

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, Ritchie Hill, LLC is the owner of a 101.83-acre parcel of land known as Parcels 115-120, 172, 177, 228 and 229, Tax Map 74C-4, said property being in the 15th Election District of Prince George's County, Maryland, and being zoned I-3; and

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2004, Ritchie Hill, LLC filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Subdivision Plan (Staff Exhibit #1) for 6 parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Subdivision Plan, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-04184 for Ritchie Hill Center was presented to the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission by the staff of the Commission on May 12, 2005, 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 May 12, 2005, 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 the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04), and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-04184, Parcels A-F for Ritchie Hill Center with the following conditions:

1. Ritchie Marlboro Road at Ritchie Station Court: Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property other than for an information/leasing center, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T/SHA, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:
 - a. Along the westbound approach of Ritchie Marlboro Road, modify the median to provide two (2) exclusive left-turn lanes into the subject site.
 - b. Along the northbound approach of Ritchie Station Court exiting the subject site, provide an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared through/left-turn lane, and two (2) exclusive channelized right-turn lanes under signalized stop-control.
 - c. Along the eastbound approach of Ritchie Marlboro Road, provide an exclusive channelized right-turn lane entering the subject site.
 - d. Prior to approval of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site, the

applicant shall complete a traffic signal warrant analysis, considering existing and future traffic conditions. If a signal is determined to be warranted by the responsible transportation agency, the applicant shall fund said traffic signal at the time of building permit with installation prior to issuance of the initial use and occupancy permit. This signalization shall include loop detectors and queue detectors as determined to be necessary by DPW&T and/or SHA.

- e. Items (a) through (d) above shall include all signage and pavement markings as determined to be necessary by DPW&T and/or SHA.
 - f. The scope of improvements required by this condition may be modified if needed to achieve all State and Federal approvals, as indicated in Condition 3.
2. I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road Interchange (Roundabouts): Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property other than for an information/leasing center, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction with DPW&T/SHA, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with DPW&T/SHA:
- a. *Western Roundabout (at the ramps to/from the inner loop of the Capital Beltway)*: Modify the westbound roadway between the bridge overpass and the roundabout to provide for transition into three (3) lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements. This improvement would provide for one (1) additional approach lane and one (1) additional circulating lane over the existing situation. Also, modify the eastbound approach between the site entrance and the roundabout to provide three (3) through lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, and transitioning into two (2) eastbound lanes prior to the bridge overpass, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements.
 - b. *Eastern Roundabout (at the ramps to/from the outer loop of the Capital Beltway)*: Modify the eastbound approach between the bridge overpass and the roundabout to provide for transition into three (3) lanes and continuing as three (3) lanes within the affected portion of the circulating roadway of the roundabout, with appropriate overhead signage and pavement markings to delineate the required movements. This would provide for one (1) additional approach lane and one (1) additional circulating lane over the existing situation.
 - c. The scope of improvements required by this condition may be modified if needed to achieve all State and Federal approvals, as indicated in Condition 3.
3. The scope of improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road Interchange and the Ritchie Marlboro Road/Ritchie Station Court intersection may be modified by SHA through discussions

with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) as a part of the Interstate Access Point Approval (IAPA) process. Therefore, prior to approval of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site, the transportation staff shall confirm the final scope of improvements in consultation with the applicant, DPW&T, and SHA. All improvements shall have approval of the operating agencies, and improvements to the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange shall have IAPA approval by FHWA. A timetable for completion of these improvements shall be provided at the same time.

4. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate the right-of-way for Ritchie Station Court as shown on the submitted subdivision plan. Improvements within the dedicated right-of-way, including the roadway lane configuration, markings, signage, pedestrian/transit amenities, and traffic control shall be determined by DPW&T in consultation with Transportation Planning Section staff as part of the review of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site.
5. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the plan shall be revised to show a parcel extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the subject property. This parcel shall be a minimum 70 feet in width to allow the future construction of the master plan road to DPW&T standards, and shall be publicly dedicated upon request by DPW&T. This easement may be used for parking and circulation associated with the parking compound as long as it does not impede the future use of the master plan road. The applicant shall also dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site upon request of DPW&T, provided a construction schedule is established to ensure the completion of the master plan road south to D'Arcy Road. This easement shall be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a subsequent master plan document.
6. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,000,000 square feet of retail space, or equivalent development which generates no more than 554 AM and 1,802 PM new peak hour vehicle trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.
7. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:
 - a. A standard sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Ritchie Road Spur, unless modified by DPW&T.
 - b. A standard sidewalk along both sides of Ritchie Station Court within the subject site, unless modified by DPW&T.
8. Prior to the issuance of permits, a Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be approved.
9. An automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

10. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with the approved stormwater management concept plan (#6076-2001-01) or any approved revision thereto.
11. Prior to signature approval of the Preliminary Plan, the Forest Stand Delineation Plan and text shall be revised to reflect accurately the amount of woodland that remains that is eligible for credit as woodland preservation, show its location on-site and have the revised plans signed and dated by the licensed Landscape Architect, Licensed Forester, or MD-DNR Qualified Professional who prepared the plan.
12. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, a copy of the new wetland study shall be submitted for review. The PMA limits on the preliminary plan and the TCPI shall be adjusted accordingly to reflect this new information prior to signature approval.
13. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated Patuxent River Primary Management Area, except for areas of approved impacts, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

"Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed."
14. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans shall be submitted to the M-NCPPC, Planning Department.
15. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan revise the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04) as follows:
 - a. Resolve all calculation discrepancies on the plan and the worksheet including acres not harvested that remain viable for woodland conservation (5.74 acres or 13.06 acres) and show on the plan where this acreage exists.
 - b. Use a phased worksheet if the project is to be phased.
 - c. Clarify what area is subject to a plan to be reviewed and approved by DNR.
 - d. Revise the plan to provide reforestation in the areas of cleared areas #5, #6 and #7.
 - e. Revise the "existing treeline after timber harvest" to accurately reflect what occurred around the parcel to remain.

- f. Show any proposed stormwater management pond outfalls that will result in impacts to the PMA.
 - g. Revise the plan for replanting of areas of timber harvest that are proposed for reforestation - use of natural regeneration can only be used in areas that were not clear-cut.
 - h. When all the revisions have been completed, have the plan reviewed, signed, and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.
16. Prior to issuance of any permits related to the subject development, a copy of the approved DNR Forest Conservation Plan shall be submitted to M-NCPPC for the official file.
17. Prior to issuance of any permits, the applicant shall provide evidence in the form of photos and other documentation that the stabilization methods required on the timber harvest plan (TCPII/203/91-01) have been completed for areas that will not be developed.
18. Development of this subdivision shall be in compliance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04). The following notes shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:
- “This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation/Tree Preservation Policy.”
19. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan the TCPI shall be revised to show conceptual locations of all outfalls and the associated limits of disturbance.
20. Pursuant to the transportation conditions herein, prior to the final plat the applicant shall confer with the local community representatives of record, State of Maryland officials, Prince George’s County officials and all relevant transportation agencies to determine specific timing of the construction of the required road improvements.

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 subject property is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Ritchie-Marlboro Road and the Capital Beltway.

3. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	I-3, R-R	I-3, R-R
Uses	Abandoned Residences	Commercial Retail
Acreage	94.33 (I-3)	94.33 (I-3)
	7.5 (R-R)	7.5 (R-R)
	101.83 (total)	101.83 (total)
Lots	0	0
Parcels	10	6
Square Footage/GFA	0	1,000,000

4. **Environmental**—The site is characterized by terrain sloping toward the west and south of the subject property and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Southwest Branch watershed in the Patuxent River basin. The predominant soil types on the site are Adelphia, Beltsville, Bibb, Collington, Chillum, Galestown, Sassafras, Shrewsbury and Westphalia. These soil series generally exhibit moderate to severe limitations to development due to steep slopes, high water table, poor and impeded drainage, seasonally high water table, and flood hazard. The site is largely undeveloped and partially wooded. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled, “Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George’s Counties,” December 1997, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this site. There are streams, floodplain and wetlands associated with the site. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. The subject property is located adjacent to I-95, a freeway and major noise generator. Because the site is zoned I-1 and the uses proposed are not residential in nature, it is not likely that the noise levels generated will be above the state noise standards for these uses. This property is located in the Developed Tier as delineated on the adopted General Plan.

Woodland Conservation

The subject property was harvested using a clear-cut method within the last year. The forest stand delineation (FSD) submitted covers 120.55 acres. The current application covers only 101.83 acres as stated on the preliminary plan application. In a letter dated February 1, 2005, the applicant’s engineer states that as a result of new computations, the amount of woodland that existed prior to the timber harvest is 93.11 acres and not 85.65 acres as stated on the previously approved TCPII. The letter goes on to state that the FSD plan has been revised. A copy of the revised FSD plan was not submitted with the revised package. If the revised FSD contains the same table that was added to the TCP, the table needs extensive revisions to reflect the conditions on-site. The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has a previously approved TCP. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/100/04)

was submitted and was found to require revisions. The TCPI currently under review has a revision date of February 10, 2005, in the revision box. Revised plans were previously requested

and were not received.

The most recent revision contains new information in the form of a table that provides figures for the woodland acreages, pre- and post-harvesting. The figures and the plan, however, are not complementary. Under “entire site” existing woodlands prior to timber harvest, the figure 93.11 acres is provided. The TCPII for the timber harvest, which included the entire site, states that the existing woodland was 85.65 acres. Both figures are based on the “entire site” (FSD and TCPII say it is 120.57 acres and the TCPI says it is 120.55 acres). In a recent letter from the applicant’s engineer, the figure 93.11 acres is stated to be the accurate figure for the amount of woodland that existed. Staff will accept this figure as a revision to the figure provided on the approved TCPII.

The table also states that there are 13.06 acres of woodland outside of the floodplain that were not harvested that would be eligible for woodland conservation credit. The plan shows 5.74 acres of woodland within the PMA that were not harvested and that are outside the floodplain and thus eligible for woodland conservation. The location of the remaining 7.32 acres is not clear. Furthermore, in a letter from the applicant dated February 1, 2005, the amount of Woodland eligible for preservation is 9.13 acres. These discrepancies need to be resolved. There appears to be an area of woodland that remained after the timber harvest around the parcel that is not part of the application; however, the area is at best less than 2 acres (clearly not 7.32 acres) and much of it was harvested during the timber operation. There are no other areas of woodland that remain that are eligible to meet the woodland conservation requirements.

The other new information provided is that the project is planned to be phased. If this is the case, a phased worksheet is required and must replace the present worksheet.

There are several revisions that are needed to the plan. There is a note that states that there is one acre of off-site clearing proposed, but the off-site clearing is not identified. It could either be in the area along the western property line that appears to be needed for a utility connection or it could be in the area of the stormwater management pond to the east of the site, but this area is not identified. Also, there is a note near the stormwater pond that says: “Clearing Subject to State Highway and Maryland Department of Natural Resources Reforestation Requirement.” Clarity is needed to determine what is off-site clearing and what will be covered under a DNR Forest Conservation Plan. A copy of the approved FCP will be required prior to issuance of any permits.

Other revisions required include revise the plan to provide for replanting of areas of timber harvest that are proposed for reforestation—use of natural regeneration can only be used in areas that were not clear cut; revise the plan to provide reforestation in the areas of cleared areas #5, #6 and #7; revise the “existing treeline after timber harvest” to accurately reflect what occurred around the parcel to remain; and show any and all proposed stormwater management pond outfalls that will result in impacts to the PMA.

