

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Shops at District Heights, LLC is the owner of a 9.2-acre parcel of land known as Parcel A and Parcel 324, Tax Map 81 A-3, said property being in the 6th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned C-S-C; and

WHEREAS, on July 21, 2004, Shops at District Heights filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Staff Exhibit #1) for 1 parcel; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Subdivision Plan, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-04125 for Shops at District Heights was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on November 18, 2004, for its review and action in accordance with Article 28, Section 7-116, Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code; and

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

WHEREAS, on November 18, 2004, the Prince George's County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04125, Shops at District Heights, LLC for Parcel A with the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of building permits, the applicant shall obtain detailed site plan approval by the Planning Board. The detailed site plan shall address landscaping, architecture, on-site circulation, and the visual relationships between the shopping center and the adjacent residences and church.
2. Development of this site shall be in conformance with the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (#22962-2004-00), or any approved revision thereto.
3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA:

- a. Provide a traffic signal on MD 458 at West Avenue/North Site Access Road. Additional

improvements at this location will include a northbound left turn lane on MD 458 and a southbound right turn lane on MD 458, designed to SHA standards. The north site access road shall also be designed with one left-turn lane and one through/right lane to access MD 458.

- b. The design and construction costs of the new traffic signal on MD 458 at West Avenue will be the sole responsibility of the applicant, his/her heirs, successors, or assignees.
  - c. The applicant, his/her heirs, successors, or assignees will also be responsible for any frontage and safety improvements along MD 4 or MD 458 and additional acceleration/deceleration lanes at the second entrance on MD 458 if deemed necessary by SHA.
  - d. These improvements shall also include any traffic signal, signage, and pavement marking modifications and additions to be determined by SHA. All costs for these improvements will be the sole responsibility of the applicant, his/her heirs, successors, or assigns.
- 4. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate 60 feet of right-of-way along MD 458 from the centerline of existing pavement.
  - 5. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 96,802 square feet consisting of an integrated shopping center, or equivalent development which generates no more than 90 AM and 405 PM peak hour trips. Any development other than that identified herein shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

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

- 1. The subdivision, as modified, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and of Article 28, Annotated Code of Maryland.
- 2. The property is located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of Silver Hill Road (MD 458) and Pennsylvania Avenue (MD 4).
- 3. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	C-S-C	C-S-C
Use(s)	RV Dealership	Retail Uses (96,802 sq.ft.)
Acreage	9.24	9.24
Lots	0	0
Parcels	2	1

- 4. **Environmental**—The site is exempt from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it contains less than 10,000 square feet of woodlands, and there is no previously approved tree

conservation plan on the subject property. The Environmental Planning Section issued a standard letter of exemption from the Woodland Conservation Ordinance on July 16, 2004. This letter is valid through July 16, 2007. There are no other outstanding or unresolved environmental concerns.

### **Water and Sewer Categories**

The water and sewer service categories are W-3 and S-3 according to water and sewer maps obtained from the Department of Environmental Resources dated June 2003. The proposed development would utilize public water and sewer facilities.

5. **Community Planning**—The property is located Planning Area 75A/Suitland. The 2002 General Plan places the site in a designated Corridor (Pennsylvania Avenue MD 4) in the Developed Tier. The vision for the Developed Tier is a network of sustainable, transit supporting, mixed-use, pedestrian-oriented, medium-to-high-density neighborhoods. The vision for Corridors is mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit-oriented development. This development should occur at local centers and other appropriate nodes within one-quarter mile of major intersections or transit stops along the corridor. The proposed preliminary plan is consistent with recommendations of the General Plan.

The 1986 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity* recommends a retail-commercial use for the subject property. This proposal is in conformance with the recommendation of the master plan.

### **Planning Issues**

#### **General Plan**

The proposed development represents an unique opportunity to counter economic stagnation and decline, expand the tax base, increase employment opportunities for local residents, eliminate blight, improve community perceptions of the area, and encourage local shopping by providing desired amenities for county residents, such as quality retail stores and restaurants. However, it is important to realize that it is not enough to attract new development; a strategic component of this economic goal is the retention and maintenance of existing businesses. The following General Plan development pattern recommendations for economic development are significantly important:

“Retain and enhance the county’s existing businesses.

