-218
- Passer-by Adjustment (40%, Retail Only)	-4	-6	-10	-38	-34	-72
<b>Net Trips Pod C</b>	<b>-34</b>	<b>-21</b>	<b>-55</b>	<b>-99</b>	<b>-108</b>	<b>-207</b>
<b>TOTAL TRIPS Pod C</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>112</b>	<b>157</b>	<b>132</b>	<b>97</b>	<b>229</b>
<b>Pod D (Block A)</b>						
Trips/193 MF DU	19	81	100	75	41	116
- TOD Trip Credit (30%)	-6	-24	-30	-23	-12	-35
- Int. Trip Capture per ITE (3% AM/10% PM)	-1	-2	-3	-8	-4	-12
<b>Net Trips Pod D</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>69</b>
<b>Pod E (Block I)</b>						
50,000 Sq. Ft. Performing Arts/Civic Space	23	12	35	23	24	47
- TOD Trip Credit (30%)	-7	-4	-11	-7	-7	-14
- Int. Trip Capture per ITE (3% AM/10% PM)	-1	0	-1	-2	-2	-4
<b>Net Trips Pod E</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>29</b>
<b>TOTAL TRIPS (Pods A – E)</b>	<b>98</b>	<b>266</b>	<b>364</b>	<b>267</b>	<b>179</b>	<b>446</b>

The table above indicates that the proposed development will generate 364 AM peak-hour trips and 446 PM peak-hour trips.



A third analysis depicting total traffic conditions was done, yielding the following results:

<b>TOTAL CONDITIONS</b>		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV/Delay)	(LOS/CLV/Delay)
MD 4 and Silver Hill Road (MD 458)	B/1,058	D/1,352
MD 458 and Royal Plaza Drive	B/1,031	A/842
MD 458 and Brooks Drive	B/1,138	C/1,250
MD 458 and Porter Avenue	33.2 seconds	31.3 seconds
<i>MD 458 and Park Lane</i>	<i>eliminated under background condition</i>	
MD 458 and MD 218	C/1,272	D/1,396
MD 218 and Huron Avenue	25.0 seconds	30.2 seconds
MD 218 and Homer Avenue	21.7 seconds	<b>105.8 seconds</b>
MD 458 and Swann Road	C/1,278	<b>F/1,661</b>
MD 458 and Navy Day Drive	B/1,040	B/1,106
MD 458 and Chelsea Way **	A/780	A/829
** Future intersection.		

The results show that all but two of critical intersections for the proposed development will operate acceptably upon full buildout of the development. Regarding the unsignalized intersection of MD 218 and Homer Avenue, additional analyses pursuant to the “Guidelines” were done, and the conclusion was that no additional improvements will be necessary. Based on the “Guidelines” for unsignalized intersections, the CLV does not exceed 1,150.

**MD 458 and Swann Road**

The intersection of MD 458 and Swann Road was found to operate with a LOS/CLV of F/1,661 during the PM peak hour. The applicant proposed a split phase change to the traffic signal. That request was disapproved by SHA; however, the agency suggested the provision of a second right-turn lane on the eastbound approach. Under that scenario, an analysis showed a LOS/CLV of C/1,286 during the PM peak hour. While the dualization of the eastbound right lane would provide acceptable levels of service, it does not appear that such an improvement is feasible for construction by a private developer nor was it proposed by the applicant. The entire western leg of the intersection of MD 458 and Swann Road is located on property belonging to the Federal Government. It would therefore not be feasible for the Planning Board to condition such an improvement on Federal land, which would require the applicant to acquire a portion of the land to build the improvement.

Both the applicant and SHA provided an analysis which evaluated the intersection using the CLV methodology. The CLV methodology has been authorized in the “Guidelines” as the planning tool for evaluation of signalized intersections. As a planning tool, its usage is predicated on the assumption that all current and future signalized intersections will operate based on a simple two-phase operating system.

Advances in traffic signal designs allow for a traffic signal to operate based on multiple phases. However, analysis of multi-phased signals requires a significant amount of operating data. A CLV-type analysis does not fully describe operations at a dynamic signalized intersection. In light of these facts, the following determinations are made:

- Dualizing the eastbound right lane is not feasible.
- SHA is not amenable to approving a split phase signal operation.
- SHA and TPS concurs that the intersection will operate adequately using the current signal configuration.

