

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, State of Maryland/University of Maryland is the owner of a 34.07-acre parcel of land known as Lots 10, 12–14, and 18, Block C, of the Riverside Subdivision, said property being in the 19th and 21st Election Districts of Prince George’s County, Maryland, and being zoned Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) and Transit District Overlay (T-D-O); and

WHEREAS, on March 16, 2017, State of Maryland/University of Maryland filed an application for approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for five parcels; and

WHEREAS, the application for approval of the aforesaid Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, also known as Preliminary Plan 4-16022 for Riverside (M Square–University of Maryland) 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 June 29, 2017, for its review and action in accordance with the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland and the Regulations for the Subdivision of Land, Subtitle 24, Prince George’s County Code; and

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

WHEREAS, on June 29, 2017, the Prince George’s County Planning Board heard testimony and received evidence submitted for the record on the aforesaid application.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to the provisions of Subtitle 24, Prince George’s County Code, the Prince George’s County Planning Board APPROVED Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-009-90-01, and further APPROVED Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16022 for five parcels, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following technical correction shall be made:
 - a. Show the location for the existing bike-share station within Lot 10 (which may be relocated at the time of detailed site plan).
2. Development of this site shall be in conformance with an approved stormwater management (SWM) concept plan and any subsequent revisions. The final plat shall note the SWM concept plan number and approval date.
3. At the time of final plat, the applicant and the applicant’s heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall grant a ten-foot-wide public utility easement along the public rights-of-way as delineated on the approved preliminary plan of subdivision.

4. Total development shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 914 AM peak hour trips, and 928 PM peak hour trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein shall require a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities and a new preliminary plan of subdivision.
5. Prior to issuance of building permits for gross floor area in excess of 604,559 square feet, the following road improvement shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been designed per the appropriate operating agencies and (c) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process: At River Road and Rivertech Court, restripe the northbound Rivertech Court approach to provide an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane. This improvement shall not be required prior to the time that the Van Buren Street overpass over the CSX tracks is complete and open to traffic.
6. Any residential development or a substantial revision to the uses on the subject site that affect Subtitle 24 adequacy findings shall require approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to approval of any building permits.
7. Approval of this preliminary plan of subdivision shall supersede Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89228 (PGCPB Resolution No. 90-42(C)(A)) for Lots 10, 12-14, and 18 (proposed Parcels 1-5) for the development of this property.
8. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the Type 1 tree conservation plan shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Revise the note on the woodland conservation worksheet to read "The fee-in-lieu requirement was paid with Permits 4334-2006 and 28102-2013."
 - b. Revise the approval block to add in the "00" line "Jim Stasz, 2/15/1990, 4-89229."
 - c. Revise the approval block to add in the "01" line under DRD # to read 4-16022.
 - d. Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it.
9. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-009-90-01). The following note shall be placed on the final plat of subdivision:

"This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP1-009-90-01), or as modified by the Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005. Copies of all approved Tree Conservation Plans for the subject property are

available in the offices of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission, Prince George's County Planning Department."

10. In accordance with Section 24-124.01(f) "Guidelines, Part 2" of the Subdivision Regulations, at the time of the detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant shall provide an exhibit that illustrates the location and limits of all off-site bicycle and pedestrian impact statement (BPIS) improvements recommended by staff for the review of the operating agencies. This exhibit shall show the location of the bus shelter installations, provide any necessary details and specification, and include appropriate Americans with Disabilities (ADA) ramp or sidewalk improvements needed for the bus stops. If it is determined at the time of DSP, after consultation with the Town of Riverdale Park, the City of College Park, and the appropriate operating agencies, that alternative off-site improvements are appropriate, the applicant shall demonstrate that the substitute improvements shall comply with the facility types contained in Section 24-124.01(d), be within one-half mile walking or bike distance of the subject site, within the public right-of-way, and within the limits of the cost cap contained in Section 24-124.01(c). The Planning Board shall find that the substitute off-site improvements are consistent with the BPIS adequacy finding made at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision.
11. Prior to approval of any building permit for the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall demonstrate that the following required adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities as designated below or as modified by DPW&T/DPIE/DPR, in accordance with Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations, have (a) full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the applicable operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction and completion with the appropriate operating agency:
 - a. Installation of two bus shelters at existing stops along Campus Drive at locations agreed to by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, Office of Transit, or alternative improvements approved in accordance with Condition 10 of this approval.
12. In conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* and the 2015 *Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide the following:
 - a. Shared-lane markings along the entire length of University Research Court north of River Road, unless modified by the Town of Riverdale Park.
 - b. At the time of detailed site plan for Lot 10 (proposed Parcel 1), provide the following:
 - (1) Details for a relocated bike-share station near the intersection of River Road and University Research Court, subject to modification by the operating agencies.

