

Case No.: CSP-06002-01 Melford

Applicant: St. John Properties, Inc.

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY, MARYLAND,
SITTING AS THE DISTRICT COUNCIL

ORDER OF APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, after review of the administrative record, that application CSP 06002-01, requesting approval for 2,500 residential units, including 500 townhouses, 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units, and 1,000 multifamily dwelling units; 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 additional square feet of office space as amendments to an approved conceptual site plan ("CSP") with 1,807,874 square feet of approved office / research and development uses, in order to create an integrated, mixed-use development known as Melford, located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Robert S. Crain Highway (MD 3) and John Hanson Highway (US 50 / 301), within Planning Area 71B, Council District 4, be and the same is hereby APPROVED, subject to conditions.

As the basis for this final decision, and as expressly authorized by the Regional District Act, namely Title 22 and Title 25 of the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland, as well as the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland, being also Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, we hereby adopt the findings and conclusions within the administrative record as to proposed application, and specifically those findings and conclusions set forth within PGCPB No. 14-128, except where otherwise stated herein.¹

¹ References to the Zoning Ordinance of Prince George's County, Maryland, being also Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, §§27-101 (2011 Ed. & Supp. 2014) *et seq.*, are styled "the Zoning Ordinance" and cited "§ 27- ____" herein. References to the Regional District Act within Md. Code Ann., Land Use (2012 & Supp. 2014) are styled the "Regional District Act" and cited "§ __ of the RDA" herein. References to the Development Review Division of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission are styled "Technical Staff"

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

On or about June 9, 2014, the Development Review Division of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission accepted, as filed and for review, conceptual site plan application CSP-06002-01, requesting approval for 2,500 residential units, including 500 townhouses, 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units, and 1,000 multifamily units; 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 square feet of office space to amend an approved conceptual site plan with 1,807,874 square feet of approved office / research and development uses. On October 30, 2014, after completing its review of the subject application, Technical Staff of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission issued a Technical Staff Report as to CSP-06002-01 in accordance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, and recommending approval of the proposed amendments to the approved conceptual site plan. *See* 10/30/2014 TSR, at 3. On November, 13, 2014, pursuant to § 27-546 of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing on the subject proposal. After considering the testimony and other evidence in the record, the Planning Board adopted PGCPB No. 14-128 at its December 4, 2014, meeting, stating its favorable disposition of approval of CSP-06002-01 embodied therein, as required by § 27-285 of the Zoning Ordinance. *Id.*

Thereafter, on January 7, 2015, in accordance with § 27-280 of the Zoning Ordinance, several Persons of Record² jointly filed a timely written appeal with the Clerk of the District Council, alleging various errors by Planning Board within its December 4, 2014, disposition as to CSP-06002-01, and requesting Oral Argument before the District Council. *See generally*

herein. References to Applicant, St. John Properties, Inc., are styled “Applicant” herein. References to Persons of Record, including those citizens that jointly appealed the December 4, 2014, disposition recommendation of the Planning Board as to CSP-06002-01 are styled “Citizens Opposition” herein. Lastly, citations to specific exhibits within the administrative record for CSP-06002-01 are styled “Ex. __” herein.

² The signatory persons of record stated in the January 7, 2015, appeal to the District Council are as follows: Martha Ainsworth, Chair, *Prince George’s Sierra Club*; Sally Mitchell, Person of Record; Bruce Pletsch, *Sherwood Manor Civic Association*; Lauren Ragsac, Person of Record; and Fred Tutman, *Patuxent Riverkeeper*.

01/07/2015 Mem., Ainsworth to Floyd. On January 12, 2015, the District Council did not elect to review CSP-06002-01.

Accordingly, after the close of the appeal period for the subject application, the Clerk of the District Council mailed notice of the oral argument scheduled for February 23, 2015, to all persons of record as required by § 27-125.04 of the Zoning Ordinance. We conducted oral argument as scheduled on February 23, 2015, in accordance with the prescriptions of § 27-131 of the Zoning Ordinance, as well as the District Council Rules of Procedure. *See generally* 02/23/2015 Tr. *See also* Rule 6, R. of Proc., County Council of Prince George's County, sitting as the District Council. In amplifying the allegations raised in the January 7, 2015, jointly filed written appeal, the Citizens Opposition raised several questions, discussed *infra*, at oral argument. *See* 01/07/2015 Mem., Ainsworth to Floyd, at 1–2. *See also* 02/23/2015 Tr. At the conclusion of the proceeding, the District Council took this matter under advisement. *See* 02/23/2015 Tr. Thereafter, on March 9, 2015, and in the manner prescribed within § 27-132 of the Zoning Ordinance, the District Council favorably voted to refer CSP-06002-01 for the preparation of an Order of Approval with Conditions.

FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

The Subject Property

CSP-06002-01 is a development proposal for property located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of the Robert S. Crain Highway (MD 3) and the John Hanson Highway (US 50/301), in Planning Area 71B, within the Fourth Council District. The site is bounded to the north by the Sherwood Manor subdivision, a development consisting of single-family detached dwelling units in the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone, and vacant property owned by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (“M-NCPPC”) in the Reserved Open

Space (R-O-S) Zone, the Patuxent River Park; to the east by the Patuxent River and the U.S. Air Force transmitter station located in Anne Arundel County; to the south by the John Hanson Highway (US 50/301) right-of-way and a small vacant property in the Open Space (O-S) Zone; and to the west by the Robert S. Crain Highway (MD 3) right-of-way.

Prior History of the Property

On January 25, 1982, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9401 for the subject property, with ten conditions (Zoning Ordinance 2-1982). In so doing, the zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the Employment and Institutional Area (E-I-A) Zone. On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, subject to 27 conditions and two considerations, consistent with the disposition recommendation of the Planning Board for the Maryland Science and Technology Center forth in PGCPB Resolution No. 86-107.

Nearly two decades years later, the District Council approved the 2006 *Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A and 74B* (“Bowie Master Plan and SMA”) via adoption of CR-11-2006 on February 7, 2006. In particular, one of the comprehensive zoning changes Sectional Map Amendment specifically approved a zoning change applicable to the subject property, namely to intensify its zoning classification from the Employment and Institutional Area (E-I-A) Zone to the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone. The original conceptual site plan for the property, CSP-06002, approved mixed-use development for the site with hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, and residential (366 single-family units including both detached and attached units, and 500 multifamily units) use components. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 5; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 4–5; 06/06/2014 App. Just’n Stmt., at 3–4. On January 11, 2007, after consideration of the

proposal and record of its public hearing, the Planning Board voted in favor of approval as to CSP-06002 on February 15, 2007, subject to 44 conditions, as set forth in PGCPB No. 07-09. *See App. Just'n Stmt.*, at 3. Thereafter, on May 11, 2009, the District Council rendered a final decision of approval as to plan application CSP-06002. The final decision of the Council as to CSP-06002 incorporated four modifications, 29 conditions and, most notably, rejected the residential component for the proposed development. *See generally* 05/11/2009, CSP 06002 Order of Approval with Conditions, PGCDC. Despite the limitations set forth in the conceptual site plan approval order issued by the District Council, we take administrative notice pursuant to § 27-141³ of prior approvals for development at the Melford property and in the vicinity of the proposed project—specifically, the findings within each approval as to consistency with approved County land use development policies. We find these previously approved projects included office uses, hotels, flex space, and other institutional uses. *See* 10/30/2014 TSR, at 3; 06/06/2104 App. Just'n Stmt., at 3. However, due to various market constraints, not all uses approved for development are fully constructed to date. *Id.*

Subject Development Request

This application proposes development of 2,500 residential units, including 500 attached single-family dwelling units (townhomes), 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units for seniors, and an additional 1,000 multifamily dwelling units; a proposed 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 square feet of proposed office space to a conceptual site plan (CSP-06002) approved for 1,547,874 square feet of approved office / research and development uses to

³ § 27-141 of the County Zoning Ordinance provides that “[t]he final decision in any zoning case shall be based only on the evidence in the record, and shall be supported by specific written findings of basic facts and conclusions. In addition, the Council may take judicial notice of any evidence contained in the record of any earlier phase of the approval process relating to all or a portion of the same property, including the approval of a preliminary plat of subdivision.”

create an integrated, mixed-use development at Melford. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 3; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 5; 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 2–3.

An examination of the evidence within the administrative record calls for development of a mixed-use residential, retail, and commercial office development at Melford, which is partially improved with some office development and related structures. The entire Melford property consists of approximately 431 acres, and is located in the northeast corner of the intersection of Crain Highway (MD 3) and the John Hanson Highway (US 50 / 301). It is bordered to the east by the Patuxent River environmental areas that are now part of a large approximately 96-acre parcel dedicated to M-NCPPC for parkland pursuant to previous approvals by of the District Council. Vehicular entrance to the property is through the existing public road called Melford Boulevard, that intersects with MD 3 north of US 50 / 301 at a large controlled intersection. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 43; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 4.

The subject application proposes development of approximately 276 acres of the Melford property, located in its central and southern portions. This area includes multiple dedicated existing public rights-of-way, such as Melford Boulevard, which has an east-west vehicular flow, and Curie Drive, which runs north-south. The primary area of revision contemplated by the subject application is defined as “Melford Village” by Applicant, and constitutes a majority of the central portion of the property surrounding the Historic Melford House and cemetery north of Melford Boulevard, on both sides of existing Curie Drive, and south of an existing stormwater management pond. The remainder of the development area proposed for the development in this application includes existing commercial office / research and development uses to the south, west, and north. However, we note that the subject application does not propose alterations or revisions to these existing structures. *Id.*

Based on our review of Applicant's development proposal, Melford Village will be organized around two main vehicular boulevards—a new boulevard running east-west, north of Melford House and Melford Boulevard; and around Curie Drive running north-south, which will be modified in the future in regard to alignment and road section as part of this development. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 3; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 5; App. Just'n Stmt., at 4–5.

Four (4) neighborhoods are created by the two main boulevards: the northwest neighborhood, southwest neighborhood, southeast neighborhood, and northeast neighborhood, along with the commercial district on the west side of Melford Boulevard. Where the two main boulevards intersect, Applicant proposes a village plaza that will include a monumental feature that will also serve as a focal point for Melford Village. The east-west boulevard, as proposed, will terminate at an amphitheater on the eastern end, adjacent to an existing stormwater pond that Applicant proposes for reconfiguration as an amenity feature. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 3; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 5; App. Just'n Stmt., at 4.

As stated in the record compiled for the subject project, Applicant proposes 260,000 square feet of commercial office space, as well as 268,500 square feet of commercial retail space which, according to our review of the evidence in the record, will be generally concentrated at the west end of Melford Village, surrounding the new east-west boulevard—just to the east and north of Melford Boulevard—west, north and south of Melford House. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 4; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 6; 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 4. On the west side of Melford Boulevard, near the existing office buildings on the site, Applicant proposes development of a smaller, more compact commercial space for the site. *Id.* Lastly, the record shows the stated proposal for the remaining portions of the proposed Melford Village area, which is located east of Melford House, surrounding the north-south boulevard and extending to the M-NCPPC

parkland to the east, as Applicant's proposed location of the residential component of the project, with construction of 2,500 residential dwelling units, including multifamily units, and a 20 percent maximum for single-family attached units. More specifically, our review of Applicant's proposal in the record unambiguously designates 1,000 market rate multifamily units, within its proposed total 2,500 residential units for the project, as senior age-restricted multifamily units. *See* 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 5. We note that Applicant's proffer demonstrates sound consistency with the existing land use policy recommendations within the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA* concerning the emerging need, as well as documented future demand that is projected for affordable senior housing the area of the Melford Property. *See* 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA*, at 12–13. To this end, we acknowledge other specific evidence in the record, namely the June 20, 2014, letter from the City of Bowie addressing the issue of affordable senior housing in its assessment concerning the subject proposal. Among the comments offered, the City recommended that Applicant revise its initial proposed residential component for the subject project, to increase the number of affordable senior units from Applicant's original stated maximum of 500 senior units to a revised maximum 1,000 senior multifamily units, which may include assisted living facility units. *See* 06/20/2014 Ltr., Robinson to Hewlett, at 1. In explaining its recommendation, the City observed that such an increase in senior multifamily units for the project "will provide more opportunities for seniors, reduce the high number of market multi-family units and generate less traffic overall." *Id.*

Based on the foregoing evidence, and as discussed in further detail within section below addressing the comprehensive planning and zoning provisions applicable to the subject proposal, *infra*, we find persuasive the evidence in the administrative record concerning the area's need for and limited supply of affordable senior housing in the area proposed for development, that is

reflected in the applicable comprehensive planning and zoning development recommendations applicable to the area of the subject property, despite any ambiguity or lack of express statutory prescription in the Zoning Ordinance concerning minimum dedicated senior housing units for residential development in the M-X-T Zone. *See* §§ 27-542–27-546, 27-547–27-548, Zoning Ordinance. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 3; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 5. Consequently, we find that the record contains specific demonstrated efforts by Applicant to incorporate specific strategies espoused within the land use policies embodied within several master plans applicable to the area proposed for the subject development. The purpose of the comprehensive planning and zoning recommendations is to realize important development recommendations espoused within current comprehensive plans in the subject proposal. We encourage Applicant’s continued efforts to formalize commitments as to a percentage of affordable senior multifamily dwelling units that will be constructed as part of the development project. *See* 06/20/2014 Ltr., Robinson to Hewlett, at 1.

Next, as to recreational facilities, while the record includes no specific list on-site private recreational facilities proposed for the subject development, the proposal does include identified potential amenity spaces and opportunity area designations within each neighborhood area. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 6; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 6. Such designations include plazas; special facilities, such as fitness centers and pools; resource parks, such as historic and natural areas; pocket parks; waterfront parks around the existing stormwater management ponds; and senior amenities within the senior multifamily buildings. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 6; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 6.

Other notable materials in the administrative record include Applicant’s 67-page “Melford Village Design Guidelines”; this document complements the subject application and

appears to address a variety of design-related standards and plans that are triggered during the implementation stage of the development of the subject property. Technical Staff offered the following observations concerning this document submitted by Applicant, with which we agree:

Community Principles & Forms

This section includes all of the plans and illustrations for the CSP. It starts with a description of Melford and the region and then provides the CSP map as described above. Organizing patterns of the boulevards, neighborhoods, and natural amenities are mapped that then lead to the illustrative site plan provided with the CSP. A map shows the variety of residential and commercial buildings proposed and discusses the intent to provide retail and commercial uses on the ground level of all buildings along the boulevards. Subsequent maps show the proposed pedestrian network, including sidewalks, trails, and bicycle routes; possible opportunity areas for public spaces or special designs; and the proposed green space network, including plazas, pocket parks, and senior amenities, among others. A street network map designates proposed primary, secondary, and tertiary routes followed by proposed typical street sections. It should be noted that these street sections are conceptual at this stage and subject to final approval with the subsequent required preliminary plan of subdivision when a specific layout is proposed and full adequacy of facilities can be determined. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval. The Parking Standards section is discussed further in Finding 7e below. However, it should be noted that this section states that the minimum size for a perpendicular parking space will be 18 by 9 feet, which will require a departure. This statement should be removed as it cannot be presumed that such a departure would be approved at the time of DSP. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

The Sustainability and Planning section describes the principles of Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design for Neighborhood Development (LEED-ND) that have been incorporated into the CSP.

Neighborhood Patterns

This section describes the four neighborhoods to be created by the two main boulevards: the northwest neighborhood, southwest neighborhood, southeast neighborhood, and northeast neighborhood, along with the commercial district on the west side of Melford Boulevard. The neighborhood requirements, key features, and the proposed development patterns are described. These aspects of the plan will be further developed in the required preliminary plan and DSP for the site.

