

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, 9620 Investments, LLC is the owner of a 3.58-acre parcel of land known as Lot 51 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section Five, said property being in the 13th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned Commercial Office (C-O) and Development District Overlay (D-D-O); and

WHEREAS, on August 11, 2021, 9620 Investments, LLC filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for 1 parcel; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-20020 for Lottsford Court Medical Arts Building 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 18, 2021, 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 APPROVAL of the application with conditions; and

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2021, 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 Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-012-2021, and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-20020 for 1 parcel with the following conditions:

1. Any proposed residential development for the subject property shall require the approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision, prior to approval of any building permits.
2. Development of the subject property shall be in conformance with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 24888-2009-02 and any subsequent revisions.
3. The applicant, and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall grant a 10-foot-wide public utility easement along the property's frontage of Lottsford Court with the final plat of subdivision.
4. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall be revised, as follows:

- a. Correct the TCP number and name on the worksheet.
  - b. Remove note 1 under General Notes for Tree Conservation, as the correct note is already under the TCP1 General Notes.
  - c. Remove the reforestation notes and details from the plan.
  - d. Remove the TCP2 notes.
  - e. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional preparing the plan.
5. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-012-2021). The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-012-2021) or as modified by the Type 2 tree conservation plan and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree Conservation Plans for the subject property are available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George’s County Planning Department.”

6. Prior to issuance of permits for this subdivision, a Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be approved. The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

“This plat is subject to the recordation of a Woodland Conservation Easement pursuant to Section 25-122(d)(1)(B) with the Liber and folio reflected on the Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, when approved.”

7. At time of final plat, the existing conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated primary management area, except for approved impacts, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section, prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

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

8. Total development within this preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 285 AM peak-hour trips and 380 PM peak-hour trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein shall require a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities and a new PPS.
9. In conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* and the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:
  - a. Planters, trash/recycling receptacles, benches, and pedestrian-scaled lighting.
  - b. Crosswalks connecting between the building entrance and the parking lots on site.
  - c. Short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities consistent with the recommendations of the 2012 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Parking Facilities. The specific number of bicycle parking spaces to be provided shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.
10. Prior to approval of the first building permit for the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that the following adequate pedestrian and bikeway facility, in accordance with Section 24-124.01 of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations ("Required Off-Site Facilities"), has (a) full financial assurances, (b) been permitted for construction through the applicable operating agency's access permit process, and (c) an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate agency:
  - a. Replace the damaged 4-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of Lottsford Court with a 5-foot-wide ADA-compliant sidewalk.

Should the applicant be unable to obtain a permit for the above listed Required Off-Site Facility, through no fault of the applicant's, the applicant shall provide alternative facilities ("Alternative Off-Site Facilities") that provide a level of adequacy equal to the Required Off-Site Facility that could not be constructed. The requirements of Section 24-124.01(g) shall also apply to all alternative off-site facilities. The following combinations of alternative off-site facilities provide an equal level of adequacy and are listed in descending priority order. A lower-priority combination of alternative off-site facilities shall only be provided if the applicant is unable to obtain permits for a higher-priority combination of facilities, through no fault of the applicant's.

- b. Install D11-1/BIKE ROUTE and R4-11/BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs along Lottsford Road within the 0.5 mile radius of the site, from Arena Drive to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard.

Repair/replace the crosswalks at the intersection of MD 202 (Landover Road) and Lottsford Road with continental-style crosswalks.

- c. Install D11-1/BIKE ROUTE and R4-11/BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs along Lottsford Road within the 0.5 mile radius of the site, from Arena Drive to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard.

Provide a crosswalk along the western approach at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court and install Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant ramps.

- d. Repair/replace the crosswalks at the intersection of MD 202 (Landover Road) and Lottsford Road with continental-style crosswalks.

Provide a crosswalk along the western approach at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court and install Americans with Disabilities Act -compliant ramps.

- e. Install bus shelters along Lottsford Road, approximately 250 feet south of McCormick Drive.

- f. Widen up to 200 feet of sidewalk to a 5-foot-width along the north side of Lottsford Court. The length of sidewalk which may be widened shall be limited by the cost cap.

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 site is located on the south side of Lottsford Court, 200 feet west of Lottsford Road. The site consists of one lot known as Lot 51 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section Five, which was recorded in Plat Book VJ 175 page 30 in February 1996. The property has an address of 9620 Lottsford Court. The 3.58-acre property is in the Commercial Office (C-O) and Development District Overlay (D-D-O) Zone, and is subject to the 2013 *Approved Largo Town Center Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (sector plan). The site is currently vacant with existing woodland along its south and west sides, which is to remain.

This preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) proposes to subdivide the property into one parcel, Parcel 1, for 100,000 square feet of medical office development. A future detailed site plan (DSP) will be required for development of the parcel.

The property is the subject of one previously approved PPS, 4-95122 (PGCPB Resolution No. 96-22), also known as the Inglewood Restaurant Park. This PPS covered 14.28 acres and was approved in January 1996. Five lots were approved under PPS 4-95122 for development of an 11,950-square-foot quality restaurant; 14,000 square feet of high turnover restaurant space; a 12-pump service station with convenience market and car wash; or other permitted uses generating no more than 404 AM and 374 PM trips. The current PPS is required because the trips

generated by the proposed medical office use will cause total development within the restaurant park to exceed the original trip cap. The current PPS establishes a new trip cap exclusive to the subject property. The current PPS supersedes 4-95122 for the subject property only. The other lots of the restaurant park remain subject to 4-95122.