“Ensure that the land use, development review and other policy decisions support the retention and growth of exiting businesses, by discouraging extension of commercial and employment strips within the Developed Tier beyond the limits of existing and planned Centers.

“Attract quality retail development to the county.

“Attract a diversity of new jobs and businesses.”

Compatibility of higher intensity development with existing communities is essential, thus close attention should be paid to design and land use relationships within and surrounding each project. The 2002 General Plan goals for Corridors that are relevant to the review of this application are to:

“Promote compact, mixed-use development at moderate to high densities.

“Ensure transit-supportive and transit serviceable development.

“Require pedestrian-oriented and transit-oriented design.

“Ensure compatibility with surrounding neighborhoods.”

Visual attractiveness in designated Corridors should be increased through the provision of high quality design. The following urban design strategies are recommended by the 2002 General Plan to ensure that projects within Developed Tier Corridors have the highest quality of design:

“Ensure that design of infill development maintains or enhances the character of the existing community.

“Ensure that the design of new development is attractive and vital and that the design of contiguous development maintains or enhances the character of the existing communities.

“Emphasize and encourage design of pedestrian friendly environments.

“Ensure that ample amenities such as plazas, public open space, public art, and civic uses are provided.

“Require special signage, lighting, landscaping, street furniture, and architecture.

“Emphasize the need for the overall design and amenities to create a special sense of place.”

### **Master Plan**

According to pages 134-135 of the master plan, “Most existing commercial centers have a basically single purpose retail commercial nature. They generally do not provide the various public service facilities that are needed to render a full range of community, social and recreational facilities. The dispersion of public and semi-public facilities, professional offices, recreational uses and moderate density residential uses contribute to a lack of meaningful focal points for community activity in [the planning area]”. A master plan guidelines states, “As

commercial areas are renewed and/or expanded, the provisions of multi-use community and village activity centers, as identified in the Plan, shall be encouraged in lieu of development as single-function shopping areas.”

Page 146 of the master plan defines the ideal pattern of development for activity centers:

“The proposed pattern of activity centers stipulates that wherever possible social and community activities should be provided in and related to, the commercial activities.

“Professional services, such as medical, dental, legal, accounting, engineering, architectural and other professional and technical offices, should be included as an integral part of the activity center.

“Another major concept of the planned activity center is the provision that, as part of the approval of commercial development, space must be provided for appropriate public and quasi-public uses—including landscaping, open space (plazas), and indoor space (meeting rooms)—which will transform the commercial shopping center into a genuine center of commercial activity.”

Some of the worst excesses of commercial proliferation are present and provide a major challenge if any improvements are to occur in the planning area. According to page 132 of the master plan: “A number of the shopping centers along Marlboro Pike or in the Suitland and Capitol Heights areas are declining or suffering from obsolescence, mainly due to changes in their market area and competition from newer centers.” Consequently, page 151 of the master plan recommends: “...[N]ew retail and redeveloped retail should occur at a rate which parallels the needs created as the local population increases, thereby avoiding overbuilding and dilution of the market which would adversely effect both local residents and the local economy.”

According to page 135 of the master plan, “Much of the strip-commercial development evidences the lack of site plan review in conventional zoning, which has resulted in poor siting of structures, poor design of automobile access, lack of pedestrian walkways, inadequate landscaping and buffering, etc. Many of the sections of the commercial corridors are unsightly and relate poorly to adjoining living areas. The use of the Comprehensive Design Zones can avoid many of these problems in future activity center development. However, new construction will not eliminate the deficiencies already present in existing development; and in any case, much development which does not require site plan review will continue to take place under conventional zoning.” Master plan guidelines (pp. 168-171) that are relevant to eliminate the deficiencies already present in existing commercial developments include:

3. Renewed and expanded commercial areas should be subjected to high standards of site design and should be designed in relation to surrounding areas as to provide safe, visually pleasing pedestrian access.