In order to meet the requirement of adequate transportation facilities as required pursuant to Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations, the applicant proposes conditions of approval for improvements to address failing critical intersections. In this case the improvement proposed by the applicant, for a dual signalization, was not accepted by SHA because the existing dynamically phased signal already provides greater capacity. The analytical procedures used in the Guidelines do not provide for taking into account dynamic phasing so the Planning Board has relied on the expertise of the SHA, the operating agency. The "Guidelines" do specifically allow input on the analysis for findings of adequacy transportation from the operating agency. In this case, the SHA has indicated that the dynamic signalization currently being used at MD 458 and Swann Road will continue to operate at a better CLV than that which can be accomplished by a split phase signal as proposed by the applicant. The resulting CLV indicates operations that are a better than adequate LOS. It is noted that the CLV analysis provided by SHA is not an analysis currently provided for in the "Guidelines," but based on the operating agencies findings and the current dynamically phased signal the Planning Board finds that the intersection will operate at an acceptable LOS.

In light of these facts, it is determined that the MD 458/Swann Road intersection operates acceptably.

Review of the TIS submitted by the applicant shows that Parcel A, Block J and Parcel B, Block A were not included in the analysis for impact to transportation facilities. Furthermore, the TIS references 80,331 square feet of GFA for proposed commercial retail while the submitted PPS references 90,000 for commercial uses, 50,000 square feet of GFA for a public arts center, and 95,000 for the public arts center. As such, the trip cap for the proposed development includes 80,331 square feet of commercial, which was proposed in the TIS, and not 90,000 and 50,000 for the public arts center, and not 45,000. Therefore, all references to 90,000 square feet of commercial retail and 45,000 square feet of public arts center on the PPS shall be revised to 80,331 and 50,000 respectively, in order to conform the determination of adequacy made with this PPS. The applicant shall provide a revised Traffic Impact Study (TIS) Exhibit 8 which shows that Pod C as described in the TIS includes Parcel A, Block J and Parcel B, Block B.

### **DPW&T Comments**

The PPS was referred to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) as well as SHA for review and comment. A DPW&T memorandum (Issayans to Masog) was submitted on October 6, 2015. The following represent the salient, traffic-related concern of this agency:

- **The proposed development abuts MD 218 (Suitland Road), MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) and six (6) Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) maintained roadways - Huron Avenue, Hudson Avenue, Chelsea Way, Lewis Avenue, Homer Avenue, and Edwin Court. As such, all pertinent Prince George's County DPW maintained roadways and intersections within the study area should be analyzed.**

The critical intersections were derived using the 20 percent/150-trip criteria outlined in the "Guidelines."

- **Please note that DPW&T is programmed to address roadway safety, pedestrian and bicycle accommodation along Swann Road east of MD 458. Therefore, the Swann Road corridor may experience a reconfiguration east of MD 458. As such, all anticipated intersection modifications at MD 458 and Swann Road should consider incorporating the impacts of pedestrians and bicyclist at the intersection.**

All matters pertaining to signal phasing modification will be addressed by SHA.

### **Master Plan Right-of-Way Dedication**

The property is located in an area where the development policies are governed by the Approved Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center Development Plan, February 2006. One of the recommendations from the master plan was the upgrade of Suitland Road to a two-four-lane collector. To that end, the site plans show dedication along its frontage which is consistent with the master plan recommendation.

A portion of two existing buildings located on Parcel 10 Liber 20342 at Liber 666 (4626 Suitland Road) and on Parcel A Plat Book WWW 19-78 (4668 Suitland Road) are shown within the proposed right-of-way dedication proposed for Street 'A' and Street 'G' (between Suitland Road and Street 'B'), adjacent to the intersections with Suitland Road. All existing structures located within land that is proposed for public right-of-way dedication must be razed prior to approval of final plats for dedication of the abutting public rights-of-way. The applicant has indicated that the razing of these buildings and the right-of-way dedication for the aforementioned roads may occur after building permits have been approved for the proposed townhouse development. The proposed development has been analyzed to ensure that adequate right-of-way would exist without the dedication of Street 'A' and full right-of-way dedication of Street 'G' to accommodate the traffic volume generated by the proposed townhouse development. Therefore, the right-of-way dedication for Street 'A' will occur with the platting of Parcel A, Block A and additional right-of-way dedication along Street 'G' will occur with the platting of Parcel A, Block B. The dedication is required for full buildout of this site.