3. **Setting**—The site is located on Tax Map 60 in Grid E-4, and is within Planning Area 73. North and northeast of the site are Lots 50, 53, and 54 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section 5, each of which has been developed with a restaurant use. East of the site is Lot 52 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section 5, a vacant lot previously identified as the site of a future bank under DSP-05055, approved in December 2005. Lottsford Court is an approximately 280-foot-long dead-end street, which directly serves the subject property, as well as Lots 50, 52, and 53. Lot 54 is served by way of an existing blanket access easement, which covers Lots 50–54.

Further east of the site beyond Lot 52 is Lottsford Road, and east of that is a vacant lot, known as Lot 5, Block B, of the Largo Park subdivision. South of the site is the Wayne K. Curry Administration Building, an office building owned by Prince George’s County, located on Lots 25, 26, and 30 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section Four. West and northwest of the site are two vacant lots owned by the County, known as Lots 31 and 32 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section Five. These two lots front on a cul-de-sac, known as Peppercorn Place, which connects to McCormick Drive.

All of the lots immediately surrounding the site and within the same block are zoned C-O. The properties across Lottsford Road are zoned Mixed Use-Infill. The site and its surroundings are within the D-D-O Zone.

4. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject PPS and the approved development.

	<b>EXISTING</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>
Zone	C-O/D-D-O	C-O/D-D-O
Use(s)	Vacant	Medical Office Building
Acreage	3.58	3.58
Gross Floor Area	0	100,000
Dwelling Units	0	0
Parcels	0	1
Lots	1	0
Outlots	0	0
Variance	Yes (Section 27-471(h)) (Section 27-474(d)) (Section 27-474(b))	No
Variation	Yes (Section 24-129) (Sections 24-130(b)(6) and (7))	No

Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, this case was heard at the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) meeting on September 3, 2021.

**5. Previous Approvals**—The site is subject to the following previous approvals:

**Conceptual Site Plan CSP-80034**

Note 5 on the plat recorded in Plat Book VJ 175, page 30 states that “development of this property must conform to the I-3 Conceptual Site Plan CSP-80034 approved on June 26, 1980, or as amended by any subsequent revisions thereto.” Available records for CSP-80034 indicate that it was approved in June 1980, covered 228.56 acres, and proposed an office park. The original resolution for this CSP is no longer available, however, a copy of the five conditions of approval is included in the record of DSP-09021. The following conditions of approval from the CSP are relevant to the review of this PPS:

**1. The concerns of the Environmental Planning Division and the S.H.A. regarding stormwater management and floodplain delineation shall be addressed on the preliminary plan and/or site development plan.**

Environmental concerns and stormwater management (SWM) concerns are addressed with the Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-012-2021) and the SWM Concept Plan (24888-2009-02) associated with this PPS, respectively.

**4. A traffic study shall be submitted by the applicant for review prior to approval of any preliminary plan beyond Phase 1 (Lots 1-9).**

A traffic study was submitted with the subject PPS and is addressed in the Transportation finding of this resolution.

**PPS 4-95122**

A previous PPS, 4-95122 (PGCPB Resolution No. 96-22), was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board in January 1996. This PPS covered 14.28 acres and approved five lots, known at the time of the PPS as Lots 1–5 of the Inglewood Restaurant Park. The subject 3.58-acre property is in the same location as Lot 4 of the PPS, which was 3.34 acres.

With 4-95122, variations were approved from Sections 24-129, 24-130(b)(6), and 24-130(b)(7) of the Subdivision Regulations for impacts to a perennial stream, 100-year floodplain, wetlands, and associated buffers. Approved variations are not carried forward to a new PPS, and Subsections (6) and (7) of Section 24-130(b) are no longer included in the Subdivision Regulations. In addition, under the current Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance, impacts to regulated environmental features must be evaluated with a statement of justification (SOJ) for impacts to regulated environmental features instead of a variation request. The applicant submitted an SOJ for the new impact proposed with the current PPS.

PPS 4-95122 also approved a blanket access easement over the five lots of the restaurant park, in accordance with Section 24-128(b)(9) of the Subdivision Regulations. It was found that direct

access from a public street to Lot 2 was not practical, given that its primary frontage was on MD 202 (Landover Road) and its secondary frontage on Lottsford Road was too short for an access point. With the current PPS, this blanket access easement is to remain, and it does not need to be reapproved because the subject site has direct access onto Lottsford Court.

PPS 4-95122 was approved subject to seven conditions, and the following conditions of approval are relevant to the review of the current PPS:

**2. Development of this subdivision shall be in accordance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan, Concept #900077.**

The site is currently subject to an approved SWM Concept Plan, 24888-2009-02, which supersedes the above-named plan. The newer SWM concept plan is discussed further in the Stormwater Management finding of this resolution.

**3. At the time of Final Plat(s), the Patuxent River Primary Management Area Preservation Area shall be placed into a Conservation Easement. However, those areas within the conservation easement for which a variation request has been granted may be disturbed for purposes of the construction and installation of sewer lines, water lines, storm drainage facilities and other infrastructure.**

This conservation easement is shown on the final plat recorded in Plat Book VJ 175 page 30. Although certain impacts to the conservation area were approved with PPS 4-95122 by means of variations, the new impact to regulated environmental features currently proposed with this PPS is reviewed under the current regulations. This impact is discussed further in the Environmental Planning finding of this resolution.