4. The location and size of commercial areas should be related where possible to the character and needs of the specific residential development these commercial areas are intended to serve.
5. As commercial areas are renewed or expanded, they should be planned, designed and constructed as cohesive units.
6. The design of renewed and expanded commercial areas should be subject to aesthetic as well as functional design review criteria and, where possible, should include such open space as parks, malls, plazas and similar areas.
7. Where existing commercial areas are proposed for expansion or for development of a different type of commercial use, compliance with a development plan for the entire parcel shall be encouraged in order to prevent fragmented development.
8. All proposals for renewal or expansion of commercial uses should include analysis of the potential impacts on the local transportation system.
9. Commercial areas should be buffered from surrounding streets and uses, where appropriate, by means of curbs, islands, landscaping, fencing, back-up development, and the siting of structures.
10. Innovative site design and/or ample landscaping should be used within and around renewed and expanded commercial areas, to enhance the aesthetic qualities of the area and to break up the otherwise monotonous, barren look of parking areas.
13. Off-street parking facilities should be designed to allow on-site vehicular circulation, in order to eliminate the need to back onto highways and to prevent the blocking of public right-of-way. No departure from design standards should be granted which conflict with these guidelines.
14. Adequate off-street loading and unloading space should be provided and located where public ways will not be blocked.
15. A gas station or other freestanding structure, locating in a renewed or expanding commercial area, should be coordinated with an overall site plan and should be of similar architectural design to other buildings in the center.
16. Where an existing or future business extends between two streets, with the minor street providing only access to the parking lot in the rear of the business, and the property opposite the rear entrance is designated for residential use, the rear should be reserved for required parking.
18. Outdoor trash storage area should be screened.

19. Businessmen and property owners should be encouraged to make necessary improvements to their properties to maintain an aesthetically pleasing environment.

The applicant is encouraged to provide for an effective transition between nonresidential uses and adjoining residential uses through the imaginative use of urban design and the development of effective buffering techniques and standards. Concurrently, page 146 of the master plan states: "The present practice of approving isolated commercial development, unrelated to the living area it is designated to serve must be changed to provide for development of activity centers conditioned on the specific relationship of the activity center to the residential development." The Commercial Areas and Activity Center (p. 170) and Living Areas (pp. 105-107) sections of the master plan list the following guidelines to protect and improve the quality of living areas:

1. The location and size of commercial areas should be related where possible to the character and needs of the specific residential development these commercial areas are intended to serve.
18. Buffering in the form of landscaping open space, attractive fencing, and/or other creative site planning techniques should be utilized to protect residential areas from commercial, industrial, and other incompatible uses.
19. Where feasible, building setbacks and/or berms or acoustical fencing should be utilized to deflect noise and to screen visual impacts, especially at major road intersections, or where conflicts between land uses may develop.

Accordingly, page 155 of the master plan states, "...site plan approval and architectural review should be required for all new development, in order to ascertain that it will be architecturally, environmentally, and socially compatible with the adjoining residential community. Such factors as building size, siting, height, façade treatment, landscaping and screening, points of vehicle access, and proximity of residential development on abutting properties should be evaluated."

Since the site has been identified as a perceptually sensitive area, master plan recommendations for developing this area is particularly important. According to page 67 of the master plan, "The areas which have these liabilities will need positive site planning treatment and other compensatory treatment to improve them when developed." The following environmental envelope (pp. 72-73) guidelines are relevant to the review of this application:

1. An open space and conservation area network, based on existing soil conditions, slopes, watercourses, vegetation, related natural or ecological features, and estimated future population needs should be preserved in the Suitland-District Heights Planning Area.
2. Developers shall be encouraged to utilize the Comprehensive Design Ordinance, the cluster provisions, and site provisions of the subdivision regulations and other innovative

techniques that ensure responsible environmental action.