Architectural Principles and Forms

This section includes a list of architectural design standards intended to ensure high-quality design and materials on all of the buildings throughout Melford Village. Another section sets forth the minimum frontage build-out requirements along the main east-west boulevard, as well as a description of its cross-section in relation to the building height-to-street width ratio. The final sections describe the various building forms proposed, including multifamily villas, townhomes, wrap buildings, specialty buildings, retail village, and clubhouses and recreation. Descriptions of the building forms are provided along with diagrams specifying setbacks and parking locations.

Melford House Preservation & Rehabilitation

This section details the general site design for the area around the historic Melford House and the intended protection of two view corridors, one between the house and the historic cemetery on-site and one between the house and the lower pond to the east. Ultimately, any work within the environmental settings of the house or cemetery will require and be subject to historic area work permits, which will require review by the Prince George's County Historic Preservation Commission. Additionally, any development in areas adjacent to the environmental settings will be subject to review and comment by Historic Preservation staff for their impacts.

Landscape Principles & Forms

This section details the landscape design standards the applicant proposes for Melford Village. This is discussed further in relation to conformance with the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) in Finding 9 below. Additionally, there are sections regarding streetscape design, signage design, and lighting design standards. The street design standards set guidelines for a pedestrian space system including sidewalks, transit facilities, sidewalk cafés, and street furniture. The signage design standards set guidelines for building-mounted and freestanding signage in Melford Village only, and not for other existing and approved development within the limits of the CSP. It also states that all signage shall conform to the Zoning Ordinance. The lighting design standards set guidelines for attractive ornamental lighting that will help ensure safe lighting of the development.

Design Review Committee Policies & Procedures

This section details the Melford Village Design Review Committee (DRC) and its policies and procedures, which the applicant intends to create to enforce the minimum design standards for Melford Village. The applicant intends for the DRC to review proposals prior to seeking approval from the City of Bowie and Prince George's County. While this could be a helpful process for the applicant to

maintain their desired quality of development, the Planning Board cannot require or enforce such an arrangement, or its policies or procedures. The DRC will also not replace the official city or county processes required for any new development within the limits of the CSP. Therefore, this section should be moved to an appendix in the book and be clearly labeled as such. Introductory language should be provided stating that this section was created by the applicant for their own use and is not endorsed or required by the Planning Board. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

Definitions

This section includes two pages of words and definitions, some of which are specific to this CSP, such as “village office,” and others that are already defined in the Zoning Ordinance, such as “alley.” This section should be moved to an appendix in the book and be clearly labeled as such. Introductory language should be provided stating that this section does not modify Zoning Ordinance definitions and is not endorsed by the Planning Board, but provided by the applicant for clarification purposes only. A condition regarding this issue has been included in this approval.

Appendices

This section includes two parts, one regarding recommended plants and sizes and one regarding parking rationale. The plants and sizes list is conceptually acceptable; however, specific information, in conformance with the Landscape Manual, will have to be provided regarding all plantings at the time of each DSP. The parking rationale issue is discussed further in Finding 7e below.

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 4–6; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 6–8.

Applicable Zoning Ordinance Requirements

As conferred by § 22-206 of the RDA, development within the County must meet the prescriptions of local zoning laws. Accordingly, the proposed conceptual site plan application must comply with all procedural requirements for site plan approval in the County Zoning Ordinance, as well as all regulations for development in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

§ 27-547(b), Table of Uses.

(1) Commercial:

All types of Offices and Research, Eating or Drinking Establishments, many types of retail, and eating and drinking establishments are permitted in the M-X-T Zone. The submitted CSP proposes office and retail space and residential development.

(7) Residential / Lodging:

Residential uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone, with the following footnote:

Footnote 7

Except as provided in Section 27-544(b), for development pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, the number of townhouses shall not exceed 20% of the total number of dwelling units in the total development. This townhouse restriction shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half (½) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000.

See § 27-547, Zoning Ordinance (2011 Ed. & Supp. 2014).

After review of the applicable use prescriptions set forth in the Mixed Use Zones Table of Uses along with the uses proposed in CSP06002-01, we find that the proposed office, retail, and residential uses are generally permitted in the M-X-T Zone pursuant to § 27-547 of the Zoning Ordinance. We further find the residential use limitation for townhomes set forth in Footnote 7 to § 27-547(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, above, is binding on the proposed residential uses in this project, as we find the subject application does not meet stated exemptions to the maximum townhome percentage, because: (1) the provisions of § 27-544(b), referenced in Footnote 7, above, are inapplicable to the subject application; and (2) the subject property lies outside the stated maximum one-half mile distance from an existing or planned Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (“WMATA”) transit rail station site. Here, as submitted by Applicant, the subject development application proposes 500 townhouses within a proposed total 2,500 residential units, which we note equals exactly 20 percent of the total dwelling units for the project. Consequently, we find the proposed residential uses consistent with this prescription as to Townhomes in the M-X-T Zone. *See* §§ 27-544, 27-547, Zoning Ordinance; PGCPB No. 14-128, at 6; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 7.

Further regulations for development in the M-X-T Zone are found in § 27-547(d) and provide standards governing a required mix of uses, as follows:

(d) At least two (2) of the following three (3) categories shall be included on the Conceptual Site Plan and ultimately present in every development in the M-X-T Zone. In a Transit District Overlay Zone, a Conceptual Site Plan may include only one of the following categories, provided that, in conjunction with an existing use on abutting property in the M-X-T Zone, the requirement for two (2) out of three (3) categories is fulfilled. The Site Plan shall show the location of the existing use and the way that it will be integrated in terms of access and design with the proposed development. The amount of square footage devoted to each use shall be in sufficient quantity to serve the purposes of the zone:

- (1) Retail businesses;
- (2) Office, research, or industrial uses;
- (3) Dwellings, hotel, or motel.

See § 27-547(d), Zoning Ordinance.

A review of the subject application indicates that the subject development proposal incorporates all three use categories articulated in the the above-stated provision of the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, we find Applicant's proposal comports with the stated minimum requirements prescribed in § 27-547(d).

Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance also regulates development in the M-X-T Zone by providing the following additional standards:

- (a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):
 - (1) Without the use of the optional method of development -- 0.40 FAR; and
 - (2) With the use of the optional method of development -- 8.00 FAR.
- (b) The uses allowed in the M-X-T Zone may be located in more than one (1) building, and on more than one (1) lot.
- (c) Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.
- (d) Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional

buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.

(e) In addition to those areas of a building included in the computation of gross floor area (without the use of the optional method of development), the floor area of the following improvements (using the optional method of development) shall be included in computing the gross floor area of the building of which they are a part: enclosed pedestrian spaces, theaters, and residential uses. Floor area ratios shall exclude from gross floor area that area in a building or structure devoted to vehicular parking and parking access areas (notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27-107.01). The floor area ratio shall be applied to the entire property which is the subject of the Conceptual Site Plan.

(f) Private structures may be located within the air space above, or in the ground below, public rights-of-way.

(g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.

(h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least one thousand eight hundred (1,800) square feet in size, and shall have at least sixty percent (60%) of the full front facades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco. In addition, there shall be no more than six (6) townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than six (6) dwelling units (but not more than eight (8) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than six (6) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be twenty (20) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. The minimum lot size, maximum number of units per building group and percentages of such building groups, and building width requirements and restrictions shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half ($\frac{1}{2}$) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000. In no event shall there be more than ten (10) dwelling units in a building group and no more than two (2) building groups containing ten (10) dwelling units. For purposes of this section, a building group shall be considered a separate building group (even

though attached) when the angle formed by the front walls of two (2) adjoining rows of units is greater than forty-five degrees (45°). Except that, in the case of a Mixed-Use Planned Community, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except when the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development, and the end units on such building groups shall be a minimum of twenty-four (24) feet in width. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be twenty-two (22) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. Garages may not dominate the streetscape. Garages that are attached or incorporated into the dwelling shall be set back a minimum of four (4) feet from the front façade and there shall not be more than a single garage, not to exceed ten (10) feet wide, along the front façade of any individual unit. Garages are preferred to be incorporated into the rear of the building or freestanding in the rear yard and accessed by an alley. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all public and private streets and parking lots. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the District Council may approve a request to substitute townhouses, proposed for development as condominiums, for multifamily dwellings that were required as a condition of approval in a Conceptual Site Plan approved prior to April 1, 2004. Such substitution shall not require a revision to any previous plan approvals. Further, such townhouses are subject to all other requirements of the Zoning Ordinance.

(i) The maximum height of multifamily buildings shall be one hundred and ten (110) feet. This height restriction shall not apply within any Transit District Overlay Zone, designated General Plan Metropolitan or Regional Centers, or a Mixed-Use Planned Community.

(j) As noted in Section 27-544(b), which references property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, regulations for Conceptual or Detailed Site Plans (such as, but not limited to density, setbacks, buffers, screening, landscaping, height, recreational requirements, ingress/egress, and internal circulation) should be based on the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or the Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change and any referenced exhibit of record for the property. This regulation also applies to property readopted in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006 and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was

conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation of a concurrent Master Plan or Sector Plan (see Section 27-226(f)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance).

See § 27-548, Zoning Ordinance.

- “(a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):**
(1) Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR; and
(2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR.”

The subject application demonstrates Applicant’s proposed use of the optional method of development for the project, as stated in § 27-548(a)(2), above, wherein qualifying projects may be approved for greater densities, in increments up to a maximum floor area ratio (“FAR”) of eight (8), for each of the uses, improvements, and amenities. To this end, we find that the subject application includes the following proposed uses, improvements, and amenities and FAR increases for the project:

Residential uses for the subject development project will potentially increase the FAR by 1.0, if more than 20 dwelling units are provided with the application. This conceptual site plan application proposes a total of 2,500 dwelling units, and we find that it is eligible for this bonus. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 8; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 10.

The optional method of development, as proposed in the subject application, has a FAR above 0.40. Thus, the proposed FAR is as follows:

Uses	Square footage
Residential	2,740,000 – 4,800,000
Commercial	1,907,874 – 2,076,374
Total	4,647,874 – 6,876,374
Net Site Area: 225.22 Acres	9,810,583
FAR	0.47 – 0.70

Based on the foregoing, we conclude that the proposed development necessitates use of the optional method of development, such as for the proposed residential units, to achieve the FAR proposed, which is above 0.40. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 7–8; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 9–10.

“(b) The uses allowed in the M-X-T Zone may be located in more than one (1) building, and on more than one (1) lot.”

We find that the subject application proposes more than one building, on more than one lot, and comports with the authority stated in § 27-548(b), above. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 8; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 10.

“(c) Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.”

While we acknowledge that this requirement is applicable at the time of review for a detailed site plan application, we take administrative notice that the record for the subject CSP application includes a design guidelines book, which offers some guidance as to proposed future improvements, but no specific regulations are set forth in that document, as we discussed in greater depth in the section concerning the Melford Village Design Guidelines at pp. 9–12, *supra*. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 8; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 10.

“(d) Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.”

We conclude, based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record, that compliance with pertinent requirements of the County Landscape Manual is required for the proposed development project. While we acknowledge that the formal assessment as to compliance with requirements of the Landscape Manual will occur at the time for review of a detailed site plan application, we take additional administrative notice of the design guidelines book submitted by Applicant that lists some regulations for proposed landscaping contemplated

in specific development proposals that will be submitted in the near term. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 8; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 10.

“(e) In addition to those areas of a building included in the computation of gross floor area (without the use of the optional method of development), the floor area of the following improvements (using the optional method of development) shall be included in computing the gross floor area of the building of which they are a part: enclosed pedestrian spaces, theaters, and residential uses. Floor area ratios shall exclude from gross floor area that area in a building or structure devoted to vehicular parking and parking access areas (notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27-107.01). The floor area ratio shall be applied to the entire property which is the subject of the Conceptual Site Plan.”

We acknowledge that this requirement will be reviewed for compliance at the time of detailed site plan review, for which required building designs will be provided. Notwithstanding, and based on our review of the administrative record, we nevertheless conclude in the context of the CSP application before us, that the proposed CSP application complies with this stated requirement. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 8–9; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 10–11.

“(f) Private structures may be located within the air space above, or in the ground below, public rights-of-way.”

Although this requirement will be formally assessed for compliance at the time DSP application review, we nevertheless conclude, based on the record for the subject CSP application, that the subject proposal does not show any private structures above or below public rights-of-way. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 9; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 11.

“(g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code”

This requirement will also be reviewed at the time of DSP application, and after access and lotting patterns are evaluated and approved pursuant to a required preliminary plan application. We further note that the CSP allows for the possibility of largely private streets

throughout the development; this may require variations at the time of preliminary plan, which may or may not be approved by Planning Board, as noted in the Technical Staff Report. Access to historic sites should be arranged via public streets. Additionally, Subtitle 24 of the Prince George's County Code requires that multifamily dwellings be served by public streets. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 9; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 11.

“(h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least 1,800 square feet in size, and shall have at least 60 percent of the full front façades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco....”

The regulations regarding townhouse design will be formally assessed for compliance at the time of preliminary plan and DSP, as required by the Zoning Ordinance. However, we acknowledge statements by Applicant in the record that indicate comply with these requirements of the Zoning Ordinance. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 9; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 11.

“(i) The maximum height of multifamily buildings shall be one hundred and ten (110) feet. This height restriction shall not apply within any Transit District Overlay Zone, or a Mixed-Use Planned Community.”

Formal assessment of the subject development proposal for compliance with this requirement is reserved for review during the detailed site plan application process; however, we note that CSP application before us does not propose any building higher than 110 feet. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 9; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 11.

Required conformance with the prescriptions of § 27-542 of the Zoning Ordinance is also required for the proposed development application, as follows;

(a) The purposes of the M-X-T Zone are:

(1) To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, major transit stops, and designated General Plan Centers so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;

(2) To implement recommendations in the approved General Plan, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, by creating compact, mixed-use, walkable communities enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses;

(3) To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;

(4) To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and reduce automobile use by locating a mix of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to one another and to transit facilities to facilitate walking, bicycle, and transit use;

(5) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;

(6) To encourage an appropriate horizontal and vertical mix of land uses which blend together harmoniously;

(7) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;

(8) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale, savings in energy, innovative stormwater management techniques, and provision of public facilities and infrastructure beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;

(9) To permit a flexible response to the market and promote economic vitality and investment; and

(10) To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.

See § 27-542, Zoning Ordinance.

“(1) To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, and major transit stops, so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens”

The subject site was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone pursuant to approval of the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA* by the Council via CR-11-2006 on February 11, 2006. Specifically, Zoning Change Number 2 rezoned the subject property from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone. *See 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA*, at 121.

The rationale for the rezoning of the subject property states “to promote development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of a major interchange (US 50 and US 301), with an emphasis on a moderate- to high-density mix of office/employment/retail/hotel, residential, and parkland/open space uses.” *Id.* The subject proposal is in keeping with the recommendations of the rezoning. The area of the proposed development also includes employment uses and proposed residential uses, and we find that the proposed uses will provide desirable employment and living opportunities for the area surrounding the development project. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 10; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 12; 06/06/2014 App. Just’n Stmt., at 41.

“(2) To implement recommendations in the approved General Plan, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, by creating compact, mixed-use, walkable communities enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses”

The record reflects the design for the subject proposal is a walkable, mixed-use community with a mixture of office, commercial, and residential uses, along with recreational spaces. As a result, and as explained in our discussion concerning the Comprehensive Plans applicable to the area of the Melford Property, below, we find that the subject application will serve to implement County land use and development policies for a town center and an employment area, as set forth within *Plan Prince George’s 2035*. Additionally, we further find that the subject application employs numerous strategies designed for enhanced implementation of the zoning and land use policies within the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA*. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 13; 06/06/2014 App. Just’n Stmt., at 16–21, 41.

“(3) To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment”

The record states that the proposal will provide a concentration of uses in an area designated as both a town center and employment area. Accordingly, we agree with the finding in the record that the subject proposal will maximize the potential for realizing the vision of both plans through development of the property. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 13; App. Just'n Stmt., at 41–42.