**6. Development on this site shall be limited to a 11,950-square foot quality restaurant, 14,000 square feet of high turnover restaurant space, 3,750 square feet of fast food restaurant space and a 12-pump service station with convenience market and car wash within the subject property, or other permitted uses which generate no more than 404 AM and 374 PM peak hour trips as determined under the Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals (April 1989). Development beyond the limits set by this condition shall require a new Preliminary Plat of Subdivision and a new finding of adequate public facilities for transportation. To provide evidence of compliance with the overall trip cap of 404 AM and 374 PM peak hour trips, each Detailed Site Plan submitted for development within any portion of the subject property shall indicate the total approved development, stated in square feet of gross floor area, prior to and including the date of the submission of the site plan. The Transportation Planning staff shall analyze each site plan application using the most current estimate of trip generation.**

The proposed development will generate trips exceeding the trip cap of the previous PPS; therefore, a new PPS is required, and the current PPS has been filed to satisfy the

requirement. A new trip cap is contained in the Transportation finding of this resolution. A DSP will be required for development of the proposed medical office building, and conformance to the trip cap established with this PPS will be applicable to development of the site.

**Final Plat VJ 175 page 30**

Following the January 1996 approval of PPS 4-95122, Lots 48–52 of the Inglewood Business Community, Section 5 were platted in Plat Book VJ 175 page 30 in February 1996. Lot 51, the subject property, was shown on PPS 4-95122 as Lot 4.

Note 1 on the plat in Plat Book VJ 175 page 30 states that Lots 49, 50, and 51 are subject to Variance V-239-95. The variances in this request previously approved for Lot 51 were from Sections 27-471(h) and 27-474(d) of the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance, in order to allow the lot to have less than 70 feet of frontage on Lottsford Court. A minimum 70-foot frontage was required because at the time the lot was approved, it was in the Planned Industrial/Employment Park Zone. The property was rezoned to C-O with the sector plan; this zone does not have minimum frontage requirements. Therefore, these variances are no longer needed, and they do not need to be noted on the final plat, which is required following the approval of this PPS.

A later plat, recorded in Plat Book REP 192 page 60 in August 2001, approved a lot line adjustment between Lots 48 and 49 to create the current lots known as Lots 53 and 54, leading to the property boundaries currently existing in the restaurant park.

**DSP-09021**

A DSP for development of Lot 51 (PGCPB Resolution No. 10-66) was approved by the Planning Board in June 2010 and affirmed by the Prince George’s County District Council in October 2010. This DSP approved a 120-room hotel on the subject site. Companion to the DSP were a Variance request (VD-09021) from Section 27-474(b), Footnotes 2 and 3, to allow a reduced building and parking setback; a Departure from Design Standards (DDS-598) from Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, to allow the size of all standard, nonparallel parking spaces to be reduced to 9 feet wide by 18 feet long; and Alternative Compliance (AC-10011) to Section 4.3.b of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual), to allow a reduced parking lot perimeter landscape strip between the parking lot and adjoining Lot 50. Construction of the hotel never commenced, and it is no longer proposed.

Because the variance, departure, and alternative compliance requests were specific to the proposed hotel, they would not apply to the medical office building now proposed; any new requests should be made with the DSP required for the medical office building.

All conditions of approval of DSP-09021 were required to be met prior to certification of the DSP, and they are not applicable to this PPS. Based on available records, it does not appear that the DSP was certified.



6. **Community Planning**—The 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035) and conformance with the sector plan are evaluated, as follows:

**Plan 2035**

This PPS is in the Largo Town Center Metro Regional Transit District. The vision for the regional transit district is to establish a mix of mid- to high-rise apartments and townhouses, including average net residential densities of 40+ dwelling units per acre; 3+ floor area ratio for new commercial development; and Metro rail with frequent local feeder connections (bus and shuttle services) and intermodal facilities such as highway, light rail/bus rapid transit, or interstate/arterial highway access.

**Sector Plan**

The sector plan recommends mixed-use development with predominantly office and institutional uses with a focus on medical services. The sectional map amendment reclassified the property to the C-O Zone with a D-D-O.

**Development District Mandatory Standards**

This PPS conforms with the purposes and recommendations for the Development District, as stated in the sector plan, and does not otherwise substantially impair the implementation of the sector plan.

Pursuant to Section 24-121(a)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations, this PPS conforms to the sector plan as evaluated within this finding and throughout this resolution.

7. **Stormwater Management**—SWM Concept Plan 24888-2009-02, approved on September 26, 2019, has been submitted, which shows the use of eight micro-bioretenion facilities and one infiltration trench. The development will be subject to a site development fine grading permit and continuing reviews by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) and the Prince George's County Soil Conservation District.

In accordance with Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations, development of the subject property shall conform with the SWM concept approval and any subsequent revisions to ensure no on-site or downstream flooding occurs.

8. **Parks and Recreation**—In accordance with Section 24-134(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, the subject subdivision is exempt from mandatory dedication of parkland requirements because it consists of nonresidential development.
9. **Bicycle/Pedestrian**—This PPS was reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), the sector plan, and Subtitle 24 of the Prince George's County Code to provide the appropriate bicycle and pedestrian transportation recommendations.