4. The responsibility for environmentally sound development practices should apply equally to private and public interest; decisions concerning the selection and use of public properties should be based on environmental considerations.
5. Private developers shall be encouraged to capitalize on natural assets by the retention and protection of trees, streams, and other ecological features in small as well as large developments.
9. In the perceptual liability areas, land uses such as schools, residences, nursing homes, and libraries that are sensitive to noise intrusion, air pollution, and other characteristics of excessive vehicular traffic should be protected by suitable construction techniques and enforcement of legally mandated standards.
10. Cooperation and coordination is necessary between the county and private developers in order to reduce environmental noise level in future development. Attenuation measures that reduce the exterior noise are preferred. If possible, over those measures that provides attenuation only for interior noise.

According to page 136 of the master plan: “[D]irect access from Pennsylvania Avenue is limited, the businesses are located on corners so that the points of entry are on one or more adjoining streets” and “parking availability and vehicular access is often poor, with little room to maneuver through the congested areas between stores and the street.” The Transportation and Circulation section (pp. 228-230) of the master plan list the following guidelines that are applicable to the proposed development:

4. Intersections should be located to facilitate safe vehicular and pedestrian access to employment sites, shopping facilities, multifamily developments, and other large traffic generators.
5. To facilitate transportation efficiency in the vicinity of high-intensity uses, provisions should be made for adequate access to collector and arterial highways, deceleration and acceleration lanes, signalization, and internal service roads as needed.
9. Occupants of new development adjoining local highways shall be secured from visual intrusion by the use of reverse frontage, minimum setbacks, and landscaping and fencing, as required by county ordinances, and should be protected from the potentially negative impacts of noise and air pollution to the degree that is legally possible.
10. Freestanding signs advertising commercial activities adjacent to major thoroughfares should be consolidated wherever possible.
11. Development adjacent to major thoroughfares should, where possible, preserve and provide landscaped open space between structures and the highway.



13. In commercial and employment areas, the loading, unloading and movement of goods to and from individual businesses should be designed to function efficiently and, where possible, be separated from auto and pedestrian traffic.

Due to the site's proximity to the Suitland-Iverson Metro Regional Center and the proposed Suitland Mixed-Use Town Center (MUTC), as well as the concerns outlined in the master plan and the General Plan, detailed site plan review is recommended for this site. Moreover, a master plan guideline states, "The design of renewed commercial areas should be subject to aesthetic as well as functional design review criteria and, where possible, should include such open space as parks, malls, plazas and similar areas."

6. **Parks and Recreation**—In accordance with Section 24-134(a) of the Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations, this subdivision is exempt from mandatory dedication of parkland requirements because it consists of nonresidential development.
7. **Trails**—There are no master plan trails issues in either the *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity* or the 1985 Equestrian Addendum to the adopted and approved Countywide Trails Plan. Due to the subject site's close proximity to the Suitland Metro, walking is a viable mode for some residents to get to Metro. Recent road improvements by the State Highway Administration along Silver Hill Road (MD 485) include standard sidewalks and wide outside curb lanes along both sides, including the frontage of the subject site. The sidewalks accommodate pedestrian movement along this heavily traveled corridor, while the side outside curb lanes serve to accommodate on-road bicycle movement. Depending on the nature of the redevelopment of the subject site, additional pedestrian improvements may be recommended at the time of detailed site plan. Pedestrians should be safely and conveniently accommodated within the subject site through appropriate sidewalks, paths and traffic calming. If road frontage improvements are required along MD 458, it may be appropriate to widen the sidewalk and separate it from the travel lanes with a planting or landscape strip.
8. **Transportation**—The applicant submitted a traffic study dated July 27, 2004. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.

#### **Growth Policy—Service Level Standards**

The subject property is located within the Developed Tier, as defined in the General Plan for Prince George's County. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

**Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, may be considered at

signalized intersections within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the guidelines.

**Unsignalized intersections:** The *Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

### Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study in support of the application using counts taken during June 2004. With the development of the subject property, the traffic consultant concluded that the proposed use would not adversely affect traffic conditions if improvements were made at the intersection of MD 4 and MD 458. The traffic consultant also concluded that a traffic signal may be required at the proposed site access point on MD 458 opposite West Avenue.