“(4) To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and reduce automobile use by locating a mix of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to one another and to transit facilities to facilitate walking, bicycle, and transit use”

Applicant testified at the November 13, 2014, hearing—and Planning Board ultimately found—that the subject development application incorporates use of LEED ND (Neighborhood Design) design principles in furtherance of achieving sustainable energy efficiencies and neighborhood conservation. By locating residences and jobs in close proximity to each other within the site design, we agree with Planning Board's finding that the proposed neighborhood planning concept embodies the sustainable design elements that will encourage walking, bicycling, as well as enhance future potential for public transportation, *i.e.*, bus service for daily commuting. *See* 11/13/2014 Tr. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 12–13; App. Just'n Stmt., at 41–42.

Applicant also testified as to its preliminary discussions held with the City of Bowie and WMATA regarding future extension of bus service to the Melford Village. As reflected in the administrative record, we note this future expansion depends on the overall development as it begins to take shape, in order to amass sufficient density needed to establish a public bus service. *See* 11/13/2014 Tr. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 12–13; App. Just'n Stmt., at 42. Applicant testified further as to ongoing dialogues with the City of Bowie and WMATA to facilitate bus service to the development. *Id.* We note that, during review of

subsequent development applications, pertinent requirements set forth in the Zoning Ordinance require consultation with WMATA prior to final road design in order to determine the logical potential bus route and plan lane widths and bus stop locations accordingly. *See* 11/13/2014 Tr. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 12–13; App. Just’n Stmt., at 42.

While bus service is not necessary for transportation adequacy, future bus service would be a benefit to future residents, employers, and employees. Future bus service, if determined to be feasible, could provide useful connections between the subject site and other area destinations, such as the Bowie Town Center, the City of New Carrollton, and the neighboring City of Crofton. We also find that, at time of preliminary plan of subdivision consideration by Planning Board, Applicant should evaluate the provision of a circulator or shuttle bus throughout Melford, which may serve to connect the site of the proposed development to destinations, major employers, commuter bus lots, or mass transit. *See* 11/13/2014 Tr. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11.

“(5) To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area”

The record reflects that the existing Melford property includes office, research, and development uses only on the site. We are persuaded by the evidence in the record that the incorporation of residential uses and proposed additional commercial uses on the site proposed in the subject application will encourage a 24-hour environment in accordance with § 27-542(a)(5). *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 11; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 12–13; App. Just’n Stmt., at 42.

“(6) To encourage an appropriate horizontal and vertical mix of land uses which blend together harmoniously”

Applicant testified and the Planning Board finds that the mixed-use proposal would not be possible had not the County determined during the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity SMA that the M-X-T Zone would assist in implementing the envisioned re-positioning of Melford from strictly an employment park to a vibrant mixed-use and pedestrian oriented community. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 13; App. Just’n Stmt., at 42.

The area of the CSP revision includes up to 2,500 residential units, 260,000 square feet of office space, and up to 268,500 square feet of retail space. This will be added to 1,547,874 square feet of approved and/or constructed employment uses within the boundary of the CSP. This represents a mix of uses which should operate harmoniously. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 13; App. Just’n Stmt., at 42.

“(7) To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity”

The proposed conceptual site plan application establishes the functional relationships between the individual uses proposed for development of the site. As stated in the Zoning Ordinance, examination of these elements occurs during the detailed site plan application process. The visual character and identity of the project will be a function of the architecture of the buildings, entrance features, and landscape plantings which will be under close examination at the time of DSP review. Accordingly, we concur with the finding of Planning Board that buildings should be designed with high-quality detailing and design variation; should should be constructed so that they are appropriate in scale with surrounding uses in the area of their location; and building architecture, street furniture, landscape treatment, signage, and other design elements of the project should be coordinated to give the development a distinctive visual character. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 13–14. Lastly, we observe that Applicant’s Melford Village Design Guidelines submitted to the record offer specific parameters

that, as stated by Applicant, will establish an appropriate standard for the development of the project. *Id.*

“(8) To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale, savings in energy, innovative stormwater management techniques, and provision of public facilities and infrastructure beyond the scope of single-purpose projects”

We find the designs within the subject proposal consistent with an energy-efficient, multipurpose plan. To further support this finding, we note in the record that Applicant proposes development design in accordance with LEED-ND principles. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14; App. Just’n Stmt., at 43.

“(9) To permit a flexible response to the market and promote economic vitality and investment”

We find, based on the evidence the administrative record, that the subject CSP application generally conforms with this purpose of the M-X-T Zone. While we note that the existing development at the Melford Property site is essentially a one-dimensional employment area at present. Thus, we find that the addition of the proposed uses not currently existing on the subject property will enhance Applicant’s ability to respond to market demands with flexibility for future adjustments prompted by future market changes in the the area. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12–13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14; App. Just’n Stmt., at 43.

“(10) To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.”

Based on the evidence within the administrative record, along with the conditions of approval embodied within the resolution of approval adopted by Planning Board, as well as the Zoning Ordinance prescription for detailed site plan approval necessary for development on the property, we find ample freedom exists to enable Applicant to achieve the requisite design

standards recited in § 27-524(a)(10), above. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 12–13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14; App. Just’n Stmt., at 43.

Next, for property in the M-X-T Zone, the Zoning Ordinance requires certain specific findings in addition to the required findings required for approval of a CSP application, as follows:

(d) In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:

(1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;

(2) For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;

(3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

(4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

(5) The mix of uses, arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, and provision of public amenities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

(6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

(7) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

(8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and

(9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant, or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the

proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.

(10) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant.

(11) On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.

§ 27-546, Zoning Ordinance.

“(2) For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change”

The subject site was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone pursuant to the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA; therefore, this required finding does not apply. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14.

“(3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation”

The subject property is located at the intersection of two freeways (MD 3 and US 50 / 301). To the north of the M-X-T-zoned property is Sherwood Manor, a single-family detached development. To the west of the subject site across MD 3 are the Buckingham at Belair and Kenilworth at Belair subdivisions within the City of Bowie. The CSP shows office, a hotel, and research and development along the perimeter of the adjacent roadways. Due to the size and location of the proposal, it is largely self-contained. Physical integration with neighborhoods

outside of Melford is a challenge; nevertheless, the applicant indicates that a pedestrian connection along Melford Boulevard to the adjacent development on the west side of MD 3 will be established (subject to approval by the Maryland State Highway Administration (“SHA”)) to physically connect Melford to nearby residential neighborhoods. The City of Bowie also recommends a condition to this effect that will be further evaluated at the time of preliminary plan. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14–15.

We find that the proposed neighborhoods within Melford Village, as represented in the design guidelines, will have an outward orientation and will be well integrated with the existing employment uses on the site. The proposed addition of commercial and residential uses and amenity spaces is intended to catalyze the improvement and rejuvenation of all of Melford. *Id.*

“(4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity”

From the time of the rezoning of the subject site to the M-X-T Zone, the longstanding vision for development of the Melford property contemplates a mix of moderate- to high-density office, employment, retail, hotel uses, along with residential and parkland / open space uses, which we find consistent with the components of the currently proposed development project. In its 2009 final decision as to CSP-06002, the original conceptual site plan application, the District Council found the proposed CSP to be in conformance with the applicable purposes of the zone. *See generally* 05/11/2009 Dist. Council Order of Approval. *See also* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14. Here, Planning Board found, and we concur with Planning Board’s finding based on the record evidence, that this application requesting to revise the approved conceptual plan in order to add residential, commercial, and office uses, maintains compatibility with existing and proposed development in the area. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14.

“(5) The mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability”

Based on our review of the administrative record, we further find the proposed CSP and design guidelines as to the Melford Village development establish the framework for a quality development planned in accordance with LEED-ND principles, and it is capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. The arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements will continue to be evaluated with future plan approvals to ensure that the proposal remains consistent with the finding above. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 13; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 14.

“(6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases”

Applicant indicates that the development will be phased according to market conditions. More specific phasing information has not been provided. Phasing information should be provided as available, but no later than the first DSP within Melford Village. This phasing information may be revised with future applications. Each building phase should be designed as a self-sufficient entity while also allowing for effective integration with subsequent construction phases. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 15; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 16.

“(7) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development”

The CSP is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development. The development will include sidewalks and connections to a larger trail network. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 15; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 16.

“(8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other

amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial)”

We find that the subject application is a conceptual site plan proposal.

“(9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats”

We find this requirement applicable to the subject application, as it was rezoned from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone pursuant to Zoning Change Number 2 approved in the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA*. Consequently, a traffic study is required for this application. *Id.* The record for the subject proposal contains a traffic impact study prepared in accordance with stated methodologies within the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1” (Guidelines).dated May 30, 2014, and submitted by Applicant. In turn, the study was referred for comment to the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), SHA, and the City of Bowie. Based on the evidence within the administrative record, we concur with the finding of Planning Board that the proposed development generally meets the code requirements, provided that the development does not exceed 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips and that all of the associated improvements proffered are fully implemented. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 16; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 17.

We also take administrative notice of the following additional support in the record:

(1) The overall Melford property is approximately 431.55 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. Based on the mix of uses being proposed, the development would generate a net total (after discounting pass-by trips and internally captured trips) of 1,834 (897 in; 937 out) AM peak hour trips, and 2,516 (1,224 in; 1,292 out)

PM peak hour trips. These trip projections were determined using the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposal,” as well as the Trip Generation Manual, 9th Edition (Institute of Transportation Engineers).

(2) The traffic generated by the proposed conceptual plan would impact the following intersections:

- MD 3 & MD 450-gas station
- Belair Drive & Ramp from MD 3 southbound
- Belair Drive & Ramp to/from MD 3 northbound
- US 301 & Gov. Bridge Road-Harbor Way
- Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)
- Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-site entrance
- Melford Boulevard & Telsa Drive-Curie Drive (Roundabout)
- Curie & Science Drive (Roundabout)

(3) None of the intersections identified in (2) above is programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) or the Prince George’s County Capital Improvement Program (CIP).

(4) The subject property is located within Transportation Service Area (TSA) 2, as defined in Plan Prince George’s 2035. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better.

Unsignalized intersections: *The Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed 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.

Roundabouts: Analyses indicating volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio that is less than 0.850 are considered to be acceptable.

The following intersections identified in (2) above, when analyzed with the total future traffic as developed using the Guidelines, were not found to be operating at or better than the policy service level defined in (4) above:

- MD 3 & MD 450-gas station

Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)

Applicant has agreed to provide the following improvements to the intersections, in consideration of the findings in (5) above:

MD 3 & MD 450-gas station

Provide a fourth northbound and southbound through lane (which is already implemented).

Melford Boulevard & Science Drive (Roundabout)

Convert the existing roundabout to a traditional four-legged signalized intersection. ALL of the intersections identified in (2) above, when analyzed with the improvements identified in (6) above and total future traffic as developed using the Guidelines, were found to be operating at or better than the policy service level defined in (4) above.

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 15–17; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 16–18.

“(10) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be approved by the applicant”

This requirement is not applicable to this CSP.

“(11) On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548”

A mixed-use planned community is not proposed.

Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance provides required site design guidelines for conceptual site plans, as follows:

(a) The Conceptual Site Plan shall be designed in accordance with the following guidelines:

(1) **General.**

(A) The Plan should promote the purposes of the Conceptual Site Plan.

(B) The applicant shall provide justification for, and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, the reasons for noncompliance with any of the design guidelines for townhouses and three-family dwellings set forth in paragraph (11), below.

(2) **Parking, loading, and circulation.**

(A) Surface parking lots should be located and designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site, while minimizing the visual impact of cars. Parking spaces should be located to provide convenient access to major destination points on the site. As a means of achieving these objectives, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) Parking lots should generally be provided to the rear or sides of structures;
- (ii) Parking spaces should be located as near as possible to the uses they serve;
- (iii) Parking aisles should be oriented to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians;
- (iv) Large, uninterrupted expanses of pavement should be avoided or substantially mitigated by the location of green space and plant materials within the parking lot, in accordance with the Landscape Manual, particularly in parking areas serving townhouses; and
- (v) Special areas for van pool, car pool, and visitor parking should be located with convenient pedestrian access to buildings.

(B) Loading areas should be visually unobtrusive and located to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) Loading docks should be oriented toward service roads and away from major streets or public view; and
- (ii) Loading areas should be clearly marked and should be separated from parking areas to the extent possible.

(C) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation on a site should be safe, efficient, and convenient for both pedestrians and drivers. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) The location, number and design of driveway entrances to the site should minimize conflict with off-site traffic, should provide a safe transition into the parking lot, and should provide adequate acceleration and deceleration lanes, if necessary;
- (ii) Entrance drives should provide adequate space for queuing;
- (iii) Circulation patterns should be designed so that vehicular traffic may flow freely through the parking lot without encouraging higher speeds than can be safely accommodated;
- (iv) Parking areas should be designed to discourage their use as through-access drives;
- (v) Internal signs such as directional arrows, lane markings, and other roadway commands should be used to facilitate safe driving through the parking lot;

(vi) Drive-through establishments should be designed with adequate space for queuing lanes that do not conflict with circulation traffic patterns or pedestrian access;

(vii) Parcel pick-up areas should be coordinated with other on-site traffic flows;

(viii) Pedestrian access should be provided into the site and through parking lots to the major destinations on the site;

(ix) Pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes should generally be separated and clearly marked;

(x) Crosswalks for pedestrians that span vehicular lanes should be identified by the use of signs, stripes on the pavement, change of paving material, or similar techniques; and

(xi) Barrier-free pathways to accommodate the handicapped should be provided.

(3) **Lighting.**

(A) For uses permitting nighttime activities, adequate illumination should be provided. Light fixtures should enhance the site's design character. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) If the development is used at night, the luminosity, orientation, and location of exterior light fixtures should enhance user safety and minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts;

(ii) Lighting should be used to illuminate important on-site elements such as entrances, pedestrian pathways, public spaces, and property addresses. Significant natural or built features may also be illuminated if appropriate to the site;

(iii) The pattern of light pooling should be directed on-site;

(iv) Light fixtures fulfilling similar functions should provide a consistent quality of light;

(v) Light fixtures should be durable and compatible with the scale, architecture, and use of the site; and

(vi) If a variety of lighting fixtures is needed to serve different purposes on a site, related fixtures should be selected. The design and layout of the fixtures should provide visual continuity throughout the site.

(4) **Views.**

(A) Site design techniques should be used to preserve, create, or emphasize scenic views from public areas.

(5) **Green area.**

(A) On-site green area should be designed to complement other site activity areas and should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill its intended use. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Green area should be easily accessible in order to maximize its utility and to simplify its maintenance;

(ii) Green area should link major site destinations such as buildings and parking areas;

(iii) Green area should be well-defined and appropriately scaled to meet its intended use;

(iv) Green area designed for the use and enjoyment of pedestrians should be visible and accessible, and the location of seating should be protected from excessive sun, shade, wind, and noise;

(v) Green area should be designed to define space, provide screening and privacy, and serve as a focal point;

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

(vii) Green area should generally be accented by elements such as landscaping, pools, fountains, street furniture, and decorative paving.

(B) The application shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130 (b)(5)..

(6) **Site and streetscape amenities.**

(A) Site and streetscape amenities should contribute to an attractive, coordinated development and should enhance the use and enjoyment of the site. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) The design of light fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks and other street furniture should be coordinated in order to enhance the visual unity of the site;

(ii) The design of amenities should take into consideration the color, pattern, texture, and scale of structures on the site, and when known, structures on adjacent sites, and pedestrian areas;

(iii) Amenities should be clearly visible and accessible, and should not obstruct pedestrian circulation;

(iv) Amenities should be functional and should be constructed of durable, low maintenance materials;

(v) Amenities should be protected from vehicular intrusion with design elements that are integrated into the overall streetscape design, such as landscaping, curbs, and bollards;

(vi) Amenities such as kiosks, planters, fountains, and public art should be used as focal points on a site; and

(vii) Amenities should be included which accommodate the handicapped and should be appropriately scaled for user comfort.