Streams, Wetlands and Floodplains

The Subdivision Ordinance requires the protection of streams, 50-foot stream buffers, wetlands, 25-foot wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, adjacent areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent, and

adjacent areas of slopes between 15 and 25 percent with highly erodible soils. When a property is located within the Patuxent River watershed these features compose the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA), which is to be protected to the fullest extent possible.

The revised TCPII, stamped as received on March 17, 2005, contains the following note: "An updated wetland delineation was prepared by McCarthy & Associates, Inc., in February 2005. The limits of this jurisdictional determination, including waters of the U.S. and wetlands, were GPS located and are depicted on this plan. The associated PMA has also been slightly adjusted." The PMA delineation on the TCPII is different from the delineation on the TCPI, and areas that are depicted on the TCPI as being harvested are now not shown as harvested on the TCPII. This affects the overall calculations on the plans. The changes to the PMA do not appear to affect the proposed impacts to the PMA.

The TCPI shows a proposed outfall, but the limit of disturbance does not reflect the area of impact to the PMA. An amended PMA impact request, dated February 8, 2005, only requests an impact for the construction of a water line. The two impacts noted, one for a stormwater management outfall and one for the water line crossing, are appropriate because they directly relate to other requirements for infrastructure. As such, staff recommends that the Planning Board find that the PMA is being preserved to the fullest extent possible.

There are still outstanding questions at the time of writing of this referral regarding the construction of Hampton Park Boulevard. If the preliminary plan changes with respect to this master-planned roadway, the impacts to the PMA will need to be reevaluated.

A stormwater management concept approval letter dated July 22, 2004, was submitted with the application. A copy of the signed plan associated with that letter has not been submitted. The plan submitted is not signed and shows two ponds, one with an outfall into the PMA. A plan stamped as received February 3, 2005, shows only one pond, off-site to the east, and no ponds on-site. This plan is also not an approved plan and shows one outfall into the PMA behind the conceptual footprint of the Kohl's building.

A copy of the plan that was approved with the July 22, 2004, letter is required for the file. As the concept evolves, it is likely that there will be at least one outfall into the PMA on the western side of the property. The TCPI must show conceptual limits of disturbance that account for all future outfalls so that the Planning Board can approve proposed impacts, even if it is determined later that the outfall is not needed.

Noise

Noise is a consideration in the review of this proposal due to proximity of the subject property to I-95. Because the site is zoned I-1 and the uses proposed are not residential in nature, it is not likely that the noise levels generated will be above the state noise standards for these uses. Based

on projected traffic (average daily traffic, or ADT, projected 10 years) data supplied by the State of Maryland, the Environmental Planning Section Noise Model has projected that the 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour is located 1,199 feet from the centerline of the roadway.

The plans as submitted shows the 65 dBA (Ldn) noise contour as required. No further action is required at this time with regard to noise contour delineation.

Water and Sewer Categories

The property is in water category W-3 and sewer category S-3 according to water and sewer maps dated June 2003 obtained from the Department of Environmental Resources. This development will utilize these public facilities.

5. **Community Planning**—The property is in Planning Area 75A/Beltway Employment Area. The 2002 General Plan places the property 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. This application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier. The 1986 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 75A and 75B* recommends an employment use for the site. As stated earlier in this report, the District Council, through CB-65-2003, allows for commercial-retail uses on split-zoned properties such as this site. This application does not impair the master plan recommendation.

Planning Issues

Due to the site's regionally accessible location on the Capital Beltway and Walker Mill Road extended (Ritchie-Marlboro Road) and the proximity of the ramps to the proposed north-south Industrial Road, proposed development should receive careful attention during the design stage.