The Redevelopment Authority has indicated that the required transportation improvements will be funded through the issuance of Tax Increment Financing District (TIF) Bonds (or other financing sources including General Obligation Bonds)) to be approved by the Prince George's County Council or the County Executive and listed within the subsequent council resolution. Inclusion of these specific improvements into the council resolution for the bonds will satisfy the requirement of having full financial assurances, having been permitted for construction through the applicable operating agency's access permit process, and having an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate operating agency as required in Section 24-124 and 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations.

Based on the preceding findings, adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations, with conditions.

12. **Vacation Petition**—The PPS proposes the vacation of eleven existing rights-of-way, which are to be rededicated and realigned at the time of final plats for the proposed development. The eleven rights-of-way proposed to be vacated are provided below with plat reference; are only vacated for that portion of the ROW shown on the plats below:

- **Plat Book BB 9-29 – Suitland Manor:** Lee Court, Kenmore Court, Inca Court, Lewis Avenue, Dublin Court, Hamill Court, Castle Court, Chelsea Way, and Abbot Court
- **Plat Book BB 9-56 – Suitland Manor:** Lewis Avenue, Hudson Avenue, Chelsea Way
- **Plat Book WWW 19-78 – Shopping Center for Suitland Realty Company:** 20-foot-wide alley

Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant shall vacate the dedicated public rights-of-way as demonstrated on the approved PPS, in accordance with Section 24-112 of the Subdivision Regulations.

13. **Schools**—The subdivision has been reviewed for impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-23-2003, and concluded the following (nonresidential development is exempt from review for impact on school facilities.):

**Impact on Affected Public School Clusters  
 Detached Single-family Units**

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 3	Middle School Cluster 3	High School Cluster 3
Dwelling Units	2	2	2
Pupil Yield Factor	0.177	0.095	0.137
Subdivision Enrollment	0	0	0
Actual Enrollment	6,696	2,135	4,328
Total Enrollment	6,696	2,135	4,328
State Rated Capacity	8,786	2,890	6,211
Percent Capacity	76%	74%	70%

**Attached Single-family Units**

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 3	Middle School Cluster 3	High School Cluster 3
Dwelling Units	219	219	219
Pupil Yield Factor	0.145	0.076	0.108
Subdivision Enrollment	32	17	24
Actual Enrollment	6,696	2,135	4,328
Total Enrollment	6,728	2,152	4,352
State Rated Capacity	8,786	2,890	6,211
Percent Capacity	77%	74%	70%

**Multifamily Units**

Affected School Clusters #	Elementary School Cluster 3	Middle School Cluster 3	High School Cluster 3
Dwelling Units	563	563	563
Pupil Yield Factor	0.119	0.054	0.074
Subdivision Enrollment	67	30	42
Actual Enrollment	6,696	2,135	4,328
Total Enrollment	6,763	2,165	4,370
State Rated Capacity	8,786	2,890	6,211
Percent Capacity	77%	75%	70%

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, 2014

County Council bill CB-31-2003 established a school facilities surcharge in the amounts of: \$7,000 per dwelling if a building is located between Interstate 495 and the District of Columbia; \$7,000 per dwelling if the building is included within a basic plan or conceptual site plan that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA); or \$12,000 per dwelling for all other buildings. CB-31-2003 allows for these surcharges to be adjusted for inflation and the current amounts are \$9,035 and \$ 15,489 to be paid at the time of issuance of each building permit.

In 2013, Maryland House Bill 1433 reduced the school facilities surcharge by 50 percent for multifamily housing constructed within an approved transit district overlay zone; or where there is no approved transit district overlay zone within a quarter (1/4) mile of a Metro station; or within the Bowie State MARC Station Community Center Designation Area, as defined in the 2010 *Approved Bowie State Marc Station Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*. The Maryland House Bill 1433 also established an exemption for studio or efficiency apartments that are located within the county urban centers and corridors as defined in §27A-106 of the County Code; within an approved transit district overlay zone; or where there is no approved transit district overlay zone then within a quarter (1/4) mile of a Metro station. This act is in effect from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2018.

The school facilities surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes. The nonresidential development proposed by this PPS is exempt from the review for schools.

14. **Fire and Rescue**—The PPS has been reviewed for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Sections 24-122.01(d) and 24-122.01(e)(1)(E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(E) states that “A statement by the Fire Chief that the response time for the first due station in the vicinity of the property proposed for subdivision is a maximum of seven (7) minutes travel time. The Fire Chief shall submit monthly reports chronicling actual response times for call for service during the preceding month.”