13. The following note shall be placed on the final plat:

“This property is located within APA-6 and is subject to the regulations of the Zoning Ordinance, Subtitle 27.”

14. Prior to release of any bonds securing road improvements required pursuant to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89228, provide an exhibit that shows shared-lane markings (sharrows) painted along the entire length of River Road between Campus Drive and Kenilworth Avenue, unless modified or denied by the appropriate operating agency, and complete installation of shared-lane markings (sharrows) in accordance with the exhibit. In the event, however, that the appropriate operating agency will not permit the shared-lane markings to be painted on the existing pavement of River Road, the shared-lane markings shall not be required along River Road, and release of the existing bonds shall not be affected or delayed.

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

1. The subdivision, as modified with conditions, meets the legal requirements of Subtitles 24 and 27 of the Prince George's County Code and the Land Use Article of the Annotated Code of Maryland.
2. **Background**—The subject site is located on Tax Map 42 in Grids E-1, E-2, F-1 and F-2 and is known as Lots 10, 12–14 and 18, Block C, of the Riverside subdivision. Lot 10 was recorded in Plat Book VJ 183-60 on June 24, 1998 and Lots 12–14 and 18 were recorded in Plat Book REP 213-69 on July 6, 2006. All the subject lots were platted pursuant to Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-89228 for Riverside, which was approved by the Planning Board on January 9, 1992 (PGCPB Resolution No. 90-42(C)(A)). The site is 34.07 acres and is zoned Mixed Use–Infill (M-U-I) within a Transit-District-Overlay (T-D-O) Zone, subject to the 2015 *Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan (TDDP)*.

Lot 12 (proposed Parcel 3) is currently improved with a 120,000-square-foot building and parking lot, which will remain. Lot 13 (proposed Parcel 4) is currently improved with a 120,000-square-foot building and parking lot, which will remain. Lot 14 (proposed Parcel 5) is currently improved with a 289,559-square-foot building and parking lot, which will remain. Lot 18 (proposed Parcel 2) currently has building permits issued for the construction of a 75,000-square-foot building and parking lot. Lot 10 (proposed Parcel 1) is currently undeveloped area and does not have an approved DSP for development. However, a DSP will be required for any future development as required for properties in the M-U-I and T-D-O Zones.

The lots included in this application were zoned Light Industrial (I-1) and Heavy Industrial (I-2) at the time of the approval of PPS 4-89228. Preliminary Plan 4-89228 included an overall land area of 134.4 acres for the development of two million square feet of office space. The property was rezoned to M-U-I as part of the 2015 TDDP. This PPS will supersede the validity of PPS 4-89228 for the geographic area of Lots 10, 12-14, and 18, Block C.

The applicant is proposing to retain the existing lotting pattern, with the subject lots now being Parcels 1–5, and is for the purpose of reevaluating adequate public facilities requirements for the subject property with this PPS, specifically as it pertains to transportation adequacy for 800,000 square feet of development (from the original two million 4-89228), and adjust improvements based on the current TDDP. The existing and proposed development is within the overall square footage originally evaluated with PPS 4-89228.