(7) **Grading.**

(A) Grading should be performed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural and cultural resources on the site and on adjacent sites. To the extent practicable, grading should minimize environmental impacts. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Slopes and berms visible from streets and other public areas should appear as naturalistic forms. Slope ratios and the length of slopes should be varied if necessary to increase visual interest and relate manmade landforms to the shape of the natural terrain;

(ii) Excessive grading of hilltops and slopes should be avoided where there are reasonable alternatives that will preserve a site's natural landforms;

(iii) Grading and other methods should be considered to buffer incompatible land uses from each other;

(iv) Where steep slopes cannot be avoided, plant materials of varying forms and densities should be arranged to soften the appearance of the slope; and

(v) Drainage devices should be located and designed so as to minimize the view from public areas.

(8) **Service areas.**

(A) Service areas should be accessible, but unobtrusive. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Service areas should be located away from primary roads, when possible;

(ii) Service areas should be located conveniently to all buildings served;

(iii) Service areas should be effectively screened or enclosed with materials compatible with the primary structure; and

(iv) Multiple building developments should be designed to form service courtyards which are devoted to parking and loading uses and are not visible from public view.

(9) **Public spaces.**

(A) A public space system should be provided to enhance a large-scale commercial, mixed-use, or multifamily development. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

(i) Buildings should be organized and designed to create public spaces such as plazas, squares, courtyards, pedestrian malls, or other defined spaces;

(ii) The scale, size, shape, and circulation patterns of the public spaces should be designed to accommodate various activities;

(iii) Public spaces should generally incorporate sitting areas, landscaping, access to the sun, and protection from the wind;

(iv) Public spaces should be readily accessible to potential users; and

(v) Pedestrian pathways should be provided to connect major uses and public spaces within the development and should be scaled for anticipated circulation.

(10) **Architecture.**

(A) When architectural considerations are referenced for review, the Conceptual Site Plan should include a statement as to how the architecture of the buildings will provide a variety of building forms, with a unified, harmonious use of materials and styles.

(B) The guidelines shall only be used in keeping with the character and purpose of the proposed type of development and the specific zone in which it is to be located.

(C) These guidelines may be modified in accordance with Section 27-277.

(11) **Townhouses and three-family dwellings.**

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

(B) Groups of townhouses should not be arranged on curving streets in long, linear strips. Where feasible, groups of townhouses should be at right angles to each other, and should facilitate a courtyard design. In a more urban environment, consideration should be given to fronting the units on roadways.

(C) Recreational facilities should be separated from dwelling units through techniques such as buffering, differences in grade, or preservation of existing trees. The rears of buildings, in particular, should be buffered from recreational facilities.

(D) To convey the individuality of each unit, the design of abutting units should avoid the use of repetitive architectural elements and should employ a variety of architectural features and designs such as roofline, window and door treatments, projections, colors, and materials. In lieu of this individuality guideline, creative or innovative product design may be utilized.

(E) To the extent feasible, the rears of townhouses should be buffered from public rights-of-way and parking lots. Each application shall include a visual mitigation plan that identifies effective buffers between the rears of townhouses abutting public rights-of-way and parking lots. Where there are no existing trees, or the retention of existing vegetation is not practicable, landscaping, berming, fencing, or a combination of these techniques may be used. Alternatively, the applicant may consider designing the rears of townhouse buildings such that they have similar features to the fronts, such as reverse gables, bay windows, shutters, or trim.

(F) Attention should be given to the aesthetic appearance of the offsets of buildings.

See § 27-274, Zoning Ordinance.

Based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record, Planning Board made the following findings concerning the subject applications conformance with the site design guidelines in § 27-274, with which we agree and hereby adopt, as follows:

(1) Section 27-274(a)(2)(A), Parking, loading, and circulation, provides guidelines for the design of surface parking facilities. Surface parking lots are

encouraged to be located to the rear or side of structures to minimize the visual impact of cars on the site. The subject CSP is in general conformance with this requirement. The illustrative site plan shows that, in general, surface parking is not proposed between buildings and the public rights-of-way. Additionally, the Melford Village Design Guidelines book specifies that, where practicable, parking shall be located to the rear or sides of buildings.

(2) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(2)(B), loading areas should be visually unobtrusive. Loading areas are not indicated on the CSP or the provided illustrative site plan. However, the Melford Village Design Guidelines book specifies that service areas, loading docks, and trash dumpsters shall be screened from the public view. At the time of DSP, attention should be paid to the design of loading areas so that they are visually unobtrusive as viewed from public spaces and the public right-of-way.

(3) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(5)(A), green areas on-site should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book provides a green network map that shows a variety of types of green spaces spread throughout all four neighborhoods. At the time of DSP, attention should be paid to the specific design of these areas to make sure they are easily accessible, well-defined, and appropriately scaled for the area they are to serve.

(4) In accordance with Section 27-274(a)(6)(A), Site and streetscape amenities, the coordination of the design of light fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, and other street furniture will be required. A comprehensive review of streetscape amenities will occur at the time of DSP. However, the Melford Village Design Guidelines book indicates that these features will be integral elements of the streetscape and will be coordinated throughout Melford Village.

(5) A public space system should be provided to enhance the commercial and multifamily development areas in accordance with Section 27-274(a)(9), Public spaces. It is specified that these public spaces should incorporate high-quality design details and be integrated into the site design by a well-designed pedestrian system. An attractive mix of design features including focal points, such as public art, sculpture, or fountains; seating areas; specialty landscaping; and specialty paving materials should be provided throughout the spaces. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book indicates that a well-designed public space system will be provided; however, this will be fully evaluated at the time of DSP.

(6) As discussed in Section 27-274(a)(10), architecture should provide a variety of building forms, with a unified harmonious use of materials and styles. The Melford Village Design Guidelines book includes an extensive list of architectural design standards and indicates approximately six different types of

building forms that should help to ensure a quality mix is provided at the time of DSP.

(7) As discussed in Section 27-274(a)(11)(B), it is noted that groups of townhouses should be arranged at right angles to each other in a courtyard design and units should front on roadways. The submitted CSP does show such an arrangement in the majority of the townhouse areas, and this should be maintained in the future preliminary plan and DSP.

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 17–19; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 17–19.

For development in the M-X-T Zone, § 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance concerns parking and required number of necessary required parking spaces to serve corresponding uses included within the mixed-use development project. While we acknowledge that the prescriptions of § 27-574 plainly apply to the proposed development project, we hasten to add that formal evaluation of the proposed project for compliance with parking requirements will be performed in the review and assessment of a detailed site plan application process that is required for this project. We further observe that, while Applicant's Melford Village Design Guidelines suggest a general illustration regarding Applicant's general vision for addressing the parking needs of the proposed development, an evaluation of its substance is premature at this time. Moreover, we agree with the finding of Planning Board that the parking rationale included within Applicant's Design Guidelines book does not follow the methodology prescribed in § 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance for calculations as to proposed parking. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 19. We further agree with Planning Board's finding that the parking ratio table and shared parking adjustment table not be evaluated for their merits at this time. *Id.* Lastly, we agree with the finding of Planning Board that Applicant's Table, in the second column of page 17, be moved to an appendix in the design guidelines book, along with the provided parking rationale. Then, it shall be clearly labeled as an appendix and include an opening statement that the provided information is the developer's preferred proposed parking amounts, but that final

parking determination will be made at the time of DSP when an assessment of the full methodology, assumptions, and data concerning parking is prescribed pursuant to § 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance. *Id.*

An additional prescription recited in Section 27-548 of the Zoning Ordinance prescribes that development within the M-X-T Zone must comply with the 2010 *County Landscape Manual*. However, we note that the time for formal evaluation of a proposal for landscape design elements is during review of Applicant's detailed site plan application a later phase of the development review process. Lastly, we also take administrative notice that, should Applicant's landscape design guidelines be deemed contradictory to the guidelines within the 2010 *County Landscape Manual*, then those landscape design guidelines that contradict the requirements of the Landscape Manual shall be removed from the proposed design guidelines prior to certification. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 34.

Applicable Comprehensive Plan Provisions

Title 21 of the RDA imposes certain minimum comprehensive planning and zoning control requirements to guide the orderly development and the use of land and structures in the regional district in furtherance of the public safety, health, and welfare, and in order to ensure development occurring within the regional district coordinates with other parts of the State and the District of Columbia. *See* §§ 21-101(a)–(b), 21-102(a), 12-103, RDA. To this end, the RDA mandates decennial consideration by the District Council of a comprehensive general plan “to guide and accomplish a coordinated, comprehensive, adjusted and systematic development of the regional district.” *See* § 21-101(b), RDA.

Turning now to an examination of CSP-06002-01 for an assessment as to its conformance with pertinent comprehensive planning and zoning regulations and policies, we take

administrative notice of the the following comprehensive plans applicable to the area of the County where subject property is located:

In the 2002 *Prince George's County General Plan*, the District Council approved the assignment of the Melford property, known at the time of approval for the 2002 General Plan as the 'Maryland Science and Technology Center', center priority designations.

Thereafter, the District Council approved the 2006 *Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A and 74B* ("Bowie Master Plan and SMA") via adoption of CR-11-2006 on February 7, 2006. In particular, one of the comprehensive zoning changes within the Sectional Map Amendment approved a zoning change applicable to the subject property, revising intensify its zoning classification from the Employment and Institutional Area (E-I-A) Zone to the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone. As a result, the 2006 Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan designated the Melford Property as a mixed-use area, intended for mixed use development, including residential and commercial uses at this site. In turn, based on this master plan designation, the original conceptual site plan for the property, CSP-06002, approved mixed-use development for the site with hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, and residential (366 single-family units including both detached and attached units, and 500 multifamily units) use components. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 5; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 4–5; 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 3–4.

In 2014, and in accordance with the decennial review requirement in Title 21 of the RDA, discussed above, the District Council considered and approved an update to its General Plan on May 6, 2014. As part of that approval, the District Council declared that where approved General Plan recommendations conflict with existing area master plan and functional master plan recommendations, the 2014 General Plan update supersedes and amends any inconsistent

provisions within said master plans, including the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA* for the area of the subject property. *See* CR-26-2014, at 1; 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 194. With respect to recommendations in the 2014 *Plan Prince George's* relevant to the subject property, the 2014 General Plan designated the Melford Property within its Bowie Town Center designation, and the pertinent recommendations applicable to those centers stated therein. *See Plan Prince George's 2035*, Table 14, at Att. B, p. 18. Specifically, the land use policy vision for the Local Town Center designations in the 2014 General Plan is as follows:

A range of auto-accessible centers that anchor larger areas of suburban subdivisions. Overall the centers are less dense and intense than other center types and may be larger than a half mile in size due to their auto orientation. The centers typically have a walkable “core” or town center. Often the mix of uses is horizontal across the centers rather than vertical within individual buildings. Town Centers such as Brandywine, Konterra, and Westphalia are currently under construction and have received significant public and private investment for infrastructure improvements. These centers are envisioned to develop per the guidelines in Plan 2035 help fulfill countywide goals.

See 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 92–93, Table 14, Att. B, at 18.

As reflected in the General Plan land use policy above, we find that *Plan Prince George's 2035* Suburban Town Center envisions a range of auto-accessible centers offered to anchor larger areas of suburban subdivisions. As a result, the centers are less dense and intense overall than other center types within the 2014 General Plan update. *See Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 92–93, Att. B, Table 14, at 18. Moreover, while recommendations within the 2006 *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA* pertinent to the area may call for future heavy or light rail extensions, or bus rapid transit, we find that the record reflects no current transit alternatives in place or approved for construction relevant to or binding upon the subject property proposed for development. *Id.*

However, we also find that within the General Plan update, *Plan Prince George's* retained an existing designation of the subject property as an "Employment Area." To this end, we find the following Policies and Strategies set forth within the approved Economic Prosperity recommendations in Section 3 'Elements'; in the 2014 General Plan relevant to the area of the subject property proposed for development:

The 2013 Strategic Economic Development Plan identified the locations of niche market areas in which businesses in the County's four industry clusters are concentrated. These locations provide opportunities for the county to focus strategic marketing and investment to spur economic development. Six geographic areas were identified as "Economic Submarkets" because of existing concentrations of targeted industry clusters or Class A office uses within the fields of health and medicine, business services, information and technology, and federal government-leased space. The six "economic submarkets" are Bowie, College Park/Riverdale Park, Greenbelt/Berwyn Heights, Largo-Capital Beltway Corridor, National Harbor, and Beltsville/Calverton.

See 2014 Plan Prince George's 2035, at 98–99.

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was approved by the District Council on May 11, 2009 for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research, and development uses. The conditions of CSP-06002 are below, followed by comment. The Planning Board finds that the conditions of the subject approval entirely supersede those contained in CSP-06002.

Condition 1: Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 2,774 AM or 3,593 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. No development with an impact beyond those limits may be approved, until the applicant revises the CSP and the Planning Board and District Council make a new determination that transportation facilities will be adequate for proposed uses. The applicant shall prepare and file another traffic analysis, to support a finding of adequacy.

Subsequent to the 2009 final decision of the District Council as to CSP-06002, we find persuasive the evidence in the record elucidated by Applicant to demonstrate that, during review

of previous approvals at the subject property, certain background developments were not included in the traffic study that formed the basis for Technical Staff analyses, followed by the subsequent approval of CSP-06002. *See* Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was approved by the District Council on May 11, 2009 for the construction of a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research, and development uses. The conditions of CSP-06002 are below, followed by comment. The Planning Board finds that the conditions of the subject approval entirely supersede those contained in CSP-06002.

Condition 1: Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses within the M-X-T Zone that generate no more than 2,774 AM or 3,593 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. No development with an impact beyond those limits may be approved, until the applicant revises the CSP and the Planning Board and District Council make a new determination that transportation facilities will be adequate for proposed uses. The applicant shall prepare and file another traffic analysis, to support a finding of adequacy.

Subsequent to the previous CSP approval, Applicant for the subject application pointed out that, during review of previous approvals, certain background developments were not included in the traffic study forming the basis for the analyses and subsequent approval of CSP-06002. Based on this information within the administrative record, we find that these oversights in the assessment as to transportation have potential impact of significance on the actual trip cap within the administrative record upon which the Planning Board and the District Council relied in the assessment of the applications. To address this issue, the applicant has prepared a technical memorandum (September 2013) which included an a mutually agreeable control to filter the impact of background developments in the area, along with a sensitivity analysis, in order to determine the full effect of the corrected background developments, as well as establishing a new trip cap, with greater precision.

We take further administrative notice of the technical memorandum within the record submitted by Applicant substantiating the calculations to clarify the actual projected peak hour trips for all development contemplated within CSP-06002, that would generate 4,498 AM and 4,475 PM peak hour trips. As stated therein, since the background developments used for trip calculations stand in various stages of development, the actual trip cap, for the areas covered by the subject application (CSP-06002-01), are 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. Moreover, as demonstrated in the revised calculations, subsequent improvements provided by Applicant are sufficient to mitigate at least 150 percent of the new traffic proposed pursuant to the approval of CSP-06002. Planning Board agreed with Applicant's calculations within the technical memorandum. Based on our review of the record, we concur. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20. Consequently, we find that the trip cap condition be replaced with the new trip cap of 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips, in accordance with the finding of Planning Board. *Id.*

Condition 2: Prior to issuance of any building permits for lots that have not been recorded, except for Lot 3, where the proposed police communication center is to be constructed, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency.

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

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

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

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

Governors Bridge Road shall be widened, and a left-turn lane shall be added, as recommended by DPW&T. Because of the short right-turn-only lane, the widening shall extend from the intersection of US 301 to the apartment complex driveway, and the entire roadway shall be restriped, to provide two outbound lanes for approximately 250 feet, all as recommended by DPW&T.

The above transportation improvements have been constructed. Accordingly, we find that this requirements imposed through this condition have been satisfied. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20–21.

Condition 3: The site plans shall be revised to delineate and note both the Environmental Setting and the Impact Area for Melford, Historic Site 71B-016.