The traffic impact study that was prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections during weekday peak hours:

- MD 4/Brooks Drive (signalized)
- MD 4/MD 458 (signalized)
- MD 4/Parkland Drive (signalized)
- MD 458/West Avenue (unsignalized)
- MD 458/Suitland H.S. Entrance (signalized)
- MD 458/Brooks Drive (signalized)

The following conditions exist at the critical intersections:

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (AM & PM)	
MD 4/Brooks Drive	1,156	1,363	C	D

MD 4/MD 458	1,164	1,389	C	D
MD 4/Parkland Drive	1,263	1,206	C	C
MD 458/West Avenue	644	713	A	A
MD 458/Suitland H.S.Entrance	847	784	A	A
MD 458/Brooks Drive	877	1,023	A	B
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

Staff notes that the traffic study shows no AM or PM peak hour volumes leaving the site at this location, referred to as the North Access driveway in the traffic study, since this portion of the site is currently abandoned. This intersection should have been analyzed using the Highway Capacity Manual to measure delay, since it is currently unsignalized. However, since this portion of the site is currently abandoned further analysis was not necessary.

Background developments include 25 single-family units, 80 townhouse units, 149,200 square feet of retail space, and a gas station. Through or background traffic along MD 4 was increased to account for overall growth up to the design year 2007. This is the expected year of full build-out. There are no funded capital improvements in the area, so the resulting transportation network is the same as was assumed under existing traffic. Given these assumptions, background conditions are summarized below:

<b>BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (AM & PM)	
MD 4/Brooks Drive	1,185	1,402	C	D
MD 4/MD 458	1,204	1,444	C	D
MD 4/Parkland Drive	1,306	1,251	D	C
MD 458/West Avenue	657	735	A	A
MD 458/Suitland H.S.Entrance	858	806	A	A
MD 458/Brooks Drive	890	1,045	A	B
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

Based on background traffic conditions, all of the intersections will operate within the level of service standard for the developed tier.

The site is proposed for development as a commercial shopping center of 96,802 square feet, which includes a Giant Food grocery store consisting of 63,035 square feet. Existing uses on the site include two automobile sales and services buildings and a five-story office building.

With site traffic, the following operating conditions were determined:

<b>TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS</b>				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (AM & PM)	
MD 4/Brooks Drive	1,191	1,427	C	D
MD 4/MD 458	1,223	1,483	C	E
MD 4/Parkland Drive	1,319	1,284	D	C
MD 458/West Avenue	803	1,449	A	D
MD 458/Suitland H.S. Entrance	866	834	A	A
MD 458/Brooks Drive	898	1,074	A	B
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are outside of the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.				

Under total traffic conditions the intersection of MD 4/MD 458 operates at LOS E during the PM peak hour. The other intersections operate at LOS D or better during the AM and PM peak hours. The applicant proposed several improvements for safety and to provide additional capacity. The traffic consultant proposed to modify the existing eastbound MD 4 exclusive right turn lane to a through/right lane. This would require the widening of eastbound MD 4 to receive the additional through lane. In addition, the modification of the triangular islands along MD 4 and the modification of the existing traffic signal would be required to accommodate the additional eastbound MD 4 through lane.

The traffic consultant's analysis included the effect of pass-by trips and reduced impacts on off-site intersections. The assumption of pass-by trips is that these trips are already on the road, passing through critical intersections and are thereby already counted. These trips are counted at the site access point where a new traffic signal is recommended on MD 458 opposite West Avenue.

All of the intersections operate within the acceptable standard for intersections within the Developed Tier, operating at a CLV of 1,600 or better, i.e., LOS E.

The Department of Public Works and Transportation provided comments on the proposal. They agreed for the need of signalization at the site access point opposite West Avenue. They also recommended that the applicant construct a left turn bay along MD 458 of sufficient length to accommodate left turn volumes. The State Highway Administration reviewed and provided comments on the traffic study and concurred with the traffic consultant's findings. The comments from these two agencies are attached.