The applicant provided a statement of justification dated April 19, 2017, which provides an extensive history of the approvals, development, and transportation improvements, which are applicable to the subject property and the larger Riverside development originally part of PPS 4-89228. In summary, PPS 4-89228 included two million square feet of office development of which approximately 1.2 million has been constructed or allocated for construction outside the boundaries of this (4-16022) PPS. The remaining approximate 800,000 square feet is being reevaluated with the subject PPS application of which 529,559 square feet is currently constructed and 75,000 square feet is under construction, a total of 604,559 square feet, which is considered existing for evaluation of this PPS. Of the remaining 195,441 square feet proposed and evaluated with this PPS, 30,000 square feet is proposed for future development on Parcel 1 and 165,441 square feet is not allocated to a specific lot in this PPS for development. This application will supersede the adequacy requirements under PPS 4-89228 for 800,000 square feet of development analyzed with this PPS, which has been removed from the background of 4-89228.

The subject site is within the municipal boundaries of the City of College Park and the Town of Riverdale Park. The PPS was referred to the both municipalities for review and comment. A final memorandum from the City of College Park was provided at the Planning Board hearing, and a referral response from the Town of Riverdale Park was not received.

3. **Setting**—The subject site is located on the north side of River Road, and surrounds University Research Court. The neighboring properties to the north and west are zoned M-U-I and are developed, or approved to be developed with office buildings. The neighboring properties to the east are zoned Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) and owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and consist of the Anacostia River Stream Valley Park. River Road abuts the southern boundary of the site.

FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION

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

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-U-I/T-D-O	M-U-I/T-D-O
Use(s)	Offices (604,559 sq. ft.)	Offices (800,000 sq. ft.)
Acreage	34.07	34.07
Lots	5	0
Outlots	0	0
Parcels	0	5
Dwelling Units	0	0
Public Safety Mitigation	No	No
Variance	No	No
Variation	No	No

Pursuant to Section 24-119(d)(2) of the Subdivision Regulations, this case was heard before the Subdivision and Development Review Committee (SDRC) on April 7, 2017.

5. **Community Planning**—The *Plan 2035 Prince George's Approved General Plan* (Plan Prince George's 2035) locates the subject property within the General Plan Growth Boundary and within a designated Employment Area. Plan Prince George's 2035 describes Employment Areas as areas commanding the highest concentrations of economic activity in four targeted industry clusters: healthcare and life sciences; business services; information, communication and electronics; and the Federal Government (page 106). It is also part of the College Park/UM Metro/M Square Purple Line Regional Transit District (Map 11).

The site is subject to the 2015 *The Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan* (TDDP). The College Park-Riverdale Park TDDP approved land-use map envisions the subject site as having Mixed-Use, Predominately Office and Office development. The subject development conforms to the land use recommendations of Plan Prince George's 2035 and the College Park-Riverdale Park TDDP.

This application is located under the traffic pattern for a small general aviation airport (College Park Airport). This area is subject to Aviation Policy Area regulations, Sections 27-548.32 through 27-548.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the subject property is located in Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6. The APA regulations contain additional height restrictions in Section 27-548.42 and purchaser notification requirements for property sales in Section 27-548.43 that are relevant to evaluation of this application. No building permit may be approved for a structure higher than 50 feet in APA-6 unless the applicant demonstrates compliance with Federal Aviation Regulations (FAR) Part 77. However, this PPS is not approving building location or architecture, including the height, of buildings. This information is provided for the applicants benefit and will be analyzed with any future DSP applications for this site. A note on the final plat indicating the property's location with APA-6 is required.