Applicant shall correct the notations on all site plans to include the following text: “Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting (Historic Site 71B-016).” *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21.

Condition 4: Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford House shall demonstrate that proposed buildings do not obstruct the vista.

The Historic Preservation Commission (“HPC”) recommended the following revised language for existing Condition 4 to clarify the meaning of the historic vista, and how it might be protected, as follows:

“Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building, either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in CSP-06002-01, comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20–21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6–7.

Our review of the record also reveals evidence that the CSP contains two view corridors. One connects the Melford house and the historic cemetery, within which no building

construction should be permitted. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 5–6. Just outside of that primary view corridor, one-story buildings are permitted. The second view corridor is directed east from Melford house to the proposed East-West Boulevard and the amphitheater. Within this second view corridor, the applicant has proffered building height restrictions. The recommended language, which the Planning Board adopts, clarifies which views shall be protected and establishes techniques for the protection of the views within the defined view corridors. *Id.*

Condition 5: Before approval of any detailed site plans, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the impact review area follow the guidelines on page 91 of the CDP-8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.

The HPC recommended the following revised language for existing Condition 5 to eliminate the reference to a 1986 comprehensive design plan, which has little current regulatory bearing on the subject site, and is difficult to research due to the age and condition of the CDP document. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6. We’ve reviewed the proposed language, and we find that the language below retains the original intent:

“Prior to approval of any detailed site plans that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22.

Condition 6: Before M-NCPPC accepts a detailed site plan application for this property, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall present a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission and Planning Board shall review and approve the plan and timetable, in the HAWP process, before approval of the first DSP.

Applicant requests modifications to the above language, which we note from the evidence in the record, the finding by HPC that the proposed revised language is appropriate, revised to state as follows:

“Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood(s) of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21–22; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6.

Our review of the administrative record supports a conclusion that the modified condition clarifies the timing for submission of a plan and the timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery historic site. *Id.* Because the plan and timetable will be evaluated for approval through the Historic Area Work Permit (“HAWP”) process, we find that the review and approval under the authority of HPC, not Planning Board, will best serve the interest of protection for historic resources, in accordance with the standard HAWP process. *Id.*

Condition 7: In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site, its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal, to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.

The record reflects Planning Board’s finding that this condition should be carried forward to all subsequent DSP applications. We concur, based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 22–23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 8: Prior to issuance of building permits for any property within CSP-06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the historic area work permit process. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for any future hotel or office uses.

Based on the completion of work associated with HAWP 5-07 and HAWP 45-07, reviewed and approved by HPC, substantial rehabilitation of Melford House and its outbuildings has been completed to a residential standard. This condition is no longer necessary. Any future rehabilitation of the historic site for a nonresidential use will be carried out through another HAWP as recommended by the modified language of Condition 6 (above). *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 22–23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 9: Prior to approval of any preliminary plan or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.

Based on our review of the record, we conclude that this condition remains in effect, and we find that it shall be carried forward with the subject approval. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 10: The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with guideline 3 of CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required. The project shall be pedestrian-friendly, with keen detail for a walkable community.

The record for the subject proposal reflects proposed sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads in the CSP. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23. We also take note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

Condition 11: Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate, and shall be shown on all affected DSPs.

Pedestrian safety features, bicycle parking, and other amenities will be addressed at the time of DSP. However, a comprehensive network of sidewalk and trail connections is reflected on the submitted CSP. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23. We also take note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

Condition 12: Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the Lower Pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and should be in conformance with guidelines 29 and 30 of CR-11-2006.

A trail is proposed along the Patuxent River stream valley, including the area of the lower pond. Two trail connections are reflected on the submitted plans that connect the development site to the stream valley trail. In addition to the trail connections, a comprehensive network of sidewalks is reflected and a partial grid street network is proposed, further enhancing and promoting pedestrian access. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23–24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24. We also take note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

As indicated by the prior conditions of approval, County Council Resolution CR-11-2006 contained a number of design standards and guidelines related to the Melford property. The standards and guidelines pertaining to trail or pedestrian access approved by the District Council in Amendment 22 within CR-11-2006 are as follows:

The Conceptual Site Plan shall have an integrated network of streets, sidewalks (on all streets), and open space, public or private, and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.

See CR-11-2006, at 40, ¶ 6.

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

See CR-11-2006, at 41, ¶ 5.

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

See CR-11-2006, at 46–47.

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

See CR-11-2006, at 47, ¶ 30.

After review of the evidence in the administrative record, we find the subject application is consistent with the above-referenced standards and guidelines. To illustrate this point, we note Applicant's inclusion of a comprehensive network of sidewalks in the subject development proposal, as well as a master plan trail along the Patuxent River, and various associated connections to the master plan trail, within the the proposed development application. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24. Additional areas of open space also appear to be provided, as well as various plazas and urban parks, as indicated on the Green Network exhibit. The open space appears to be accessible and visible from adjacent roadways and buildings, and the sidewalk network appears to provide pedestrian access throughout the site and to all of the appropriate destinations. *Id.*

13. The illustrative plan provided with the CSP is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with

the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other Master Plan considerations.

The record reflects submittal of new illustrative plans for Melford by Applicant *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24. However, we must point out that these illustrative plans are for guidance and informational purposes only. As a result, we find that the above condition remains in effect. *Id.*

Condition 14: Prior to signature approval of the CSP and TCP I, the TCP I shall be revised as follows:

- a. **Revise the shading patterns so that the information underneath is legible;**
- b. **Eliminate the pattern used to depict previously approved limits of disturbance and show only the limit of disturbance needed for the proposed development;**
- c. **Eliminate all clearing not necessary for the conceptual construction of the features shown;**
- d. **Revise the existing tree line per Staff Exhibit A (2006 Aerial);**
- e. **Provide labels on each cleared area, with acreage and land pod identifications; if cleared areas cross pods, divide them up so that the table on Sheet 1 can be checked for correctness;**
- f. **Revise the worksheet to reflect all cleared areas, preservation areas, etc.;**
- g. **Revise the table on Sheet 1 to fill in all the boxes;**
- h. **Add the following note: “This TCP I is associated with the approval of CSP-06002; it is conceptual in nature, and is subject to further revisions with the preliminary plan of subdivision application”;**
- i. **Revise the plans to address all other staff comments of record; and**
- j. **Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.**

The above conditions have been fully addressed, based on the record, prior to certification of the original CSP. Consequently, we find that this condition is not relevant to the subject approval.

Condition 15: Prior to signature approval of the CSP, and at least 30 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCP I shall be revised to remove all buildings, roads, trails, and other amenities from the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain.

Prior to certification of the CSP, revisions were made for all of the listed features, except for the master-planned trail proposed on park land and two connections from the internal trail system to the master-planned system. These trail connections were allowed per Condition 29b of CSP-06002. The Planning Board adopts the following replacement condition:

At the time of preliminary plan review and subsequent development applications, the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 16: Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbance to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested, wherever possible. The TCP I associated with the preliminary plan will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls, as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans, and the applicant shall adhere to the setback.

We find, based on our review of the administrative record, that this condition will be fully addressed in the course of the evaluation of the required preliminary plan of subdivision application review process. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 17: During the review of the TCP I associated with the preliminary plan, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated, to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.

We find, based on our review of the administrative record, that this condition will be fully addressed in the course of the evaluation of the required preliminary plan of subdivision application review process. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 18: Prior to approval of any DSP, the applicant shall donate to the M-NCPPC, by donation deed acceptable to the M-NCPPC, 100± acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer, as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit “A”.

Our examination of the record reveals that this condition has been addressed. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27. Moreover, the subject proposal expressly indicates that 99.48 acres of land have been donated to M-NCPPC for preservation and / or parkland resources. Thus, our assessment of the evidence within the administrative record plainly demonstrate that the dedicated land is no longer included within the CSP boundary. As a result, we find that this condition is no longer necessary as a condition to be brought forward from the original conceptual site plan approval to the proposed revision that is pending within the subject application. *Id.*

We take administrative notice of Conditions 1 through 9 of Exhibit B, “Conditions for Conveyance of Parkland to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission,” as follows:

Condition 19: Land to be conveyed is subject to conditions 1 through 9, in attached Exhibit “B”.

- 1. An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed, (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), along with the Final Plat.**
- 2. The M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed, including but not limited to, sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges prior to and subsequent to Final Plat.**
- 3. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to the M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.**
- 4. The land to be conveyed shall not be disturbed or filled in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). If the land is to be disturbed, the DPR shall require that a performance bond be posted to warrant restoration, repair or improvements made necessary or required by The M-NCPPC development approval process. The bond or other suitable financial guarantee (suitability to be judged by the General Counsel's Office, The M-NCPPC) shall be submitted to the DPR within two weeks prior to applying for grading permits.**
- 5. Storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC, the DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. The DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.**
- 6. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. All wells shall be filled and underground structures shall be removed. The DPR shall inspect the site and verify that land is in acceptable condition for conveyance, prior to dedication.**
- 7. All existing structures shall be removed from the property to be conveyed, unless the applicant obtains the written consent of the DPR.**

8. The applicant shall terminate any leasehold interests on property to be conveyed to the Commission.

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

We find that, since the land has been conveyed to M-NCPPC, this condition has been satisfied and does not need to be brought forward with the subject CSP revision. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27.

Condition 20: Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:

a. Development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces where soil conditions provide for the use of permeable paving materials. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent possible.

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

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

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

Upon review of the administrative record, we find that the above condition remains in effect and, accordingly, it should be brought forward as a condition of the subject application.

See PGCPB 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27.

Condition 21: Prior to the submission of a preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for evaluating the resource at the Phase II level. In accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, if a Phase II archeological evaluation is necessary, the applicant shall submit a research design for approval by Historic Preservation staff. After the work is completed, and before approval of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II investigations, and shall ensure that all artifacts are curated to MHT Standards.

We find Applicant has complied with the requirements of this condition for the Phase II archeological investigations. As of this date, the artifacts have not been curated, and that portion of the condition should be carried forward. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28. In addition, we note the testimony by Applicant at the Planning Board hearing concerning that documentation has been received verifying that artifacts have been deposited with the Maryland Archeological Conservation Lab, as well as the evidence in the record confirming the accuracy of Applicant’s statements. *Id.*

Condition 22: If a site has been identified as significant and potentially eligible to be listed as a Historic Site or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

- a. **Avoiding and preserving the resource in place; or**
- b. **Phase III Data Recovery investigations and interpretation.**

Phase III Data Recovery investigations shall not begin until Historic Preservation staff approves the research design. The Phase III (Treatment/Data Recovery) final report shall be reviewed for compliance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, before approval of any grading permits within 50 feet of the perimeter of the site.

The record for the subject proposal reveals that there were no significant archeological resources found outside of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting. Therefore, we find

that this condition has been satisfied and does not need to be carried forward with the subject approval. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28–29.

Condition 23: Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that retail uses are designed to:

- a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.**
- b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.**
- c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes and customized shopfronts, to create a street-like rhythm.**
- d. Provide attractive, quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC, and other unsightly functions.**
- e. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways shall be separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, and on-street parallel parking or structures; walking distances through parking lots shall be minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings; and walkways shall be made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.**
- f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.**

g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.

h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.

i. Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards, with requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.

Previous development approvals for the Melford property include a signage package considered within Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 29–30; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30–31. Additionally, we note that Applicant’s design guidelines include submitted sign standards. After evaluation of the record evidence, we find that the previously approved sign package is intended to apply to the existing commercial, office, and research properties, while the proposed signage guidelines are intended to apply to Melford Village. Accordingly, we find that one comprehensive signage package shall be created for ease of reference, and that this may be accomplished through a revision to DSP-11008 in order to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies. *Id.*

j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.

k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.

We concur with the finding by Planning Board that any retail development should be designed compatibly with adjacent office or residential development, as outlined in the design

guidelines. Efforts should be made to locate parking for retail uses at the rear or sides of the buildings, screened from the street. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites.

m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features.

Based on the foregoing, we find that the above conditions, as modified by PGCPB No. 14-128, shall remain in effect and shall be carried forward to the subject application. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

Condition 24: The research and development flex space shown in DSP-07031, if approved by the District Council, shall be the last research and development flex space approved in the M-X-T Zone at Melford.

We take administrative notice of the final decision of approval, along with its subsequent revisions, as to Detailed Site Plan DSP-07031; consequently, and based on our review of the administrative record we find that no additional research and development flex space shall be permitted property with a zoning classification in the M-X-T Zone within the Melford Property. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 31; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30. We also find no research and development flex space proposed within the subject CSP revision application. *Id.* As a result, we find ample basis in the record to reword the above-stated condition of approval for CSP-06002 so as to reflect an approved detailed site plan, DSP-07031, pursuant to the above-stated condition of the 2009 conceptual site plan approval, to illustrate pertinent subsequent history concerning development on the site, prompting our finding that no additional research and development flex space shall be permitted within the site proposed for development. *Id.*

Condition 25: All stream channels on the site should be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.

The record evidence reveals that the width of the stream buffers shown on the Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI) is consistent with the approved natural resources inventory (NRI) for the site. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 31; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30. However, a revised NRI with addenda, in which all streams, wetland limits, floodplain limits are prominently identified, an update to the specimen tree list, and a forest stand delineation for areas not yet approved for clearing with accounting details as to any clearing that has already occurred, will be submitted by Applicant. Current stream buffer requirements shall be applied on the NRI and at the time of preliminary plan in defining the primary management area for the site. *Id.*

We further note that, while the depictions as to the 100-foot natural buffer and the 150-foot wide buffer on the 100-year floodplain on the TCPI are accurate, we also find that certain sheets of the CSP application materials show these buffers incorrectly, particularly in the southeastern corner of the property. *Id.* We find that Applicant shall correct the inaccurate information prior to certificate of approval of the CSP. *Id.*

Condition 26: Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

a. Plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.

We are persuaded, based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record, of the significant environmental benefit derived from continuation of the above-captioned condition. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 31–32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30–31. Accordingly, we find that this condition shall remain in effect in the approval of the subject application. *Id.*

b. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site, to call attention to the history of the area.

Based on our review of the administrative record, Applicant installed an interpretive sign near the current entry drive to the Melford and Cemetery historic site, and which is now accessed

from Melford Boulevard. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31. What's more, we concur with findings of Planning Board that proposed revisions to CSP-06002 to relocate the entry drive will very likely result in the relocation of the interpretive sign to a location near the new entry drive to Melford House. *Id.* As such, we find that, in order to satisfy this condition fully, additional signage is needed to address the Duckett Family graveyard; moreover, we find that this signage should be provided as part of a future DSP application. While Applicant does not currently own the graveyard property, Applicant is the record owner of the property surrounding the graveyard. Appropriate signage should be placed near the cemetery. *Id.* Therefore, this condition should be carried forward until such time as a DSP application that includes the graveyard is approved. Also, additional public interpretation should be provided on the property, and may take the form of signage, brochures, lectures, or a website. *Id.*

c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill-over.

We find that the record evidence is persuasive for the protection of the public safety, health, and welfare, and find that this condition remains in effect and shall be carried forward as a condition of approval for the subject application. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

Condition 27: Prior to signature approval of the plans, the coversheet shall be revised to clearly indicate the limits of the application.

We take administrative notice that, within the administrative record, there is ambiguity concerning the limits of disturbance associated with the proposed development of the subject property. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31.

To this end, we find that the boundary of the subject CSP revision shall be revised to include all of the privately-owned properties that were the subject of CSP-06002. If the subject CSP boundary includes the same properties as the original CSP, then the subject approval may

entirely supersede the previous approval, and appropriately update all necessary conditions of approval. Publicly-owned properties not subject to zoning do not need to be included in the CSP boundary. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31.

Condition 28: Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot wide landscape buffer between the development and US 50, if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.

Upon review of the administrative record, we find that above condition shall remain in effect.

Condition 29: Recreation Facilities Conditions:

a. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan (DSP). The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

The Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation ("DPR") recommends the revised language for this condition language, as follows:

"The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the Home Owners Association (HOA) land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board."