### **Review of Internal Sidewalks and Bicycle Infrastructure**

The companion TCP1 shows sidewalk abutting the four sides of the planned medical office building. The applicant has agreed to provide on-site short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities, as stated in a comment response letter from the applicant (Gibbs to Diaz-Campbell, dated September 22, 2021, page 2), incorporated by reference herein.

The submitted PPS does not include blocks over 750 feet long and therefore does not need to provide facilities, pursuant to Section 24-121(a)(9).

Section 24-123(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations requires all land for bike trails and pedestrian circulation systems that are indicated on a master plan, county trails plan, or abutting existing or dedicated trails to be shown on the PPS. However, there are no such facilities within the bounds of or abutting the subject PPS.

### **Review of Connectivity to Adjacent/Nearby Properties**

The subject site is adjacent to an existing restaurant use on Lot 50. The two properties are proposed to be connected by way of a parking lot drive aisle.

The Bicycle and Pedestrian Impact Statement (BPIS) improvements associated with the development includes replacement of the existing 4-foot-wide sidewalk along the west side of Lottsford Court, which has been damaged by tree roots, with a new 5-foot-wide sidewalk.

### **Review of Master Plan Conformance**

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT includes the following policies regarding sidewalk and bikeway construction and the accommodation of pedestrians and bicyclists (MPOT, pages 9-10):

**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.**

**POLICY 4: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.**

**POLICY 5: Evaluate new development proposals in the Developed and Developing Tiers for conformance with the complete streets principles.**

Based on the MPOT recommendations, bikeway signage and pavement markings should be provided along Lottsford Road within 0.5 mile of the subject site. These improvements are addressed below as an option for meeting off-site bicycle adequacy. Providing these improvements would be consistent with MPOT Policies 2 and 4 because they will help

accommodate bicycling as a mode of transportation and contribute to bicycle-friendly roadways. Policy 1 is superseded by the recommendations of the sector plan for this site. Policy 5 is met with the review of this PPS, and conformance with complete streets principles will be further evaluated at the time of DSP.

In addition, the sector plan includes the following recommendations relevant to the subject PPS. The recommendations are given in bold text, and comments are given in plain text:

1. **Vision Elements/Fully-Integrated, Multimodal Transportation System – Largo Town Center provides a comprehensive, multimodal transportation network that fully accommodates public transit, automobiles, pedestrians and bicyclists through the application of Complete Street principles (pg. ix).**
2. **This sector plan sets out a development vision for the Largo Town Center DDOZ that articulates vibrant and diverse neighborhoods, an efficient multimodal transportation system, sustainable and accessible environmental infrastructure, and pedestrian and bicyclist-friendly urban design. This vision emphasizes:**
  - **Pedestrian and bicycle friendly development and redevelopment in the DDOZ.**
  - **Promote transit-supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian oriented neighborhoods (pg. 8).**
3. **The TDMD (transportation demand management district) is intended to:**
  3. **Provide and maintain adequate multimodal transportation and mobility options for residents, workers, and visitors (pg. 86).**

To meet the above recommendations, a sidewalk zone, consisting of sidewalk and a planting zone or buffer space, should be provided consistent with Figure 8: Plan View of Build to Line Placements on page 136 of Chapter 8 of the sector plan and related criteria listed on pages 135 and 144. The sidewalk and buffer should be evaluated at the time of DSP to determine if they are consistent with Figure 8 and the related criteria. Providing the sidewalk zone will support a pedestrian-oriented neighborhood and will contribute to a multimodal transportation network that accommodates pedestrians.

4. **Street furnishings, including transit shelters, bike racks, benches, bollards, tree grates, trash/recycling receptacles and similar shall be consistent in material, style, and color throughout the TOD-core and are encouraged to be consistent throughout the four quadrants of the DDOZ, west of Landover Road (pg. 151).**

To meet this recommendation, planters, trash/recycling receptacles, benches, and pedestrian-scaled lighting shall be provided. Specifically, these features should be provided within the planting portion of the sidewalk zone. The design of these features shall be evaluated with the DSP.

- 5. A combination of pedestrian-scaled street light fixtures and intersection street lights fixtures will be required to ensure a well-lit street area and to re-establish a unifying element along the area (pg. 152).**

To meet this recommendation, pedestrian-scaled street lighting fixtures shall be provided. Specifically, the features should be provided within the planting portion of the sidewalk zone. Any lighting provided should be evaluated at the time of DSP.

- 6. Bicycle parking should be provided in structured parking garages and surface parking lots based on a site-by-site needs basis. Appropriate location, number of racks, and level of access for each facility depends on the anticipated use of the site or building (pg. 165).**

To meet this recommendation, both short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities shall be provided consistent with the 2012 *AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities*. The type and location of the bicycle parking provided will be evaluated with the DSP. The specific number of bicycle parking spaces provided shall be determined at the time of DSP.

- 7. Drive aisles shall be designed and located so that adequate visibility is ensured for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists when entering individual parking spaces, circulating within a parking facility, and entering or leaving a parking facility (pg. 166).**

To meet this recommendation, crosswalks shall be provided across drive aisles in order to connect between the building and the parking lots on site. . The locations and designs of the crosswalks will be evaluated with the DSP.