Given the site's proposed use as a commercial shopping center within the Hampton Business Park and in accordance with the requirements promulgated by CB-65-2003, site plan review is encouraged to create consistency in this area and to eliminate the deficiencies already present in existing commercial development. Specifically, "the design of renewed commercial areas should be subject to aesthetic as well as functional design criteria and, where possible should include such open space as parks, malls, plazas and similar areas." Moreover, "... 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."

According to page 155 of the master plan, "...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 proximately of residential development on abutting properties should be evaluated."

6. **Parks and Recreation**—The proposed subdivision is exempt from the mandatory park dedication requirements of Section 24-134 of the Subdivision Regulations because no dwelling units are proposed.
7. **Trails**—Ritchie-Marlboro Road is designated as a master plan trail corridor in the 1985 Equestrian Addendum to the Adopted and Approved Countywide Trails Plan. More specifically, a Class II Trail is recommended along this section of Ritchie-Marlboro Road. As seen on the Equestrian Addendum, this planned trail will connect to the Chesapeake Beach Rail-Trail outside the Beltway and provide a trail connection to nearby Walker Mill Regional Park. Portions of the Chesapeake Beach Rail-Trail have been constructed in the Upper Marlboro area, and another segment is under construction in Seat Pleasant. A trail along Ritchie-Marlboro Road will provide safe pedestrian and bicycle access under the Capital Beltway, which would otherwise be a barrier to bicycle and pedestrian travel. The portion of the Ritchie-Marlboro Road constructed as part of the new interchange includes an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the south side. The subject site's entire road frontage of Ritchie-Marlboro Road has been improved and includes this eight-foot-wide sidewalk. No additional improvements are recommended along this roadway.

Sidewalk Connectivity

The adjacent townhouse development includes sidewalks along both sides of most internal roads. As noted above, Ritchie-Marlboro Road includes an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the frontage of the subject site. Ritchie Road Spur is open section with no sidewalk along the frontage of the subject site. Staff recommends the provision of a standard sidewalk along the subject site's frontage, if improvements are required by DPW&T. This is in keeping with improvements made to the north side of Ritchie Road Spur. Similarly, staff recommends the provision of a standard sidewalk along both sides of Hampton Park Boulevard, unless modified by DPW&T.

8. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the subdivision application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 101.83 acres of land in the I-3 and R-R zones. The property is located in the southwest quadrant of I-95/I-495 (the Capital Beltway) and Ritchie Marlboro Road. The applicant proposes a commercial subdivision with 1,000,000 square feet of retail space.

The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated December 2004, and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. Subsequently an addendum addressing specific State Highway Administration (SHA) concerns dated February 10, 2005 was provided to staff in mid-February. Both studies have been referred to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and SHA.

Growth Policy - Service Level Standards

The subject property is in 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 is required in the developing tier.

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.

Analysis of Traffic Impacts

The traffic study for this site examined the site impact at four intersections:

Ritchie Road/Walker Mill Road (signalized)
Ritchie Marlboro Road/site entrance (future/signalized)
I-95/I-495 Southbound Ramps/Ritchie Marlboro Road (roundabout)
I-95/I-495 Northbound Ramps/Ritchie Marlboro Road (roundabout)

The existing conditions at the study intersections are summarized below:

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS			
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)
Ritchie Road and Walker Mill Road	806	1,205	A C
Ritchie Marlboro Road and site entrance	future		
I-95/I-495 Southbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	15.2*	13.2*	-- --
I-95/I-495 Northbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	12.6*	15.8*	-- --
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections and roundabouts, 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 <i>Guidelines</i> , 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. This criterion is applicable to roundabouts as well as standard four-way or three-way intersections.			