6. **Urban Design**—Existing development on the subject site has been approved pursuant to the detailed site plan (DSP) approvals, which include Detailed Site Plan DSP-06026, approved by the Planning Board on October 19, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-233) and subsequent revisions for Lot 14; Detailed Site Plan DSP-05078, approved by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-47), and subsequent revisions for Lot 13; Detailed Site Plan DSP-05079, approved by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-46) and subsequent revisions for Lot 12; Detailed Site Plan DSP-05080, approved by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 06-45), and subsequent revisions for Lot 18. A DSP for Lot 10 has not been approved and will be required prior to the issuance of permits as required for properties in the M-U-I and T-D-O Zones.
7. **Environmental**—The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed the following applications and associated plans for the subject site:

Development Review Case #	Associated Tree Conservation Plan #	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
DSP-05078	TCP2-073-90	Planning Board	Approved	3/02/2006	PGCPB No. 06-47
DSP-05078-01	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	9/04/2008	N/A
DSP-05078-02	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	9/30/2009	N/A
DSP-05079	TCP2-006-06	Planning Board	Approved	3/02/2006	PGCPB No. 06-46
DSP-05079-01	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	8/20/2009	N/A
DSP-05080	TCP2-006-06	Planning Board	Approved	3/03/2006	PGCPB No. 06-45
DSP-05080-01	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	11/06/2013	N/A
DSP-05080-02	TCP2-006-06-02	Planning Director	Approved	9/12/2016	N/A
DSP-06026	TCP2-006-06-01	Planning Board	Approved	10/19/2006	PGCPB No. 06-233
DSP-06026-01	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	5/19/2016	N/A
4-89228	TCP1-009-90	Planning Board	Approved	2/15/1990	PGCPB No. 90-42
4-16022	TCP1-009-90-01	Pending	Pending	Pending	Pending
NRI-229-2016	N/A	Staff	Approved	12/6/2016	N/A

Proposed Activity

This PPS application is for five parcels for existing and proposed research and development offices within the Riverside, M-Square campus.

Grandfathering

The project is subject to the environmental regulations contained in Subtitles 24, 25, and 27 that came into effect on September 1, 2010 and February 1, 2012 because the application is for a new PPS.

Site Description

This 34.07-acre site is in the M-U-I and T-D-O zones and located on River Road, approximately 1,050 feet from the Kenilworth Road and River Road intersection. A review of the available information indicates that streams and 100-year floodplain are found to occur on the property. The predominant soils found to occur according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) include the Codorus and Hatboro soils, Codorus-Hatboro-Urban land complex and Elsinboro sandy loam soils series. According to available mapping information, Marlboro clay does not occur on or in the vicinity of this property. There are no Forest Interior Dwelling Species (FIDS) habitat mapped on-site. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur on or in the vicinity of this property. The site has one stream system that drains to the east towards Northeast Branch, which is part of the Lower Northeast Branch watershed, and then to the Anacostia River basin. The site has frontage on River Road, which is not identified as a scenic-historic roadway, but is identified as a Collector master plan roadway. River Road is not a traffic noise generator and noise will not be regulated in this subject application. The overall site of the TCP (51.44 acres), which includes Lots 15–17 and Outlot A, in addition to the lots included in this PPS, is located within three planning areas; the College Park-Berwyn Heights and Vicinity Planning Area, College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone Development Plan, and the Hyattsville-Riverdale-Mount Rainier-Brentwood Planning Area. All of the proposed activities are within the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone Development Plan. The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map as designated by *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*. According to the 2017 Green Infrastructure Plan, which is part of the 2017 *Approved Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan*, the site contains Regulated areas, Evaluation areas, and Network Gap areas.

2017 Resource Conservation Plan

The 2017 Resource Conservation Plan, contains policies and strategies related to the sustainability, protection and preservation of drinking water, stormwater, and wastewater systems within the County, on a county wide level. These policies are not intended to be implemented on individual properties or projects and instead will be reviewed periodically on a countywide level. As such, each property reviewed and found to be consistent with the various countywide and area master plans, County ordinances for stormwater management, floodplain and woodland conservation, and programs implemented by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE), the Prince George's County Department of Health, the Prince George's County Department of the Environment, the Prince George's Soil Conservation District, the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), and the Washington Suburban and Sanitary Commission are also deemed to be consistent with this master plan.