The proposed project is served by Silver Hill Fire/EMS, Company 829. This first due response station located at 3900 Silver Hill Road, Suitland, Maryland, is within the maximum seven-minute travel time for both residential and nonresidential land uses.

**Capital Improvement Program (CIP)**

There are no Prince George’s County CIP projects for public safety facilities proposed in the vicinity of the subject site.

15. **Police Facilities**—The PPS has been reviewed for adequacy of police services and is located in Police District III, Palmer Park.

**Residential**

The response time standard for residential is ten minutes for emergency calls and 25 minutes for nonemergency calls. The times are based on a rolling average for the preceding 12 months. The PPS was accepted for processing by the Planning Department on July 31, 2015.

Reporting Cycle	Previous 12 Month Cycle	Emergency Calls	Nonemergency Calls
Acceptance Date 07/31/2015	6/2014-5/2015	6 minutes	13 minutes
Cycle 1			
Cycle 2			
Cycle 3			

The response time standards of 10 minutes for emergency calls and the 25 minutes for nonemergency calls were met on September 3, 2015.

The Police Chief has reported that the Police Department has adequate equipment to meet the standards stated in CB-56-2005. Pursuant to CR-69-2006, the Prince George's County Council and the County Executive suspended the provisions of Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(A) and (B) regarding sworn police personnel staffing levels.

### **Nonresidential**

The proposed nonresidential development is within the service area of Police District III, Palmer Park. There is 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George's County Police Department and the July 1, 2014 (U.S. Census Bureau) county population estimate is 904,430. Using the 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, it calculates to 127,524 square feet of space for police. The current amount of space 267,660 square feet is within the guideline.

16. **Water and Sewer Categories**—Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.” The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed part of this property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System. The site will therefore be served by public water and sewer service. The site is located in Sustainable Growth Tier 1.
17. **Health Department**—The Prince George's County Health Department has evaluated the PPS and recommends that the applicant remove any trash debris from the site and that all wells be filled at the time of grading permits.
18. **Public Utility Easements**—In accordance with Section 24-122(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, when public utility easements (PUEs) are required by a public utility company, the subdivider shall include the following statement on the final plat:

“Utility easements are granted pursuant to the declaration recorded among the County and Records in Liber 3703 at Folio 748.”

### **Variation Request**

The applicant has filed a variation request from Section 24-122(a) of the Subdivision Regulations for standard public utility easements (PUEs), which are ten feet wide and adjacent to all public rights-of-way and either right-of-way line of a private street. The PPS proposes an alternative PUE to serve the proposed development. Section 24-122 states the following:

- (a) **When utility easements are required by a public utility company, the subdivider shall include the following statement in the dedication documents:**

**Utility easements are granted pursuant to the declaration recorded among the County Land Records in Liber 3703 at Folio 748.**

Section 24-128(b)(12) states the following:

- (12) Private roads provided for by this Subsection shall have a public utility easement contiguous to the right-of-way. Said easement shall be at least ten (10) feet in width, and shall be adjacent to either right-of-way line.**

Section 24-113(a) of the Subdivision Regulations sets forth the required findings for approval of variation request as follows:

- (a) Where the Planning Board finds that extraordinary hardship or practical difficulties may result from strict compliance with this Subtitle and/or that the purposes of this Subtitle may be served to a greater extent by an alternative proposal, it may approve variations from these Subdivision Regulations so that substantial justice may be done and the public interest secured, provided that such variation shall not have the effect of nullifying the intent and purpose of this Subtitle; and further provided that the Planning Board shall not approve variations unless it shall make findings based upon evidence presented to it in each specific case that:**

- (1) The granting of the variation will not be detrimental to the public safety, health, welfare, or injurious to other property;**

The location of utilities on the site must be reviewed and approved by the applicable utility providers to determine their most adequate location in relation to other easements and the overall development of site, thereby ensuring public safety, health, and welfare.

- (2) The conditions on which the variations are based are unique to the property for which the variation is sought and are not applicable generally to other properties;**

The conditions on which the variation is based are unique because the site is county-owned property intended for urban infill redevelopment. The property is surrounded by existing commercial and residential development and is located within one mile of the Suitland Metro Station and federally-owned property. The site is designated for medium-high density development in the 2014 *Approved Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA).

- (3) The variance does not constitute a violation of any other applicable law, ordinance or regulation.**



As the location of the alternative PUE would require approval of the applicable public utility providers, it is determined that no other applicable law, ordinance, or regulation would be violated by this variation.