The area of background development includes several large developments in the vicinity of the subject property. Through traffic growth of 3.0 percent per year was assumed along Ritchie Marlboro Road as well as along the Interstate ramps. The traffic study attempted to separate the analysis into two stages; as most of the discussion leading into the findings has been based upon

the ultimate development of the site, full background and full development of the site are presented. Background conditions are summarized below:

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS			
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)
Ritchie Road and Walker Mill Road	993	1,424	A D
Ritchie Marlboro Road and site entrance	1,003	1,041	B B
I-95/I-495 Southbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	19.7*	15.3*	-- --
I-95/I-495 Northbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	15.8*	20.7*	-- --
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections and roundabouts, 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 <i>Guidelines</i> , 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. This criterion is applicable to roundabouts as well as standard four-way or three-way intersections.			

The site is proposed for development as a commercial subdivision. The site is proposed to be developed with 1,000,000 square feet of retail space. The Guidelines allow a retail development of this size to assume that 40 percent of site traffic is already on the adjacent roadway; this is termed pass-by traffic. The subject development, in consideration of the pass-by factor, would generate 554 (337 in, 217 out) AM peak hour vehicle trips and 1,802 (901 in, 901 out) PM peak hour vehicle trips. With the trip distribution and assignment as assumed, the following results are obtained under total traffic:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS			
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)
Ritchie Road and Walker Mill Road	1,024	1,486	B E
Ritchie Marlboro Road and site entrance	968	1,503	A E
I-95/I-495 Southbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	22.1*	19.7*	-- --
I-95/I-495 Northbound Ramps and Ritchie Marlboro Rd.	29.4*	132.0*	-- --
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections and roundabouts, 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. This criterion is applicable to roundabouts as well as standard four-way or three-way intersections.

The traffic study identifies inadequacies at the eastern roundabout of the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. As a result of extensive discussions with SHA and DPW&T, a number of improvements were identified to improve traffic operations within the interchange and at the site access to acceptable levels. These improvements are fully reflected in the associated conditions. With the improvements in place, it is determined, with confirmation from DPW&T and SHA, that the ramp junctions and the site access with Ritchie Marlboro Road will operate acceptably with the development of the subject property as proposed.

SHA and DPW&T comments are attached.

It is noted that the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) has the ultimate jurisdiction and approval authority for improvements to and operations along the Interstate Highway system, and this includes ramps and ramp junctions along any interstate highway. SHA has provided a degree of assurance that the subject development proposal, with proffered transportation improvements, would result in adequate transportation facilities and adequate traffic operations at nearby critical intersections. Nonetheless, FHWA has not formally reviewed the scope of the proffered improvements, and there remains a possibility that the scope of improvements could change. For that reason, it is essential that the scope and status of the improvements be reviewed at the time of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development on the site.

Plan Comments

The site is adjacent to Ritchie Marlboro Road, which is a master plan arterial facility within a variable right-of-way. Adequate right-of-way dedication is reflected on the submitted plan.

A planned industrial facility, which is proposed on the plan as Ritchie Station Court and is shown on the master plan as an extension of Hampton Park Boulevard, crosses the subject property north to south. While it is acceptable to construct Ritchie Station Court as shown on the plan at this time, it is essential to protect an alignment to extend this facility to the southern property line in the future for several reasons:

1. Past traffic projections for buildout of the area have suggested that this roadway extension could serve up to 16,300 vehicles per day. Without the extension, the parallel Ritchie-Forestville Road facility would operate poorly as a collector roadway, potentially necessitating the upgrading of Ritchie-Forestville Road to an arterial. These projections were supplied by transportation planning staff to DPW&T in support of the Ritchie Road/Forestville Road CIP project. A table displaying these traffic projections is attached.

2. The roadway extension is potentially a key route for future residents within the Westphalia Planning Area to reach the subject property.
3. The roadway extension has a function to help route truck traffic away from existing neighborhoods along Sansbury Road, Westphalia Road, and Ritchie-Forestville Road.
4. A justification statement provided by the applicant suggested that several rezonings in the area of the subject property had rendered this industrial roadway extension unnecessary. However, transportation staff determined that when the rezonings were considered in combination with the change in use proposed for the subject property by the current application that average daily traffic generated by the affected properties would increase from approximately 13,000 trips to nearly 41,000 trips under a buildout scenario. A table displaying this information is attached.
5. The same justification statement only considered the environmental impacts of the precise alignment shown on the master plan. Given the size of the subject property, it was determined that avoidance and minimization strategies should have been studied more carefully.