#### **Review of Proposed On-Site Improvements**

The applicant proposes sidewalks abutting the subject site, the possibility of adding additional pedestrian-scaled lighting, and the provision of both short-term and long-term bicycle parking facilities.

The proposed on-site pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements reflect the minimum facilities necessary for adequacy, pursuant to Section 24-124.01(b) of the Subdivision Regulations.

#### **Review of Proposed Off-Site Improvements**

The proposed development includes the replacement of the existing 4-foot-wide damaged sidewalk on the west side of Lottsford Court with a new 5-foot-wide sidewalk. A waiver may be needed from DPIE guidelines in order to accommodate the sidewalk widening.

The proposed off-site pedestrian and bicycle facility improvements reflect the minimum facilities necessary for adequacy, pursuant to Section 24-124.01(b).

### **Bicycle and Pedestrian Impact Statement**

The subject site is in the Largo Town Center and is subject to Section 24-124.01 and the Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 2.

The cost cap for the site is \$41,116.43. The cost cap calculation for this development includes the most recent inflation rates available from the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

The applicant's *Inglewood Business Community, Lot 51* BPIS recommends the applicant's contribution be used to widen 180 feet of sidewalk along the south side of Lottsford Court to a 5-foot width, which is consistent with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards.

The estimated cost for the above off-site pedestrian adequacy improvement is \$39,960, which is within the cost cap, pursuant to Section 24-124.01(c). This improvement shall be the top priority, in light of the uprooted sidewalk segments there.

In the event the sidewalk widening is not feasible due to right-of-way restrictions or other reasons, the applicant has proposed a list of alternative off-site improvements, as follows:

- Provide a crosswalk along the western approach at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court and install ADA-compliant ramps. The cost of these improvements is estimated at \$10,800.
- Widen 200 feet of sidewalk to a 5-foot width, along the north side of Lottsford Court. The cost to reconstruct this section of sidewalk is estimated at \$44,400.
- Install bus shelters along Lottsford Road approximately 250 feet south of McCormick Drive. The existing stops have neither benches nor shelters. The cost to install the shelters is estimated at \$36,000.
- Repair/replace the crosswalks at the intersection of MD 202 and Lottsford Road with continental-style crosswalks. The cost to repair these crosswalks is estimated at \$21,600.
- Install D11-1/BIKE ROUTE and R4-11/BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs along Lottsford Road within the 0.5 mile radius of the site, from Arena Drive to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. It is anticipated that 16 total signs will be required. The cost of these signs is estimated at \$14,400.

The alternative improvements listed above also satisfy off-site pedestrian and bicycle adequacy requirements. However, the cost cap limits the value of facilities that may be required. Accordingly, if the top priority improvement cannot be provided, one of the following combinations of alternative facilities shall be provided. The combinations are listed in descending priority order:

1. Install D11-1/BIKE ROUTE and R4-11/BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs along Lottsford Road within the 0.5-mile radius of the site, from Arena Drive to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. It is anticipated that 16 total signs will be required. The cost of these signs is estimated at \$14,400.

Repair/replace the crosswalks at the intersection of MD 202 and Lottsford Road with continental-style crosswalks. The cost to repair these crosswalks is estimated at \$21,600.

2. Install D11-1/BIKE ROUTE and R4-11/BICYCLES MAY USE FULL LANE signs along Lottsford Road within the 0.5-mile radius of the site, from Arena Drive to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. It is anticipated that 16 total signs will be required. The cost of these signs is estimated at \$14,400.

Provide a crosswalk along the western approach at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court and install ADA-compliant ramps. The cost of these improvements is estimated at \$10,800.

3. Repair/replace the crosswalks at the intersection of MD 202 and Lottsford Road with continental-style crosswalks. The cost to repair these crosswalks is estimated at \$21,600.

Provide a crosswalk along the western approach at the intersection of Lottsford Road and Lottsford Court and install ADA-compliant ramps. The cost of these improvements is estimated at \$10,800.

4. Install bus shelters along Lottsford Road, approximately 250 feet south of McCormick Drive. The existing stops have neither benches nor shelters. The cost to install the shelters is estimated at \$36,000.

5. Widen 200 linear feet of sidewalk to a 5-foot-width along the north side of Lottsford Court. The cost to reconstruct this section of sidewalk is estimated at \$44,400. This cost estimate exceeds the cost cap, so the entire 200 feet would not be required to be completed.

#### **Demonstrated Nexus Finding**

The on-site and off-site pedestrian and bicyclist improvements proffered by the applicant will provide improved safety and accessibility for pedestrian travel between the subject site and Lottsford Road.

Pursuant to Section 24-124.01, there is a demonstrated nexus between the proffered improvements for the development and nearby destinations.

Based on the findings presented above, adequate pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities will exist to serve the subdivision, as required under Subtitle 24. The facilities will conform to the MPOT and the sector plan.

10. **Transportation**—Transportation-related findings related to adequacy are made for this PPS, along with any determinations related to dedication, access, and general subdivision layout.