We note that Planning Board endorsed this modification and incorporated the revised language above within PGCPB No. 14-128. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 32–33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31–32. Accordingly, and based on our examination of the administrative record, we agree with the proposed modification as stated above.

b. Prior to certificate approval of the CSP-06002, the applicant shall revise the plan to show the conceptual trail layout of the master planned trail on donated parkland.

Review of the administrative record reflects that the condition recited above was addressed previously, and this occurred prior to certification of the original CSP-06002. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32. The current proposal requesting a revision for the approved CSP shows the master-planned trail on land that is currently owned by M-NCPPC. *Id.* Consequently, Planning Board determined, during the course of its review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07055, which was subsequent to the approval of CSP-06002, that Applicant and Applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the master plan trail along the Patuxent River in conformance with DPR guidelines and standards. *Id.*

c. Prior to approval of the first final plat for the project, the applicant shall make a monetary contribution in the amount of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex.

Our review of the administrative record demonstrates that compliance with the required monetary contribution has been met. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32. *See also* 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 16.

d. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the public park.

In its memorandum submitted to the administrative record, and dated October 20, 2014, there is evidence we find persuasive from DPR, which plainly states that this condition has been satisfied. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32.

e. The applicant shall submit three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by the DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

This condition has been addressed, based on our review of the evidence in the record for the subject application. The site has a recreational facilities agreement ("RFA"), which is

recorded in the Land Records for Prince George's County at Liber 31304, Folio 145, for the design and construction of the master plan trail, as well as associated trailhead facilities along the Patuxent River. DPR suggests, and we agree with DPR's assessment, that the RFA be amended to incorporate an asphalt parking lot and an asphalt access road to the park. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32.

f. The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits. Upon completion of the trail and trailhead construction, M-NCPPC shall acknowledge the applicant's donation of the trail and trailhead construction by completing the appropriate Federal and State tax forms deemed acceptable by M-NCPPC.

We concur with the finding of Planning Board, and based on persuasive evidence in the administrative record, that alternative wording for the above language is appropriate. Thus, we find that, in lieu of this stated condition "f," above, Applicant shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee in an amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32–33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 33. In other words, based on our review of the available information within the administrative record, we are persuaded that oversights in the assessment as to the trips calculated for transportation have potential significance on the actual trip cap stated for the subject proposal within the administrative record, and upon which the Planning Board and the District Council relied in the assessment of the applications. To address this issue, Applicant prepared a technical memorandum (dated September 2013), which was submitted to the administrative record; included therein is a mutually agreeable formula as a control to filter varying impact of background developments in the area, as well as a sensitivity analysis, to provide greater

accuracy in quantifying the complete effect of the corrected background developments, as well as establishing a new, properly calculated trip cap. *Id.* We take further administrative notice of the technical memorandum within the record submitted by Applicant to substantiate the basis for a clarification to the formula to correctly calculate actual projected peak hour trips for all development contemplated within CSP-06002, that would generate 4,498 AM and 4,475 PM peak hour trips. *Id.* As stated therein, since the background developments used for trip calculations stand in various stages of development, the actual trip cap, for the areas covered by the subject application (CSP-06002-01), are 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. Moreover, as demonstrated in the revised calculations, subsequent improvements provided by Applicant are sufficient to mitigate at least 150 percent of the new traffic proposed pursuant to the approval of CSP-06002. Planning Board agreed with Applicant's calculations within the technical memorandum. Based on our review of the record, we concur. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20. Consequently, we find that the trip cap condition be replaced with the new trip cap of 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips, in accordance with the finding of Planning Board. *Id.*

Condition 2: Prior to issuance of any building permits for lots that have not been recorded, except for Lot 3, where the proposed police communication center is to be constructed, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency.

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

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

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

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

Governors Bridge Road shall be widened, and a left-turn lane shall be added, as recommended by DPW&T. Because of the short right-turn-only lane, the widening shall extend from the intersection of US 301 to the apartment complex driveway, and the entire roadway shall be restriped, to provide two outbound lanes for approximately 250 feet, all as recommended by DPW&T.

We conclude that the above transportation improvements have been constructed, based on the evidence presented. Consequently, we find that this condition has been satisfied. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20–21.

Condition 3: The site plans shall be revised to delineate and note both the Environmental Setting and the Impact Area for Melford, Historic Site 71B-016.

Applicant shall correct the notations on all site plans to include the following text: “Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting (Historic Site 71B-016).” *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21.

Condition 4: Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford House shall demonstrate that proposed buildings do not obstruct the vista.

The Historic Preservation Commission (“HPC”) recommended the following revised language for existing Condition 4 to clarify the meaning of the historic vista, and how it may best be protected, as follows:

“Applicable detailed site plans that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building, either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in CSP-06002-01, comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 20–21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6–7.

Our examination of the evidence in the administrative record further reflects support for that the CSP contains two view corridors. One connects the Melford house and the historic cemetery, within which no building construction should be permitted. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 5–6. Just outside of that primary view corridor, we note that one-story buildings are permitted. The second view corridor is directed east from Melford house to the proposed East-West Boulevard and the amphitheater. Within this second view corridor, the applicant has proffered building height restrictions. *Id.* The recommended language, which the Planning Board adopts, clarifies which views shall be protected and establishes techniques for the protection of the views within the defined view corridors. *Id.*

Condition 5: Before approval of any detailed site plans, the applicant shall demonstrate that plans for new construction within the impact review area follow the guidelines on page 91 of the CDP-8601 document for the former Maryland Science and Technology Center.

As set forth in the record, we find a recommendation by HPC to include the following revised language for existing Condition 5, in order to eliminate the reference to the 1986 comprehensive design plan, which has little current regulatory bearing on the subject site, and which is difficult to research due to the age and condition of the CDP document. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6. We’ve reviewed the proposal and, accordingly, we find that the language below captures the original intent:

“Prior to approval of any detailed site plans that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 21–22.

Condition 6: Before M-NCPPC accepts a detailed site plan application for this property, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall present a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission and Planning Board shall review and approve the plan and timetable, in the HAWP process, before approval of the first DSP.

Applicant requests modifications to the above language, which we note from the evidence in the record, the finding by HPC that the proposed revised language is appropriate, revised to state as follows:

“Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood(s) of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.”

See PGCPB No. 14-128, at 21–22; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 22; 10/22/2014 Mem., HPC to Kosack, at 6. Our review of the administrative record supports a conclusion that the modified condition clarifies the timing for submission of a plan and the timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery historic site. *Id.* Because the plan and timetable will be evaluated for approval through the Historic Area Work Permit (“HAWP”) process, we find that the review and approval under the authority of HPC, not Planning Board, will best serve the interest of protection for historic resources, in accordance with the standard HAWP process. *Id.*

Condition 7: In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site, its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space, should

be incorporated into the proposal, to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.

The record reflects Planning Board's finding that this condition should be carried forward to all subsequent DSP applications. We concur, based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 22–23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 8: Prior to issuance of building permits for any property within CSP-06002, the applicant shall initiate the restoration of the Melford House and outbuildings, through the historic area work permit process. The restoration of Melford and outbuildings shall be completed prior to issuance of use and occupancy permits for any future hotel or office uses.

Based on the completion of work associated with HAWP 5-07 and HAWP 45-07, reviewed and approved by HPC, substantial rehabilitation of Melford House and its outbuildings has been completed to a residential standard. This condition is no longer necessary. Any future rehabilitation of the historic site for a nonresidential use will be carried out through another HAWP as recommended by the modified language of Condition 6 (above). *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 22–23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 9: Prior to approval of any preliminary plan or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.

Based on our review of the record, we conclude that this condition properly remains in effect, and we find that it shall be carried forward with the subject approval. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23.

Condition 10: The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with guideline 3 of CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required. The project shall be pedestrian-friendly, with keen detail for a walkable community.

The record for the subject proposal reflects proposed sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads in the CSP. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23. We also take

note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

Condition 11: Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate, and shall be shown on all affected DSPs.

Pedestrian safety features, bicycle parking, and other amenities will be addressed at the time of DSP. However, a comprehensive network of sidewalk and trail connections is reflected on the submitted CSP. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23. We also take note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

Condition 12: Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the Lower Pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and should be in conformance with guidelines 29 and 30 of CR-11-2006.

A trail is proposed along the Patuxent River stream valley, including the area of the lower pond. Two trail connections are reflected on the submitted plans that connect the development site to the stream valley trail. In addition to the trail connections, a comprehensive network of sidewalks is reflected and a partial grid street network is proposed, further enhancing and promoting pedestrian access. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 23–24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24. We also take note of the wide sidewalks provided in the subject proposal along commercial areas and other areas of higher density. *Id.*

As indicated by the prior conditions of approval, County Council Resolution CR-11-2006 contained a number of design standards and guidelines related to the Melford property. The standards and guidelines pertaining to trail or pedestrian access approved by the District Council in Amendment 22 within CR-11-2006 are as follows:

The Conceptual Site Plan shall have an integrated network of streets, sidewalks (on all streets), and open space, public or private, and shall give priority to public space and appropriate placement of uses.

See CR-11-2006, p. 40, at ¶ 6.

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

See CR-11-2006, p. 41, at ¶ 5.

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

See CR-11-2006, at 46–47.

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

See CR-11-2006, p. 47, at ¶ 30.

After review of the evidence in the administrative record, we find the subject application is consistent with the above-referenced standards and guidelines. To illustrate this point, we note Applicant's inclusion of a comprehensive network of sidewalks in the subject development proposal, as well as a master plan trail along the Patuxent River, and various associated connections to the master plan trail, within the the proposed development application. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24 Additional areas of open space also appear to be provided, as well as various plazas and urban parks, as indicated on the Green Network exhibit. The open space appears to be accessible and visible from adjacent roadways

and buildings, and the sidewalk network appears to provide pedestrian access throughout the site and to all of the appropriate destinations. *Id.*

Condition 13: The illustrative plan provided with the CSP is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other Master Plan considerations.

The record reflects Applicant's submittal of new illustrative plans for Melford. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 24; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 23–24. However, we must also point out that these illustrative plans are useful for non-binding guidance and informational purposes only. As a result, we find that the above condition remains in effect. *Id.*

Condition 14: Prior to signature approval of the CSP and TCP I, the TCP I shall be revised as follows:

- a. **Revise the shading patterns so that the information underneath is legible;**
- b. **Eliminate the pattern used to depict previously approved limits of disturbance and show only the limit of disturbance needed for the proposed development;**
- c. **Eliminate all clearing not necessary for the conceptual construction of the features shown;**
- d. **Revise the existing tree line per Staff Exhibit A (2006 Aerial);**
- e. **Provide labels on each cleared area, with acreage and land pod identifications; if cleared areas cross pods, divide them up so that the table on Sheet 1 can be checked for correctness;**
- f. **Revise the worksheet to reflect all cleared areas, preservation areas, etc.;**
- g. **Revise the table on Sheet 1 to fill in all the boxes;**

- h. Add the following note: “This TCP I is associated with the approval of CSP-06002; it is conceptual in nature, and is subject to further revisions with the preliminary plan of subdivision application”;**
- i. Revise the plans to address all other staff comments of record; and**
- j. Have the revised plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared them.**

The above conditions were addressed prior to certification of the original CSP. This condition is not relevant to the subject approval.

Condition 15: Prior to signature approval of the CSP, and at least 30 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCP I shall be revised to remove all buildings, roads, trails, and other amenities from the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain.

Prior to certification of the CSP, revisions were made for all of the listed features, except for the master-planned trail proposed on park land and two connections from the internal trail system to the master-planned system. These trail connections were allowed per Condition 29b of CSP-06002. The Planning Board adopts the following replacement condition:

At the time of preliminary plan review and subsequent development applications, the 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 16: Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbance to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested, wherever possible. The TCP I associated with the preliminary plan will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls, as

necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans, and the applicant shall adhere to the setback.

We find, based on our review of the administrative record, that this condition will be fully addressed in the course of the evaluation of the required preliminary plan of subdivision application review process. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 17: During the review of the TCP I associated with the preliminary plan, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated, to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.

We find, based on our review of the administrative record, that this condition will be fully addressed in the course of the evaluation of the required preliminary plan of subdivision application review process. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26.

Condition 18: Prior to approval of any DSP, the applicant shall donate to the M-NCPPC, by donation deed acceptable to the M-NCPPC, 100± acres including but not limited to 100-year floodplain and floodplain buffer, as shown on the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) Exhibit “A”.

Our review of the administrative record reveals that this condition has been addressed. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27. The CSP indicates that 99.48 acres of land have been donated to M-NCPPC. This land area is no longer included within the CSP boundary. As a result, we find that this condition does not need to be brought forward with the subject approval. *Id.*

Condition 19: Land to be conveyed is subject to conditions 1 through 9, in attached Exhibit “B”.

We take administrative notice of Conditions 1 through 9 of Exhibit B, “Conditions for Conveyance of Parkland to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission,” as follows:

- 1. An original, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed, (signed by the WSSC Assessment Supervisor) shall be**

submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), along with the Final Plat.

2. The M-NCPPC shall be held harmless for the cost of public improvements associated with land to be conveyed, including but not limited to, sewer extensions, adjacent road improvements, drains, sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and front-foot benefit charges prior to and subsequent to Final Plat.

3. The boundaries and acreage of land to be conveyed to the M-NCPPC shall be indicated on all development plans and permits, which include such property.

4. The land to be conveyed shall not be disturbed or filled in any way without the prior written consent of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). If the land is to be disturbed, the DPR shall require that a performance bond be posted to warrant restoration, repair or improvements made necessary or required by The M-NCPPC development approval process. The bond or other suitable financial guarantee (suitability to be judged by the General Counsel's Office, The M-NCPPC) shall be submitted to the DPR within two weeks prior to applying for grading permits.

5. Storm drain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC. If the outfalls require drainage improvements on adjacent land to be conveyed to or owned by The M-NCPPC, the DPR shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. The DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.

6. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property to be conveyed. All wells shall be filled and underground structures shall be removed. The DPR shall inspect the site and verify that land is in acceptable condition for conveyance, prior to dedication.

7. All existing structures shall be removed from the property to be conveyed, unless the applicant obtains the written consent of the DPR.

8. The applicant shall terminate any leasehold interests on property to be conveyed to the Commission.

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

As the record unambiguously demonstrates, we find that this land has been conveyed to M-NCPPC.

As a result, we find that this condition has been satisfied, and will not be brought forward with the final disposition as to the subject CSP revision. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27.

Condition 20: Prior to the approval of a preliminary plan or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:

- a. Development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces where soil conditions provide for the use of permeable paving materials. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent possible.**
- b. Streams shall have a 100-foot natural buffer and a 150 foot-wide building and parking setback. There shall be a 150-foot buffer on the 100-year floodplain. If a utility must be extended into any buffer, then an equal area of natural buffer alternative shall be retained on community property.**
- c. Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.**
- d. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

Based on our review of the administrative record, we find that the above condition remains germane to the proposed development, and it should remain in effect for the subject

proposal and be brought forward as a condition of approval for the subject application. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 26–27; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 26–27.

Condition 21: Prior to the submission of a preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for evaluating the resource at the Phase II level. In accordance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, if a Phase II archeological evaluation is necessary, the applicant shall submit a research design for approval by Historic Preservation staff. After the work is completed, and before approval of the preliminary plan, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II investigations, and shall ensure that all artifacts are curated to MHT Standards.

We find Applicant has complied with the requirements of this condition for the Phase II archeological investigations. As of this date, the artifacts have not been curated, and that portion of the condition should be carried forward. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28. In addition, we note the testimony by Applicant at the Planning Board hearing concerning that documentation has been received verifying that artifacts have been deposited with the Maryland Archeological Conservation Lab, as well as the evidence in the record confirming the accuracy of Applicant's statements. *Id.*

Condition 22: If a site has been identified as significant and potentially eligible to be listed as a Historic Site or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

- a. Avoiding and preserving the resource in place; or
- b. Phase III Data Recovery investigations and interpretation.