- (4) **Because of the peculiar physical surroundings, shape or topographical conditions of the specific property involved, a particular hardship to the owner would result, as distinguished from a mere inconvenience, if the strict letter of these regulations is carried out.**

As previously stated, the site is county-owned property intended for urban infill redevelopment. The property is surrounded by existing commercial and residential development and is located within one mile of the Suitland Metro Station and federally-owned property. The site is designated for medium-high density development in the 2014 *Southern Green Line Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Southern Green Line Sector Plan SMA). The placement of a ten-foot-wide PUE along the property frontage would severely inhibit the ability to develop the site in accordance with the medium to high density normally achieved with urban redevelopment within one mile of a metro station.

- (5) **In the R-30, R-30c, R-18, R-18c, R-10, R-10, and R-H zones, where multifamily dwellings are proposed, the Planning Board may approve a variation if the applicant proposes and demonstrates that, in addition to the criteria in Section 24-113 (a) above, the percentage of dwelling units accessible to the physically handicapped and aged will be increased above the minimum number of units required by Subtitle 4 of the prince George's County Code.**

Finding 5 is not applicable to the subject property because the site is not located in any of the listed zones.

Based on the findings above, the variation from Sections 24-122(a) and 24-128(b)(12) for an alternative PUE is **APPROVED**, with conditions.

The applicant intends to implement an alternative PUE on the site, which is supported. A wet utility plan has been submitted by the applicant to show the location of proposed storm drain and water/sewer utility easement.

A dry utility plan shall be submitted by the applicant prior to signature approval of the PPS as an informational exhibit. Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant shall provide documentation of concurrence with the alternative layout from the applicable utility providers at the time of final plat. At the time of final plat, the PUE shall be reflected on the final plat and granted in conformance with the wet and dry utility plans agreed to by the utility companies. If the applicant is unable to obtain consent from all of the affected utilities, a standard ten foot-wide PUE shall be required along all public and one side of all private rights-of-way.

19. **Historic**—The existing commercial buildings located at 4606, 4620, 4628 and 4646 Suitland Road were built in 1950, 1956, 1956 and 1954 respectively. Most of the structures appear to have been substantially altered. The area to the north of the commercial buildings was the location of the Suitland Manor garden apartments, which were constructed in 1942. Built by Sam Minskoff & Sons of New York City, the complex was designed to house some of the numerous defense employees who were supporting the war effort in the District of Columbia. Sam Minskoff & Sons constructed some of the largest apartment houses and hotels in the country prior to World War II. Washington architect Edwin Weihe prepared the architectural plan for the development that provided for two-story buildings with four apartments each. All of the apartment buildings were demolished as of 2009.

Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the subject property. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. This proposal will not impact any historic sites, historic resources or known archeological sites.

20. **Use Conversion**—The subject application is proposing 700 multifamily dwelling units (of which 137 are housing for the elderly), 219 townhouse dwelling units, two (2) single-family detached dwelling units, 80,331 square feet of GFA for retail uses, and 45,000 square feet of GFA for a public arts center. If a substantial revision to the mix of uses on the subject property is proposed that substantially affects Subtitle 24 adequacy findings as set forth in the resolution of approval, that revision of the mix of uses may require approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to approval of any building permits.

21. At the public hearing on November 19, 2015, the Planning Board approved applicant’s revised Conditions 1(a), 1(k), 13(c) and 13(d), and 18(b) per Applicant’s Exhibit No. 1. Revised Condition 1(a) is intended to provide flexibility to the applicant in addressing adequate separation of the townhouse uses and apartment housing for the elderly as it relates to design and layout. Condition 18(b) was revised in order to provide more clarity that the applicant may only dedicate right-of-way that is under its ownership within the boundary of the PPS. The Planning Board’s authority to condition right-of-way dedication only pertains to land that is the subject of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision. While this condition revision is redundant, it is intended to further clarify that the applicant is not required by this PPS approval to dedicate land that is not under its ownership and subject to this PPS.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board’s action must be filed with Circuit Court for Prince George’s County, Maryland within thirty (30) days following the date of notice of the adoption of this Resolution.

\* \* \* \* \*

PGCPB No. 15-124  
File No. 4-15005  
Page 43

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Bailey, with Commissioners Washington, Bailey, Shoaff, Geraldo and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 19, 2015 in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 10th day of December 2015.

Patricia Colihan Barney  
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:WM:ydw