**Analysis of Traffic Impacts**

The table below summarizes trip generation in weekday peak hours used in reviewing traffic and developing a trip cap for this site:

<b>Weekday Trip Generation Summary: 4-20020: Lottsford Court Medical Arts Building</b>								
Land Use	Use Quantity	Metric	Weekday AM Peak Hour			Weekday PM Peak Hour		
			In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
Office (Medical/Professional)	100,000	square feet	230	55	285	120	260	380
<b>Recommended Trip Cap</b>					<b>285</b>			<b>380</b>

The four critical intersections identified in the applicant’s August 2020 traffic study include:

- Lottsford Road at Lottsford Court/Driveway (Lottsford Court and the driveway are stop-controlled)
- Lottsford Road at MD 202 (signalized)
- Lottsford Road at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard/Palmetto Drive (Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and Palmetto Drive are stop-controlled under existing condition and will be signalized under background and total conditions)
- Lottsford Road at Campus Way (signalized)

The subject property is located within a center as identified in Plan 2035. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

**Signalized intersections:** The critical lane volume (CLV) method should be used to measure the level-of-service (LOS). LOS E, with signalized intersections operating at a CLV of 1,600 or better will be acceptable.

**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, and the standards are explained below:

For two-way stop-controlled intersections, a three-part process is employed:

- (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using 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; (d) a CLV no more than 1,150 will be acceptable.

For all-way stop-controlled intersections, a two-part process is employed:  
 (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using the *Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure; (b) if delay exceeds 50 seconds, the CLV is computed; (c) a CLV no more than 1,150 will be acceptable.

The critical intersections identified above, when analyzed with existing traffic and existing lane configurations, operate as follows:

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM and PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM, and PM)	
	Lottsford Road at Lottsford Court/Driveway (unsignalized)	17.5*	24.4*	N/A
Lottsford Road at MD 202 (signalized)	1036	1215	B	C
Lottsford Road at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard/ Palmetto Drive (unsignalized)	17.0*	44.8*	N/A	N/A
Lottsford Road at Campus Way (signalized)	939	912	A	A
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

The critical intersections are not programmed for any lane configuration changes within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation "Consolidated Transportation Program" or Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program. Approved but unbuilt developments have been identified within the study area, background traffic has been developed. A 1 percent annual growth rate for a period of 6 years has been assumed.



<b>BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM and PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM, and PM)	
	Lottsford Road at Lottsford Court/Driveway (unsignalized)	81.9*<100 veh.	113.6*>100 veh. 607	N/A
Lottsford Road at MD 202 (signalized)	1292	1468	C	E
Lottsford Road at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard/ Palmetto Drive (signalized)	786	955	A	A
Lottsford Road at Campus Way (signalized)	1115	1246	B	C
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

The critical intersections identified above, when analyzed with total future traffic as developed using the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1” (Guidelines) including the site trip generation as described above, operate as follows:

<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM and PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM, and PM)	
	Lottsford Road at Lottsford Court/Driveway (unsignalized)	315.6*>100 veh. 590	1205.7*>100 veh. 827	A
Lottsford Road at MD 202 (signalized)	1336	1541	D	E
Lottsford Road at Ruby Lockhart Boulevard/ Palmetto Drive (signalized)	836	1004	A	B
Lottsford Road at Campus Way (signalized)	1142	1275	B	C
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as “+999” suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

Based on the analysis results, all the signalized study intersections will operate at LOS E or better during the peak hours. At the unsignalized intersections, the maximum movement delay will be less than 50.0 seconds, or the maximum CLV computed as a part of the three-step analysis is within the standards of the Guidelines. A trip cap consistent with the trip generation assumed for the site is required.

A memo dated September 10, 2021, sent from DPIE summarized their review of the traffic impact study. This memo is incorporated by reference herein. DPIE's comments do not affect the findings contained in this resolution. DPIE's comments are listed in **BOLD** text below, with evaluation in plain text.

- **The applicant should be conditioned to perform a signal warrant study at the site access along Lottsford Road using most recent traffic counts and construct the signal if warranted.**
- **During the permitting stage, the applicant shall provide a signal warrant study at the Site Access and Lottsford Road.**
- **During the permitting stage, the applicant shall be required to perform an operational analysis along Lottsford Road at all the study intersections using most recent Turning Movement Counts (TMC) and lane configuration.**

Based on the Guidelines, neither a signal warrant study nor an operational analysis are needed for this case in order to ensure the PPS meets Subtitle 24 adequacy requirements. Approval of this PPS is therefore not conditioned on these studies being completed. However, DPIE will still be able to require these studies on their own authority at time of permit.

- **The Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) should be revised for the following reasons:**
  - a) **TMC used at the study intersections are three to four years old and are outdated (conducted in 2017 and 2018). Typical acceptable TMC should be between two years of it begin counted. As such, the applicant should perform a new TIA using the criteria set forth during the pandemic for conducting TMC in the County. Furthermore, the configuration of Lottsford Road has changed due to recent restriping of the roadways. The traffic lanes are now different, and this should be reflected in a revised analysis.**

The traffic counts were taken and used in accordance with the Guidelines and Planning Department policy regarding COVID-affected traffic counts. From the standpoint of determining Subtitle 24 adequacy, revisions to the traffic study or counts are not needed.

- b) **Lottsford Road and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard/Palmetto Drive (intersection #3) should have been studied as a signalized intersection during the background and future conditions. The CLV analysis that was performed for this intersection did not incorporate the accurate lane configuration.**

This issue was identified during initial review of the project, and the applicant was advised prior to SDRC that a revision to the CLV analysis was needed.

In response, the applicant submitted revised CLV worksheets, and an email dated August 31, 2021 (Lenhart to Yang, incorporated by reference herein), which confirmed the intersection would be signalized. The revision was accounted for in the analysis contained in this resolution.