Conformance to the 2015 Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan

The site is within Planning Areas 66 and 68. The most current application area master plan is the 2015 *Approved College Park-Riverdale Park Transit District Development Plan* (TDDP). There are no specific environmental recommendations or standards that require review for conformance with this project, which proposes a building on an existing pad site developed in conformance with previous site plan and tree conservation plan (TCP) approvals. The environmental requirements for woodland conservation, noise, and stormwater management are addressed in the Environmental Review Section below.

Conformance with the 2017 Green Infrastructure Plan

The Green Infrastructure Plan shows approximately 80 percent of the overall site of the TCP contains Regulated, Evaluation, and Network Gap Areas. The subject area proposed for development on the PPS is not located within a sensitive area and is in keeping with the goals of the Resource Conservation Plan.

Natural Resources Inventory/Environmental Features

An approved Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-29-2016, is in conformance with the environmental regulations that became effective September 1, 2010 was submitted with the application. The site contains regulated environmental features (streams, floodplains or their associated buffers). The site has an approved Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2-006-06-03) and the proposed work will not change impact areas previously approved by the TCP2. No additional information is required with regard to the NRI.

Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance

The site is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size and it contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland.

The overall site of the TCP (51.44 acres) contains a total of 38.59 acres of woodlands and 5.67 acres of wooded floodplain. The site has a woodland conservation threshold of 6.62 acres, proposes to clear 35.05 acres of woodland and 0.01 acre within the floodplain with a total requirement of 17.70 acres. The Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) proposes to meet the requirement with on-site preservation (3.45 ac.) and woodland conservation fee-in-lieu. The required fees have been collected with permits 4334-2006 and 28102-2013 for activities within the overall area of the TCP.

Minor revisions to the worksheet and approval block are required to the TCP1

Primary Management Area (PMA) Impacts

No impacts to PMA are proposed with this application.

Noise

The site has frontage on River Road, which is identified as a Collector master plan roadway. River Road is not a traffic noise generator and noise will not be regulated in this subject application.

8. **Stormwater Management**—The applicant provided a copy of the previous stormwater management (SWM) concept approval letters with the subject application, which are listed in Note 11 on the TCP1. Stormwater management concept approval was obtained for the subject area and implemented with the existing grading and development on-site. Therefore, a new SWM concept plan was not required to be submitted with the subject application. Future development within the subject site may require additional SWM approvals. However, given the site is largely developed and modification to the existing lot layout is not approved with this application, the SWM concept plan approval will not have any effect on the PPS layout approved with this application (Section 24-130).
9. **Parks and Recreation**—Pursuant to Section 24-134(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations, the PPS is exempt from the requirement of mandatory dedication of parkland because the development does not contain any residential units.
10. **Trails**—The PPS has been reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the College Park-Riverdale Park TDDP in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. The subject application consists of five recorded lots, three (Lots 12, 13, and 14) of which are developed with 529,559 square feet of gross floor area. Lot 18 is approved for a 75,000-square-foot building, currently under construction, pursuant to Detailed Site Plan DSP-05079. Lot 10 is currently undeveloped. The future development of 195,441 square feet of gross floor area is evaluated with this PPS. The site is located on the north side of River Road approximately three-quarter miles from the College Park Metro. Because the site is located in the College Park Metro Center, it is subject to the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations and the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 2, 2013” at the time of PPS. In order to meet these requirements, the applicant provided a bicycle and pedestrian impact statement (BPIS).

The College Park-Riverdale Park TDDP included a number of recommendations for sidewalks, trails and bicycle facilities in the vicinity of the subject site. Text regarding the applicable recommendations are copied below:

River Road/River Road Extended: Continuous sidewalk on both sides and cycle tracks or buffered bicycle lanes (TDDP, page 71)

Strategy 4.2: Install dedicated bicycle facilities (e.g., buffered bicycle lanes or one-way cycle tracks) on River Road over the short- to medium-term. The TDDP’s proposed road narrowing will provide space for these facilities from Paint Branch Parkway to the Northeast Branch.