As a result of consideration of all information presented, it was determined that the plan would be revised to show a parcel extending from the end of Ritchie Station Court to the southern end of the subject property. The parcel will be a minimum 70 feet in width to allow the future construction of the master plan road to DPW&T standards, and will be dedicated upon request by DPW&T. The easement may be used for parking and circulation within the site as long as these functions would not impede the future use of the master plan road. It is also determined that the applicant shall dedicate all needed slope and drainage easements associated with the master plan road extension on the site, provided that a construction schedule is established to ensure its extension to D'Arcy Road. This easement shall be extinguished if the master plan road is removed by a future master plan document.

The portion of Ritchie Station Court that is proposed to be constructed will likely require special treatment due to its function in serving the proposed development. Therefore, any improvements within the right-of-way of Ritchie Station Court, including lane configurations, markings, signage, traffic control, and other amenities should be reviewed by DPW&T in consultation with transportation staff. This review should occur as a part of the review of the initial Detailed Site Plan proposing development within this site.

Transportation Staff Conclusions

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 the conditions contained at the end of this report.

9. **Schools**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this

subdivision plan for review of school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and CB-30-2003 and CR-23-2003. The proposed subdivision is exempt from the review test for schools because it is a commercial use.

10. **Fire and Rescue**—The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed this commercial subdivision (thus not subject to CB-89-2004) for adequacy of fire and rescue facilities.

The existing fire engine service at Ritchie Fire Station, Company 37, located at 1415 Ritchie-Marlboro Road, has a service travel time of 2.19 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Forestville Fire Station, Company 23, located at 8321 Old Marlboro Pike, has a service travel time of 4.25 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute travel time guideline for Parcels 1 and 6. All other parcels are beyond.

The existing paramedic service at Kentland Fire Station, Company 46, located at 10400 Campus Way South, has a service travel time of 6.76 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute travel time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at District Heights Fire Station, Company 26, located at 6208 Marlboro Pike, has a service travel time of 7.94 minutes, which is beyond the 4.25-minute travel time guideline.

In order to alleviate the negative impact on fire and rescue services due to the inadequate service discussed, an automatic fire suppression system shall be provided in all new buildings proposed in this subdivision, unless the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department determines that an alternative method of fire suppression is appropriate.

The existing ambulance service located at Forestville Station, Company 23, is beyond the recommended travel time guideline for Parcels 2, 3, 4 and 5. The nearest fire station, Ritchie Company 37, is located at 1415 Ritchie-Marlboro Road, which is 2.19 minutes from the development. This facility would be within the recommended travel time for ambulance service for Parcels 2, 3, 4 and 5 if an operational decision to locate this service at that facility is made by the county.

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 applicable to the subject application 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 an additional 57 sworn personnel. Therefore, in accordance with Section 24-122.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations, existing county police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed development.

12. **Health Department**—The Health Department reviewed the application and has no comment.
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, 6076-2001-00, has been approved. Development must be in accordance with this approved plan or any revisions thereto.
14. **Historic/Cemeteries**—There are no known cemeteries on the subject property. However, this land was once part of a larger plantation landholding. The applicant submitted a Phase IA Assessment on March 17, 2005, which recommends further archeological investigation be undertaken. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (M-NCPPC) agrees with that recommendation.
15. **Public Utility Easement**—The preliminary plan shows a ten-foot-wide public utility easement adjacent to all public rights-of-way. It is accurately reflected on the proposed preliminary plan and will be included on the final plat.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Harley, with Commissioners Squire, Harley, Vaughns, Eley and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 12, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 14th day of July 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:TL:rmk