- c) **The average growth rate of 1.14% should be used in growing traffic and not 1%. There trips to and from the site access and at the study intersection when using the 1.14% growth rate may increase the TMC and provide a different outcome.**

Based on the Guidelines, a 1 percent growth rate is acceptable at the planning stage of traffic analysis. From the standpoint of determining Subtitle 24 adequacy, a revised growth rate is not needed.

The site is not within or adjacent to any master plan facilities identified in the MPOT. No additional right-of-way dedication is required from this plan.

Based on the preceding findings, adequate transportation facilities will exist to serve the subdivision, as required in accordance with Section 24-124.

11. **Schools**—Pursuant to Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations, this PPS is exempt from review for impact on school facilities because the proposal consists of nonresidential development.
12. **Public Facilities**—In accordance with Section 24-122.01, water and sewerage, police, and fire and rescue facilities are found to be adequate to serve the subject site, as outlined in a memorandum from the Special Projects Section, dated August 25, 2021 (Thompson to Diaz-Campbell) and incorporated herein by reference.
13. **Use Conversion**—As set forth in the PPS, the total development included in this PPS is 100,000 square feet of medical office development in the C-O Zone. If a substantial revision to the mix of uses on the subject property is proposed that affects Subtitle 24 adequacy findings, as set forth in the resolution of approval and reflected on the PPS, that revision of the mix of uses shall require approval of a new PPS, prior to approval of any building permits. If any residential development is proposed that proposal shall require approval of a new PPS, prior to approval of any building permits.
14. **Public Utility Easement**—In accordance with Section 24-122(a), when utility easements are required by a public company, the subdivider shall include the following statement in the dedication documents recorded on the final plat:

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

The standard requirement for PUEs is 10 feet wide along both sides of all public rights-of-way. The property abuts Lottsford Court to the east. A 10-foot-wide PUE was provided along this road with the prior PPS and established on the current plat. The PUE will be rerecorded with the subject PPS and subsequent plat.

15. **Historic**—A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates that the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. The subject property does not contain and is not adjacent to any designated Prince George’s County historic sites or resources. A Phase I archeology survey is not required.
16. **Environmental**—The subject PPS 4-20020 and TCP1-012-2021 were received on August 11, 2021. Verbal and written comments were provided in an SDRC meeting on September 3, 2021. Revised plans and information were received on October 8, 2021.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the following applications and associated plans for the subject site applicable to this case:

Development Review Case	Associated TCP(s)	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
4-95122	Exempt	Planning Board	Approved	2/8/1996	96-22
DSP-02020	E-014-02/01	Planning Board	Approved	6/27/2002	02-145
NRI-020-09	N/A	Staff	Approved	9/29/2009	N/A
DSP-09021	TCP2-010-10	Planning Board	Approved	6/10/2010	10-66
NRI-020-09-01	N/A	Staff	Approved	12/7/2020	N/A
4-20020	TCP1-012-2021	Planning Board	Approved	11/18/2021	2021-139

**Grandfathering**

The project is subject to the environmental regulations of Subtitles 24, 25, and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010, because it is a new PPS.

**Site Description**

The site includes streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and associated areas of steep slopes. The predominant soils found to occur according to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, and Web Soil Survey include Urban land-Collington-Wist Complex, and Widewater and Issue soils, frequently flooded. According to available mapping information, Marlboro and Christiana clay do not occur on or in the vicinity of this overall property. No forest interior dwelling species (FIDS) habitat or FIDS buffer are mapped on-site. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this overall property. The site drains to Southwest Branch, which is a part of the Western Branch watershed, then to the Patuxent River basin. The site has frontage on Lottsford Court, which is not identified as a master plan roadway. No designated scenic or historic roadways are adjacent to the project site. The site contains regulated and

evaluation areas, as designated on the 2017 *The Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan of the Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan* (Green Infrastructure Plan).

## **MASTER PLAN CONFORMANCE**

### **2014 Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan**

The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map, as designated by Plan 2035.

### **2013 Largo Town Center Sector Plan**

In the approved sector plan, environmental recommendations are made for proposed development. These recommendations contain goals and strategies. The following guidelines have been determined to be applicable to the environmental planning review of the current project. The text in **BOLD** is the text from the sector plan and the plain text provides comments on plan conformance.

#### **Goal: A Green and Sustainable Community**

##### **Strategies:**

- **Identify places where green infrastructure elements of local significance can be permanently preserved and, where possible, restored and enhanced.**
- **Preserve the woodlands along streams as woodland conservation to meet their own requirements or those of adjacent sites.**
- **Identify suitable sites for and construct replacement green infrastructure elements within the Southwest Branch Watershed.**
- **Share stormwater management facilities and function between development sites to reduce the overall land consumption needed to manage stormwater with an emphasis on managing stormwater quantities in shared facilities.**
- **Identify priority downstream locations within the Southwest Branch Watershed for stream and wetland restoration projects required for mitigation.**
- **Integrate stormwater management and environmental site design features with complete street designs for all new and reconstructed interior streets within the sector plan area.**

The site contains regulated and evaluation areas, based on the Green Infrastructure Plan. The regulated areas consist of wetlands, stream buffers and 100-year floodplain on-site.

A Site Development Concept Plan, 24888-2009-02, was approved on September 26, 2019, by DPIE. Their review ensures that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. Development shall be in accordance with the approval of this plan.