Road restriping to accommodate bike lanes as part of the site's off-site improvements was considered. However, after discussion with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), it was determined that the provision of bike lanes along River Road should occur after the construction of the Purple Line. The provision of bicycle facilities along River Road will be contingent upon reallocating the space within the curbs. This may be accomplished by narrowing the travel lanes and restricting the turning lane to certain locations (rather than having a continuous center turn lane). This work can be considered by DPIE/DPW&T as part of the Purple Line development.

University Research Court/University Research Court Extended: Continuous sidewalk on both sides of the street and bicycle lanes or shared lane markings (sharrows) (TDDP, page 71)

Sidewalks exist along both side of the road within the subject property. Pavement markings for on-road bike facilities are recommended, subject to the concurrence of DPIE.

Strategy 5.1: Expand College Park's bike share system into and throughout the transit district. A bikeshare facility is already planned for installation at the College Park/U of MD Metro Station in M Square and as part of the Cafritz Property development. Additional locations should be evaluated, including the Purple Line's M Square station, the Wells/Linson complex, and College Park Airport and Aviation Museum. The Town of Riverdale Park should be encouraged to fully participate in the bike-share system as a partner.

The City of College Park and the University of Maryland have an existing bike-share system called 'mBike'. DPW&T is establishing the regional Capital Bikeshare system in Prince George's County and has funding in FY18 for implementation of Phases 1 and 1(a). It should be noted that the technologies for the two systems are currently not compatible. It is anticipated that in the future College Park may decide to transition to the Capital Bikeshare system or that a "blended" network of both systems will be in place. Details regarding how or if this would take place will be based on discussions between the City of College Park and DPW&T. However, the first phases of implementation of the Capital Bike Share system into Prince George's County is funded in FY18. The location of the existing bike-share station shall be shown on this site, with additional details and specifications to be developed at the time of DSP. This approach is consistent with the Planning Board decision in the Riverfront at West Hyattsville, PPS 4-15020. This location could be utilized by the 'mBike' system in the short term, and potentially as a Capital Bike share location in the future as the expansion of the county system occurs. The "bike share" should be located within the public right-of-way or along the public right-of-way within a public use easement, subject to approval of the operating agency.

Strategy 5.2: Provide adequate bicycle parking and storage lockers throughout the transit district. Additional bike parking should be provided at the M Square Purple Line station, and with all new buildings, ideally placed as close as possible to building entrances. Consider additional amenities, such as shower and changing

facilities and secured bicycle rooms, in new development to encourage bicycling as a commuter mode of travel for employees.

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT reinforces the need for these recommendations and includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

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

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

A standard sidewalk exists along the site's frontage along both sides of University Research Court and along the site's frontage of River Road.

On-Site Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

As noted in the statement of justification, most of the site has already been developed. As indicated above, standard sidewalk exists along both sides of University Research Court and a standard sidewalk exists along the site's frontage of River Road. The master plan trail along River Road has been implemented as an eight-foot-wide sidewalk on the south side of River Road, which is the opposite side of the road from the subject site. Bicycle parking at each of the approved buildings was addressed in the prior Detailed Site Plans (DSP-05078, DSP-05079 and DSP-05080). In addition, sidewalk and trail access was provided between the buildings on Lots 12, 13, and 14 and to the adjacent Northeast Branch Trail to the east (M-NCPPC). All of these previously approved facilities will accommodate pedestrian and bicycle trips on-site and provide access to the surrounding trail network.

Review of the Bicycle and Pedestrian Impact Statement (BPIS) and Proposed Off-Site Improvements

Due to the location of the subject site within a designated corridor, the application is subject to County Council Bill CB-2-2012, which includes a requirement for the provision of off-site bicycle and pedestrian improvements. Section 24-124.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations includes the following guidance regarding off-site improvements:

- (c) **As part of any development project requiring the subdivision or re-subdivision of land within Centers and Corridors, the Planning Board shall require the developer/property owner to construct adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities (to the extent such facilities do not already exist) throughout the subdivision and within one-half mile walking or bike distance of the subdivision if the Board finds that there is a demonstrated nexus to require the applicant to connect a pedestrian or bikeway facility to a nearby**

destination, including a public school, park, shopping center, or line of transit within available rights of way.