#### **Site Plan Comments**

Staff did not review a detailed site plan or receive enough information to comment on on-site circulation issues and parking lot layout. Staff will defer comment on these issues until a detailed site plan is submitted.

The applicant will be required to improve the intersection of MD 458 and West Avenue or the North Avenue site access point. This may include additional turn lanes and a new traffic signal. According to the traffic consultant's report, the State Highway Administration has agreed that there is a need for a traffic signal on MD 458 at West Avenue. This will improve traffic safety and is recommended by staff as well.

The applicant will be required to provide frontage improvements along MD 4 and MD 458 as determined by the State Highway Administration. The applicant will be required to provide any necessary acceleration and deceleration lanes at the site entrance and make any necessary safety improvements.

Additional signage and pavement markings will also be the responsibility of the applicant. The second entrance/exit on MD 458 will be restricted to right in/right out. This site access point will have to be improved. It is not clear how trucks will be able to return to MD 4 upon entering the second access point shown on the plan.

### **Master Plan Comments**

MD 458 (Silver Hill Road) is listed in the Suitland-District Heights Master Plan (1985) as A-40, an arterial roadway. It is recommended as a four- to six-lane roadway with 120 feet of right-of-way. Dedication of 60 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of MD 458 will be required. MD 4 (Pennsylvania Avenue Extended) is listed as an expressway with 200 feet of right-of-way, therefore, no further dedication along MD 4 will be required.

### **Conclusions and Recommendations**

Based on the preceding findings, adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with conditions limiting the number of peak hour trips to the site and requiring improvements to the surrounding transportation network.

9. **Schools**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and CB-30-2003 and CR-23-2003 and concluded that the subdivision is exempt from the APF test for schools because it is a commercial use.
10. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this subdivision plan for adequacy of public facilities and concluded the following:

- a. The existing fire engine service at District Heights Fire Station, Company 26, located at 6208 Marlboro Pike has a service travel time of 1.52 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute travel time guideline.
- b. The existing ambulance service at District Heights Fire Station, Company 26, located at 6208 Marlboro Pike has a service travel time of 1.52 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.
- c. The existing paramedic service at Silver Hill Fire Station, Company 3900, located at Silver Hill Road has a service travel time of 3.08 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.
- d. The existing ladder truck service Boulevard Heights Fire Station, Company 17, located at 4101 Alton Street has a service travel time of 2.98 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.

The proposed subdivision will be within the adequate coverage area of the nearest existing fire/rescue facilities for fire engine, ambulance, paramedic and ladder truck services.

The above findings are in conformance with the standards and guidelines contained in the *Approved Public Safety Master Plan* (1990) and the “Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.”

11. **Police Facilities**—The proposed development is within the service area for Police District III-Landover. The Planning Board’s current test for police adequacy is based on a standard for square footage in police stations relative to the number of sworn duty staff assigned. The standard is 115 square feet per officer. As of January 2, 2004, the county had 823 sworn staff and a total of 101,303 square feet of station space. Based on available space, there is capacity for additional 57 sworn personnel. This police facility will adequately serve the population generated by the proposed subdivision.
12. **Health Department**—The Health Department indicates that a raze permit will be required by the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) for the removal of the existing structures. Numerous tires and one abandoned car were found within the confines of the property and should be removed and properly discarded.
13. **Stormwater Management**—The Department of Environmental Resources (DER), Development Services Division, has determined that on-site stormwater management is required. A Stormwater Management Concept Plan, # 22962-2004-00, has been approved with conditions to ensure that development of this site does not result in on-site or downstream flooding. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan.
14. **Existing Covenant:** As previously noted, the adjoining church uses spaces on Parcel A for overflow parking pursuant to a recorded covenant. The church and the applicant are currently working toward a solution that would result in additional parking being created on the church site

in return for their abandonment of the covenant.

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

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Harley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Harley, Vaughns, Squire, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, November 18, 2004, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 13th day of January 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:TL:rmk