### **Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan**

According to the Green Infrastructure Plan, the site contains both regulated and evaluation areas within the designated network of the plan. The conceptual design, as reflected on the PPS and the TCP1, is in keeping with the goals of the Green Infrastructure Plan and focuses development outside of the most sensitive areas of the site. The northern portion of the site is outside of the GI area. The regulated area is mapped along the streams and regulated environmental features and the evaluation area is mapped along the northern portion of the regulated area. The plans as submitted generally show the preservation of the regulated areas. The current PPS and TCP1 are in general conformance with the Green Infrastructure Plan.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW**

### **Natural Resources Inventory**

A Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-020-09-01, was approved on December 7, 2020, and is provided with this PPS. The site contains 100-year floodplain, wetlands, streams, and their associated buffers, which comprise the primary management area (PMA). There is one specimen tree on the property. The TCP1 and the PPS show all the required information correctly, in conformance with the NRI. No additional information is required regarding the NRI.

### **Woodland Conservation**

This site is subject to the provisions of the 2010 Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the project is a new PPS. This project is subject to the WCO and to the Environmental Technical Manual. TCP1-012-2021 has been submitted with the subject PPS and requires minor revisions to be found in conformance with the WCO.

The woodland conservation threshold for this 3.58-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area or 2.21 acres. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing is 0.39 acre. This requirement is to be met by providing 0.11 acre of woodland preservation and 0.28 acre of fee-in-lieu. One specimen tree is located on-site and will remain.

Technical revisions to the TCP1 are required and included in the conditions of approval.

### **Specimen Trees**

The site contains one specimen tree (yellow poplar) in good condition, which is to be retained within the on-site preservation area.

### **Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area**

Impacts to the regulated environmental features should be limited to those that are necessary for development of the property. Necessary impacts are those that are directly attributable to infrastructure required for the reasonable use, orderly and efficient development of the subject property, or are those that are required by County Code for reasons of health, safety, or welfare.

Necessary impacts include, but are not limited to, adequate sanitary sewerage lines and water lines, road crossings for required street connections, and outfalls for SWM facilities.

Road crossings of streams and/or wetlands may be appropriate if placed at the location of an existing crossing or at the point of least impact to the regulated environmental features. SWM outfalls may also be considered necessary if the site has been designed to place the outfall at a point of least impact. The types of impacts that should be avoided include those for site grading, building placement, parking, SWM facilities (not including outfalls), and road crossings where reasonable alternatives exist. The cumulative impacts for the development of a property should be the fewest necessary and sufficient to reasonably develop the site, in conformance with the County Code.

The proposed impact to the PMA is for one sanitary sewer pipe connection. An SOJ was received with the PPS application, dated August 11, 2021. A revised SOJ was received on October 8, 2021, which included an exhibit showing the PMA impact for the sanitary sewer connection.

#### **Statement of Justification**

The SOJ includes a request to impact 0.007 acre (301 square feet) of on-site PMA for the installation of one sanitary sewer pipe connection; however, impacts are required to be rounded to the nearest 0.01 of an acre, so the impact is 0.01-acre. This sewer connection will service the proposed medical building.

#### **Analysis of Impacts**

Based on the revised SOJ, the applicant is requesting a total of one impact, as described below:

**Impact A**—The PMA impact totaling 0.01 acre (301 square feet) is requested for the construction of a sanitary sewer connection near the southeast corner of the parcel. The impact area will disturb the stream buffer and 100-year floodplain. There is an existing on-site sewer alignment, which goes along the entire south side of the parcel. Several locations were investigated for a connection, but the PMA impacts would be greater at those locations, and this sewer connection is needed to serve the site. The proposed PMA impact is supportable.

The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored to the fullest extent possible, based on the limit of disturbance (LOD) shown on the TCP1. The LOD includes a single new PMA impact for a sewer connection, which is approved.

- 17. Urban Design**—The development of the 100,000-square-foot medical office building is subject to DSP approval.

#### **Conformance with the Requirements of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance**

The proposed medical office use is a permitted use in the C-O and D-D-O Zones. DSP review is required for the project by the D-D-O Zone Standards (page 129). The TCP1 submitted with the PPS shows a development scheme for the site. Based on the layout shown, it does not appear that sufficient area has been provided to meet some site design requirements of the D-D-O standards

and Landscape Manual requirements. Conformance with the applicable D-D-O Zone standards and other regulations will be evaluated at the time of DSP review.

**Conformance with the 2010 Prince George’s County Landscape Manual**

The D-D-O development standards note that most standards of the Landscape Manual apply. Conformance with these landscaping requirements will be determined at the time of DSP.

**Conformance with the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**

In accordance with Section 25-128 of the Prince George’s County Code, properties in the C-O Zone are required to provide 10 percent of the gross tract area in TCC. The subject site is 3.58 acres and is required to provide 0.36 acre (or 15,682 square feet) of the site in TCC. Conformance with this requirement will be evaluated at the time of DSP review.

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.

\* \* \* \* \*

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 Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 18, 2021, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.


Adopted by the Prince George’s County Planning Board this 9th day of December 2021.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett  
Chairman

*Jessica Jones*

By Jessica Jones  
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:EDC:nz

  
11/29/21  
Approved for Legal Sufficiency  
M-NCPPC Office of General  
Counsel