Phase III Data Recovery investigations shall not begin until Historic Preservation staff approves the research design. The Phase III (Treatment/Data Recovery) final report shall be reviewed for compliance with the Guidelines for Archeological Review, before approval of any grading permits within 50 feet of the perimeter of the site.

The record for the subject proposal reveals that there were no significant archeological resources found outside of the Melford and Cemetery environmental setting. Therefore, we find

that this condition has been satisfied and does not need continue with the final disposition as to the subject approval. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28–29.

Condition 23: Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that retail uses are designed to:

a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.

b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.

c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes and customized shopfronts, to create a street-like rhythm.

d. Provide attractive, quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC, and other unsightly functions.

e. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways shall be separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, and on-street parallel parking or structures; walking distances through parking lots shall be minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings; and walkways shall be made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.

f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.

g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.

h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.

i. Create a signage package for high-quality signs and sign standards, with requirements for all retail and office tenants and owners. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, logos, colors, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs.

Melford has previous approvals for a signage package that was the subject of Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 29–30; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30–31. Additionally, we note that Applicant’s submitted design guidelines include sign standards. Based on the evidence in the record, we find that the previously approved sign package is intended to apply to the existing commercial, office, and research properties, while the proposed signage guidelines are intended to apply to Melford Village. Accordingly, we find that one comprehensive signage package shall be created for ease of reference, and that this may be accomplished through a revision to DSP-11008 in order to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies.

Id.

j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.

k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, parking shall be located to the rear of the pad sites.

We concur with the finding by Planning Board that any retail development should be designed compatibly with adjacent office or residential development, as outlined in the design guidelines. Efforts should be made to locate parking for retail uses at the rear or sides of the buildings, screened from the street. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites.

m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features.

Based on the foregoing, we find that the above conditions, as modified by PGCPB No. 14-128, shall remain in effect and shall be carried forward to the subject application. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

Condition 24: The research and development flex space shown in DSP-07031, if approved by the District Council, shall be the last research and development flex space approved in the M-X-T Zone at Melford.

We take administrative notice of the final decision of approval, along with its subsequent revisions, as to Detailed Site Plan DSP-07031; consequently, and based on our review of the administrative record we find that no additional research and development flex space shall be permitted property with a zoning classification in the M-X-T Zone within the Melford Property. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 31; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30. We also find no research and development flex space proposed within the subject CSP revision application. *Id.* As a result, we find ample basis in the record to reword the above-stated condition of approval for CSP-06002 so as to reflect an approved detailed site plan, DSP-07031, pursuant to the above-stated condition of the 2009 conceptual site plan approval, to illustrate pertinent subsequent history concerning development on the site, prompting our finding that no additional research and development flex space shall be permitted within the site proposed for development. *Id.*

Condition 25: All stream channels on the site should be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.

The record evidence reveals that the width of the stream buffers shown on the Type I tree conservation plan (TCPI) is consistent with the approved natural resources inventory (NRI) for the site. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 31; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30. However, a revised NRI with addenda, in which all streams, wetland limits, floodplain limits are prominently identified, an

update to the specimen tree list, and a forest stand delineation for areas not yet approved for clearing with accounting details as to any clearing that has already occurred, will be submitted by Applicant. Current stream buffer requirements shall be applied on the NRI and at the time of preliminary plan in defining the primary management area for the site. *Id.*

We further note that, while the depictions as to the 100-foot natural buffer and the 150-foot wide buffer on the 100-year floodplain on the TCPI are accurate, we also find that certain sheets of the CSP application materials show these buffers incorrectly, particularly in the southeastern corner of the property. *Id.* We find that Applicant shall correct the inaccurate information prior to certificate of approval of the CSP. *Id.*

Condition 26: Prior to the approval of a detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

a. Plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.

We are persuaded, based on our review of the evidence in the administrative record, of the significant environmental benefit derived from continuation of the above-captioned condition. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 31–32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 30–31. Accordingly, we find that this condition shall remain in effect in the approval of the subject application. *Id.*

b. Appropriate signage should be placed near the historic site, to call attention to the history of the area.

Based on our review of the administrative record, Applicant installed an interpretive sign near the current entry drive to the Melford and Cemetery historic site, and which is now accessed from Melford Boulevard. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31.

What's more, we concur with findings of Planning Board that proposed revisions to CSP-06002 to relocate the entry drive will very likely result in the relocation of the interpretive sign to a location near the new entry drive to Melford House. *Id.* As such, we find that, in order to

satisfy this condition fully, additional signage is needed to address the Duckett Family graveyard; moreover, we find that this signage should be provided as part of a future DSP application. While Applicant does not currently own the graveyard property, Applicant is the record owner of the property surrounding the graveyard. Appropriate signage should be placed near the cemetery. *Id.* Therefore, this condition should be carried forward until such time as a DSP application that includes the graveyard is approved. Also, additional public interpretation should be provided on the property, and may take the form of signage, brochures, lectures, or a website. *Id.*

c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill-over.

We find that the record evidence is persuasive for the protection of the public safety, health, and welfare, and find that this condition remains in effect and shall be carried forward as a condition of approval for the subject application. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 28–29; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 28.

Condition 27: Prior to signature approval of the plans, the coversheet shall be revised to clearly indicate the limits of the application.

We take administrative notice that, within the administrative record, there is ambiguity concerning the limits of disturbance associated with the proposed development of the subject property. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31.

To this end, we find that the boundary of the subject CSP revision shall be revised to include all of the privately-owned properties that were the subject of CSP-06002. If the subject CSP boundary includes the same properties as the original CSP, then the subject approval may entirely supersede the previous approval, and appropriately update all necessary conditions of approval. Publicly-owned properties not subject to zoning do not need to be included in the CSP boundary. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31.

Condition 28: Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot wide landscape buffer between the development and US 50, if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.

Upon review of the administrative record, we find that above condition shall remain in effect. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at

Condition 29: Recreation Facilities Conditions:

a. The applicant shall provide private recreational facilities as determined appropriate at the time of review of the detailed site plan (DSP). The recreational facilities shall be constructed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

The Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation ("DPR") recommends the revised language for this condition language, as follows:

"The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the Home Owners Association (HOA) land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board."

We note that Planning Board endorsed this modification and incorporated the revised language above within PGCPB No. 14-128. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 32–33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 31–32. Accordingly, and based on our examination of the administrative record, we agree with the proposed modification as stated above.

b. Prior to certificate approval of the CSP-06002, the applicant shall revise the plan to show the conceptual trail layout of the master planned trail on donated parkland.

Review of the administrative record reflects previous assessment as to the above-stated condition, which occurred prior to certification of the original CSP-06002. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32. The current proposal requesting a revision for the approved CSP

shows the master-planned trail on land that is currently owned by M-NCPPC. *Id.* Consequently, Planning Board determined, during the course of its review and approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07055, which was subsequent to the approval of CSP-06002, that Applicant and Applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the master plan trail along the Patuxent River in conformance with DPR guidelines and standards. *Id.*

c. Prior to approval of the first final plat for the project, the applicant shall make a monetary contribution in the amount of \$250,000 for the design and construction of the Green Branch Athletic Complex.

We find that the evidence within the administrative record demonstrates Applicant's compliance as to the required monetary contribution. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32. *See also* 06/06/2014 App. Just'n Stmt., at 16.

d. If necessary, a public access easement shall be recorded from US 301 to the proposed public parkland over the planned private streets to provide public access to the public park.

In its memorandum submitted to the administrative record, and dated October 20, 2014, there is evidence we find persuasive from DPR, which plainly states that this condition has been satisfied. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32.

e. The applicant shall submit three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) for trail and trailhead construction to the DPR for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat of subdivision. Upon approval by the DPR, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

This condition has been addressed, based on our review of the evidence in the record for the subject application. The site has a recreational facilities agreement ("RFA"), which is recorded in the Land Records for Prince George's County at Liber 31304, Folio 145, for the design and construction of the master plan trail, as well as associated trailhead facilities along the Patuxent River. DPR suggests, and we agree with DPR's assessment, that the RFA be amended

to incorporate an asphalt parking lot and an asphalt access road to the park. *See* PGCPB 14-128, at 32; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 32.

f. The applicant shall submit to the DPR a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by the DPR, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits. Upon completion of the trail and trailhead construction, M-NCPPC shall acknowledge the applicant's donation of the trail and trailhead construction by completing the appropriate Federal and State tax forms deemed acceptable by M-NCPPC.

We concur with the finding of Planning Board, and based on persuasive evidence in the administrative record, that alternative wording for the above language is appropriate. Thus, we find that, in lieu of this stated condition “f,” above, Applicant shall submit a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee in an amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 32–33; 10/30/2014 TSR, at 33.

Other Technical Staff Report Comments from Agencies

The District Council also specifically adopts by reference, as if fully restated herein, Planning Board's findings and conclusions, as they relate to comments and recommendations from the Community Planning Division, Transportation Section, Countywide Planning, Subdivision Review Division, Environmental Planning, Department of Parks and Recreation, the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission, Potomac Electric Power Company, the Prince George's County Police Department, the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department, the Prince George's County Health Department, the Department of Permits, Inspections and Enforcement, Verizon, the Maryland State Highway Administration, and the City of Bowie. *See* PGCPB No. 14-128, at 37–61.

Issues Raised on Appeal

On December 9, 2014, after Planning Board adopted Resolution No. 14-128 at its December 4, 2014, public meeting, the Planning Board issued notice of its action in accordance with the requirements of § 27-280 of the Zoning Ordinance. The notification letter also advised all persons of record of the time for appeal from the disposition of Planning Board by filing a written appeal with the Clerk of the District Council. *See* 12/09/2014 Ltr., Kosack to St. John Properties, at 1.

Thereafter, on January 7, 2015, being within the 30-day time period for appeals recited within the Zoning Ordinance, on January 7, 2015, Appellants filed a timely joint appeal with the District Council seeking review of the subject proposal by the District Council. As reflected in the written appeal, named Appellants are Martha Ainsworth, Sally Mitchell, Bruce Pletsch, Lauren Ragsac, and Fred Tutman. *See* 01/07/2015 Ltr., Ainsworth, *et alia*, to Floyd, at 1–2. The joint appeal letter alleged the following errors as to CSP-06002-01:

1. The addition of a large residential component to Melford does not support its main purpose as an employment center.

As stated in the written appeal letter, and further amplified during its remarks at the February 23, 2015, Oral Argument concerning CSP-06002-01, Appellants argue that the *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA* states that “[t]he primary emphasis of the overall development at Melford is on employment. Site development should maximize employment opportunities so Melford becomes a major employment center and mixed-use venue in the County. *See* 01/07/2015 Ltr., Ainsworth, *et alia*, to Floyd, at 1–2 (internal citations omitted). In support of this argument, Appellants cite additional provisions set forth in the *Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan* approved in 2006, requiring “any residential component not to exceed 866 housing units and 20-30% of gross floor area,” as well as the provisions in the 2014 General Plan Update,

Plan Prince George's 2035, claiming that the current General Plan “identifies the Bowie Town Center (of which Melford is now a part), as one of four county Employment Areas,” citing to Policy 6 of the Land Use Chapter within Section 3: Elements. *See generally* 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 66–81; 01/07/2015 Ltr., Ainsworth, *et alia* to Floyd, at 1–2. *See also* 02/23/2015 Tr. This argument is factually and legally without merit.

Contrary to Appellants’ stated view of the land use policy for the Melford Property area, and as we discussed within the Comprehensive Plan section, appearing on pages 42–43, *supra*, we find the provisions of the 2014 General Plan inapposite to their assessment that the subject property is one of four designated Employments Areas within the 2014 Plan. *See* 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 83 (“In support of the Plan 2035 growth concept, the eight Regional Transit Centers (which include Priority Investment Districts and Primary Employment Areas) are the focus of the county’s planned growth and mixed use development. The Local and Suburban Centers are secondary, and provide smaller scale opportunities for development.... [E]mployment and office growth this is anticipated over the next 20 years is limited [within Local and Suburban Centers]). Here, as we point out in our discussion at page 42, the subject property is a designated Local Town Center in the approved General Plan. *See* 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, Table 14, Att. B., at 18. Moreover, we find persuasive the Land Use Policy 10.3 articulated in the Land Use Chapter of the 2014 General Plan, which calls for the County to “evaluate master plans that include Residential / Neighborhood Services land use and zoning to reduce commercial zoning. Redesignate to residential land use as appropriate.” *See* 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, at 93.

As a result, we are unpersuaded by Appellants’ view of the applicable land use policy for the subject property, find ample evidence in the record to conclude that there is substantial

evidence within the administrative record supporting the proposed development at Melford Village embodied within CSP-06002-01.

2. CSP-06002-01 is not Smart Growth and not consistent with the County's development goals in Plan [Prince George's] 2035.

Appellants next aver that the subject development proposal is not consistent with development goals in *Plan Prince George's 2035*, because:

“it will increase sprawl and auto-dependency and divert development from areas better served by existing infrastructure. It places dense residential development in the eastern boundary of the county, far from mass transit. As Melford is physically separated from the rest of Bowie and has a single entrance, retail development will be limited to “convenience retail.” Residents will be driving their cars for employment, shopping, and most other needs. The applicant’s traffic study estimated that the residential component will generate about 13,000 new daily trips. Unlike trips associated with the employment uses at Melford, the residential traffic will take place 7 days a week. The plan will exacerbate congestion and commuting times in Prince George’s County, already among the worst in the country. Instead, new housing should be focused on areas closer to transit and concentrations of jobs—such as around the County’s 15 undeveloped metro stations—and at the closer-in areas identified in *Plan 2035* that are well served by existing transit and utility infrastructure and in need of revitalization.”

See 01/07/2015 Ltr., Ainsworth, *et alia*, to Floyd, at 1–2, Annex. at 1–5. *See also* 02/23/2015 Tr.

Our review of the evidence in the administrative record, as well as the unambiguous language of the approved 2014 General Plan update pertinent to the subject development proposal plainly states specific policy designations supporting the elements within Applicant’s proposal before us—namely, for “auto-accessible centers that anchor larger areas of suburban subdivisions.... The centers typically have a walkable “core” or town center. Often the mix of uses is horizontal.... While master plans may call for future heavy or light rail extension or bus rapid transit, no transit alternatives have been approved for construction.” that flatly contradict Appellants’ arguments, above. *See* 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035*, Table 14, Att. B., at 18. *See*

also discussion of comprehensive plan provisions applicable to the subject property, at 42–43, *supra*.

Consequently, we are unpersuaded by Appellants’ view of the applicable land use policy for the subject property, and we find ample support within the administrative record from which we conclude that there is substantial evidence within the administrative record to support the proposed development at Melford Village embodied within CSP-06002-01.

3. CSP-06002-01 will have substantial adverse environmental impacts.

A final basis advanced by Appellants in the written appeal and advanced at the oral argument conducted on February 23, 2015, involves the potential environmental consequences resulting from the approved land use policy designation for the area of the Melford Property in the 2014 General Plan update with *Plan Prince George’s 2035*, as follows:

The auto-dependent residential community and resulting congestion will raise greenhouse gas emissions and air pollution. The high-density 24/7 residential development will put people and pets from 2,500 dwelling units, one the edge of the Patuxent River wetlands, brimming with wildlife. The runoff from the development will go directly into the Patuxent River and the Chesapeake Bay. CSP-06002-01 does not go far enough in terms of minimizing impervious surfaces and polluted runoff at each stage of development, as required by the Master Plan. In fact, the Planning Board weakened the conditions of the previous CSP-06002 with respect to minimizing impervious surfaces. It makes no sense that this application should allow additional construction with excessive impervious surfaces that will later have to be retro-fitted using tax revenues.

In short, the Melford CSP will replace rather than promote employment, foster a dense urban and auto-dependent community far from mass transit, with substantial environmental and quality of life impacts, and divert development from areas that the County has prioritized. In light of these severe shortcomings, we do not believe that CSP-06002-01 represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use,” as required for approval in § 27-276(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance. We believe that there are more reasonable alternatives to CSP-06002-01 that preserve the object of promoting an employment center, and that better protect the environment.

See 01/07/2015 Ltr., Ainsworth, *et alia*, to Floyd, at 2, Annex. at 5–6. *See also* 02/23/2015 Tr.

As a preliminary observation, we acknowledge Appellants’ concerns for the health of delicate environmental resources near and around the site of the subject development proposal. However, Appellants we are unable to conclude that this argument is supported by persuasive, substantial evidence within the administrative record to meet its burden of persuasion. By contrast, we find that the general plan land use development policies approved in the 2014 General Plan Update with *Plan Prince George’s 2035* are entirely consistent with the subject proposal before us, as previously discussed in response to Appellants’ claims, above, and our discussion herein as to applicable comprehensive plan provisions for CSP-06002-01. *See* 2014 *Plan Prince George’s 2035*, Table 14, Att. B., at 18. *See also* discussion of comprehensive plan provisions applicable to the subject property, at 42–43, *supra*.

Thus, we are also unpersuaded by this third argument advanced by Appellants as to the applicable land use policy for the subject property to find a sufficient basis to refute the ample evidence contrary to Appellants’ position in the administrative record. What’s more, we find ample support within the administrative record from which we conclude that substantial evidence exists within the administrative record to support the proposed development at Melford Village embodied within CSP-06002-01. Consequently, based on the foregoing, we find Appellants’ argument meritless.

In assessing this application, we take administrative notice of the prescription set forth in the Zoning Ordinance that “the burden in any zoning case shall be the applicant’s.” *See* § 27-142, Zoning Ordinance. As Maryland courts have long settled, when assessing the merits of whether to approve a special exception application, there is a distinction between evidence which compels a certain result and that which merely permits it. *See Jabine v. Priola*, 45 Md. App. 218,

232–33, 412 A.2d 1277 (1980), *rev'd on other grounds sub nom.*, *Woodfield v. W. River Improvement Ass'n*, 165 Md. App. 700, 886 A.2d 944 (2005).

Moreover, when we, the administrative agency for land use and zoning proposals, review a special exception application, we note other requirements within Maryland administrative law that “[e]valuation of a special exception application is not an equation to be balanced with formulaic precision.” *See Sharp v. Howard County Bd. of Appeals*, 98 Md. App. 57, 73, 632 A.2d 248, 256 (1993). And, this lack of a precise rubric is reflected in the standard of judicial review applied to zoning decisions. *Schultz v. Pritts*, 291 Md. 1, 26, 432 A.2d 1319, 1333 (1981); *see also Alviani v. Dixon*, 365 Md. 95, 107–08, 775 A.2d 1234, 1241 (2001); *Board of County Commissioners v. Oakhill Farms*, 232 Md. 274, 283, 192 A. 2d 761, 766 (1963) (whether test of substantial evidence on the entire record or test against weight of all the evidence is followed, courts have exercised restraint so as not to substitute their judgments for that of the agency and not to choose between equally permissible inferences, or to make independent determinations of fact, as to do so constitutes non-judicial role). Rather, courts have attempted to decide whether a reasoning mind could reasonably have reached the result the agency reached upon a fair consideration of the fact picture painted by the entire record. In the cases dealing with consideration of the weight of the evidence, the matter seems to have come down to whether, all that was before the agency considered, its action was clearly erroneous or, to use the phrase which has become standard in Maryland zoning cases, not fairly debatable. *Id.* The basic reason for the fairly debatable standard is that zoning matters are, first of all, legislative functions and, absent arbitrary and capricious actions, are presumptively correct, if based upon substantial evidence, even if substantial evidence to the contrary exists. *See Cremins v. County Comm'rs of Washington County*, 164 Md. App. 426, 438, 883 A.2d 966, 973–74 (2005) (internal quotations

and citations omitted). There is substantial evidence to support the zoning agency's conclusion if reasoning minds could reasonably reach the conclusion from facts in the record. Evidence is substantial if there is a little more than a scintilla of evidence. *Id.* Thus, "fairly debatable" under Maryland administrative law is whether the agency's determination is based upon evidence from which reasonable persons could come to different conclusions. *Sembly v. County Bd. of Appeals*, 269 Md. 177, 182, 304 A.2d 814, 818 (1973). *See also Prince George's County v. Meininger*, 264 Md. 148, 151, 285 A.2d 649, 651 (1972) (internal quotations omitted); *Annapolis v. Annapolis Waterfront Co.*, 284 Md. 383, 398, 396 A.2d 1080, 1089 (1979).

Before us is an application of first revision to a conceptual site plan, CSP-06002-01. As stated in Maryland administrative law cases, Applicant's burden "assumes not merely the lesser burden of generating a fairly debatable issue so as to permit a ruling in its favor but the significantly greater burden of actually dispelling fair debate by proof so clear and decisive as legally to compel a ruling in its favor." *B. P Oil, Inc. v. Bd. of Appeals*, 42 Md. App. 576, 580, 401 A.2d 1054 (1979).

Based on the foregoing, we are persuaded by substantial evidence within the administrative record to specifically demonstrate consistency with the comprehensive planning and zoning development policies set forth in the current general plan and master plans for the area of the property proposed for development. Moreover, our review of the proposed conditions of approval adopted by Planning Board within PGCPB No. 14-128, as modified herein, will ensure conformance with development requirements for the project set forth in the Zoning Ordinance.

Approval of CSP-06002-01 is subject to the following conditions:

1. The proposed development shall be limited to a mix of uses where the trip cap associated with the uses within the boundary of CSP-06002-01 shall not exceed 4,441 AM and

4,424 PM peak hour trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified hereinabove shall require a revision to the conceptual site plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

2. Prior to certificate of approval of the conceptual site plan (CSP), the following revisions shall be made, or information shall be provided:
 - a. Verify the square footages of the existing development within the area of the CSP. Correctly note the existing and proposed square footages and floor area ratio based on the net tract area.
 - b. Add a note to the Site Data chart on Sheet 4 that all detailed site plans must show conformance to the specific allowed floor area ratios.
 - c. Revise the CSP to graphically show the conceptual location of the proposed pedestrian connection between the Melford Boulevard/Science Drive roundabout and Kendale Lane in the Kenilworth section of Bowie.
 - d. Revise General Note 4 and the CSP to clearly indicate the range of square footage for each use within the boundary of the CSP.
 - e. Designate the retail area west of Melford Boulevard for retail, institutional, or office uses.
 - f. Correct the notations on the CSP to include the following text “Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting (Historic Site 71B-016).”
 - g. Revise CSP Sheets 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 of 13 to show the 150-foot-wide floodplain buffer correctly.
 - h. Indicate the location of a “conservation easement” that is required for the 150-foot-wide floodplain buffer on Sheet 13 of 13.
 - i. Revise the subject CSP boundary to include all of the properties that were the subject of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002. Publicly-owned properties not subject to zoning do not need to be included in the boundary of CSP-06002-01.
3. Prior to certificate of approval of the conceptual site plan (CSP), the Melford Village Design Guidelines (Guidelines) shall be revised as follows:
 - a. References to departures, variances, or variations should be modified or clarified, as necessary, to avoid conflicts with Zoning Ordinance procedures.
 - b. Label each appendix section clearly as an appendix.

- c. Move the parking ratio table and shared parking adjustment table, and all associated language, to an appendix. Add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 7e above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - d. Move the Definitions section to an appendix and add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 6 above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - e. Move the Design Review Committee Policies & Procedures section to an appendix and add an opening statement regarding the purpose, as described in Finding 6 above, to be reviewed by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.
 - f. A note shall be added to the Street Sections section (page 19) indicating that it shows conceptual street sections that are subject to final approval with the preliminary plan of subdivision.
 - g. Provide language at the bottom of the Street Sections section on page 19 to state that the appropriateness of shared lane markings (sharrows) will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision subject to the approval of the City of Bowie.
 - h. Remove the reference to a parking space size in the Parking Standards section.
 - i. Revise the maps within the Guidelines to maintain consistency with the CSP, as necessary.
 - j. Amend the landscape design guidelines to state that “Residential landscaping shall be provided in accordance with Section 4.1 of the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual.”
 - k. Amend the landscape design guidelines to reflect that street trees along private streets should be located between the street curb and the sidewalk in conformance with the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual, and meet the minimum soil surface area requirements contained in the Prince George’s County Landscape Manual.
 - l. Amend the landscape design guidelines on page 51 to reflect that landscaping in parking areas should be designed to conform to the Prince Georges County Landscape Manual.
4. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the following issues shall be addressed, or information shall be provided:

- a. Reevaluate the intersection of Melford Boulevard and Science Drive to determine what improvements will be needed at various phases of the proposed development.
 - b. Provide an updated letter from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife and Heritage Division, concerning the presence of rare, threatened, and/or endangered species on the site as an amendment to the updated natural resources inventory (NRI) prior to approval.
 - c. If impacts to regulated environmental features are proposed at the time of preliminary plan, over and above those previously approved by the Planning Board, a statement of justification shall be submitted in accordance with Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The justification shall address how each impact has been avoided and/or minimized and shall include 8.5 by 11 exhibits of the proposed disturbance.
 - d. The preliminary plan application package shall contain a copy of the erosion and sediment control concept plan.
 - e. Evaluate the provision of a circulator shuttle bus service or route throughout Melford, to/from adjacent or nearby employers, commuter bus lots, and future stations and/or mass transit.
5. Except for previously approved clearing that directly relates to the construction of the stormwater management ponds, all disturbances to the stream and floodplain buffers shall be eliminated. Where buffers have been disturbed by previous approvals, they shall be reforested wherever possible. The Type I tree conservation plan associated with the preliminary plan of subdivision will be evaluated for impacts to these buffers for the installation of stormwater management outfalls, as necessary. The 150-foot building setback shall be shown on the plans, and the applicant shall adhere to the setback.
 6. During the review of the Type I tree conservation plan associated with the preliminary plan of subdivision, the linear wetland in the middle of the southeastern portion of the site shall be evaluated to ensure its protection in a manner consistent with previous approvals.
 7. Prior to approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:
 - a. The development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces to the maximum extent possible, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces in accordance with the approved storm water management concept plan for Melford. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent reasonably practicable.
 - b. The required 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the

fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts.

- c. Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally-sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.
 - d. The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally-sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.
8. All stream channels on the site shall be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.
9. At the time of detailed site plan (DSP), the following design issues shall be addressed:
- a. The plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.
 - b. Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan that includes a portion of the Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting, in consultation with archeology staff, the applicant shall provide for additional public interpretation of the significance of archeological findings within the property. That public interpretation may take the form of on-site signage, a printed brochure, public lectures or a website. The location and wording of any additional signage, brochure text, or website shall be subject to approval by the Prince George's County Planning Department staff archeologist.
 - c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill-over.
 - d. Applicable DSPs that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.
 - e. Prior to approval of any DSPs that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.

10. Detailed site plans shall provide a minimum 30-foot-wide landscaped buffer between the development and John Hanson Highway (US 50/301) if research and development flex space is proposed. The buffer shall be measured from the public utility easement.
11. At the time of detailed site plan, the private on-site recreational facilities within the area of each DSP shall be reviewed. The following issues shall be addressed:
 - a. The applicant shall provide a final list of proposed private recreational facilities and their cost estimates. The list of facilities provided on page 15 of the conceptual site plan design guidelines shall initially be viewed as the types of facilities required. The appropriateness of the number and size of the facilities will be reviewed at DSP.
 - b. The minimum size of the proposed private recreational facilities and the timing of their construction shall be determined.
 - c. The developer and the developer's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall satisfy the Prince George's County Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
12. Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that the retail uses are designed to:
 - a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services, and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.
 - b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.
 - c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes, and customized shopfronts to create a street-like rhythm.
 - d. Provide attractive quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash, HVAC (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning), and other unsightly functions.
 - e. Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for

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

- f. Screen parking from the streets, and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.
 - g. Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.
 - h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient, direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.
 - i. Provide a comprehensive sign package for signs and sign standards that integrate the signage guidelines within Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 and the previously approved sign standards contained in Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs. The revised signage plan to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies may be approved by the Planning Director, as designee of the Planning Board.
 - j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.
 - k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel/residential component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, all off-street parking shall be located to the rear or side of the pad sites. Parking provided on the side of pad sites shall be buffered with appropriate screening and/or landscape features.
 - l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites, to the maximum extent possible.
 - m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features, where reasonably practicable.
13. All plans shall delineate and note both the environmental setting and the impact area for Melford and Cemetery, Historic Site 71B-016.
 14. Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection,

stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.

15. In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site (71B-016), its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening, landscaping, berming, and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.
16. Prior to approval of any preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.
17. The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with Guideline 3 of Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required where reasonably appropriate, unless modified by the City of Bowie for portions of sidewalk within the public right-of-way.
18. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate, and shall be shown on all affected detailed site plans.
19. Connector trails shall be provided to complement the sidewalk network and provide access between uses and development pods. Priority shall be given to providing trail and sidewalk access to the existing trail around the lower pond. The comprehensive trail network will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision and should be in conformance with Guidelines 29 and 30 of Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-11-2006.
20. The illustrative plan provided with the conceptual site plan (CSP) is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other master plan considerations.
21. No additional research and development flex space is permitted in the Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone at Melford.
22. Recreation Facilities Conditions:

- a. The applicant shall complete construction of a ten-foot-wide asphalt surface hiker/bicycler/equestrian trail, four boardwalks, a 15-space asphalt parking lot, an asphalt access road, and trailhead facilities on adjacent Patuxent River Park prior to issuance of a building permit for the 500th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.
 - b. Prior to the first residential building permit, the applicant shall submit to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) for review and approval revised construction drawings for public recreational facilities. These drawings shall include details for construction of the planned asphalt parking lot and asphalt access road.
 - c. The applicant shall construct at least two eight-foot-wide asphalt trail connectors from the residential neighborhood to the master-planned trail on dedicated parkland. The location of the trail connectors shall be established at the time of detailed site plan review and approval.
 - d. The applicant shall submit to the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) a performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DPR, at least two weeks prior to issuance of a building permit for the 100th residential dwelling unit within the Melford development.
 - e. Prior to a submission of any final plat of subdivision for the residential component of Melford, the public Recreational Facilities Agreement (RFA) recorded at Liber 34304, Folio 145 shall be amended to incorporate an asphalt parking lot and asphalt access road to the park, timing of construction, and bonding of the recreational facilities. Upon DPR approval, the RFA shall be recorded among the Land Records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
 - f. The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the homeowners association land. The private recreational facilities shall include playgrounds for children of all ages. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the detailed site plan by the Planning Board.
23. A pedestrian connection, designed according to the CSP Streetscape Design Standards, shall be constructed between the Melford Boulevard/Science Drive roundabout and Kendale Lane in the Kenilworth section, prior to the issuance of the building permit for the 300th dwelling unit, subject to the approval of the Maryland State Highway Administration.

24. The final number of affordable workforce housing units and senior multifamily units shall be submitted by the applicant prior to submittal of an application for preliminary plan of subdivision.
25. The phasing of all development proposed in CSP-06002-01 shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

Ordered this 23rd day of March, 2015, by the following vote:

In Favor: Council Members Davis, Glaros, Harrison, Patterson, Taveras, Toles and Turner.

Opposed: Council Member Lehman.

Abstained:

Absent: Council Member Franklin.

Vote: 7-1

COUNTY COUNCIL OF PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND, SITTING AS THE
DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR THAT PART OF
THE MARYLAND-WASHINGTON
REGIONAL DISTRICT IN PRINCE GEORGE'S
COUNTY, MARYLAND

By: _____
Mel Franklin, Chairman

ATTEST:

Redis C. Floyd
Clerk of the Council