Council Bill CB-2-2012 also included specific guidance regarding the cost cap for the off-site improvements. The amount of the cost cap is determined pursuant to Section 24-124.01(c):

The cost of the additional off-site pedestrian or bikeway facilities shall not exceed thirty-five cents (\$0.35) per gross square foot of proposed retail or commercial development proposed in the application and Three Hundred Dollars (\$300.00) per unit of residential development proposed in the application, indexed for inflation.

Of the 800,000 square feet of development evaluated with this application, 529,559 square feet is built and 75,000 square feet is under construction. Based on Section 24-124.01(c), the 195,450 square feet of unbuilt and proposed commercial/office space, is subject to a cost cap for the site of \$68,407.50.

Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations also provided specific guidance regarding the types of off-site bicycle and pedestrian improvements that may be required, per Section 24-124.01(d):

(d) Examples of adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities that a developer/property owner may be required to construct shall include, but not be limited to (in descending order of preference):

- 1. Installing or improving sidewalks, including curbs and gutters, and increasing safe pedestrian crossing opportunities at all intersections;**
- 2. Installing or improving streetlights;**
- 3. Building multi-use trails, bike paths, and/or pedestrian pathways and crossings;**
- 4. Providing sidewalks or designated walkways through large expanses of surface parking;**
- 5. Installing street furniture (benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks, bus shelters, etc.); and**
- 6. Installing street trees.**

The required BPIS was submitted as part of the PPS package. The submitted BPIS proffers two off-site bus shelters to serve the subject site. Both shelters will be at existing stops that currently lack protection from the elements for the users. This is an acceptable package of off-site improvements. It should also be noted that Campus Drive to the north will be partially

reconstructed as a “complete/green street” by DPW&T in the future, making construction along that road inappropriate at this time. It was also considered whether the applicant should dedicate the off-site resources towards providing bike lanes along River Road. However, after discussions with DPW&T, it was determined that no improvements of this nature should be completed along River Road until after the Purple Line construction (indefinite) is complete. Consequently, the provision of two bus shelters in conformance with Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations is approved and an exhibit showing details and specifications of both shelters shall be provided at the time of DSP. The size, type and location of the shelters shall be determined at the time of DSP in consultation with the DPW&T Office of Transit. Bus routes in the immediate vicinity of the subject site service destinations including Greenbelt Metro, Deanwood, and New Carrollton.

Demonstrated nexus between the subject application and the off-site improvements

Section 24-124.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations requires that a demonstrated nexus be found with the subject application in order for the Planning Board to require the construction of off-site pedestrian and bikeway facilities. This section is copied below, and the demonstrated nexus between each of the proffered off-site improvements and the subject application is summarized below.

- (c) **As part of any development project requiring the subdivision or re-subdivision of land within Centers and Corridors, the Planning Board shall require the developer/property owner to construct adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities (to the extent such facilities do not already exist) throughout the subdivision and within one-half mile walking or bike distance of the subdivision if the Board finds that there is a demonstrated nexus to require the applicant to connect a pedestrian or bikeway facility to a nearby destination, including a public school, park, shopping center, or line of transit within available rights-of-way.**

Demonstrated Nexus Finding: The off-site bus shelters will directly benefit the future employees and visitors to the subject site by providing enhanced accommodations for the local transit options serving the subject site. The bus shelters are along routes that will provide access from the subject site to New Carrollton, Greenbelt, and Deanwood.

Finding of Adequate Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

Council Bill CB-2-2012 requires that the Planning Board make a finding of adequate bicycle and pedestrian facilities at the time of PPS. Council Bill CB-2-2012 is applicable to PPSs within designated Centers and Corridors. The subject application is located within the designated Greenbelt Road corridor, as depicted on the Adequate Public Facility Review Map of the General Plan. Council Bill CB-2-2012 also included specific guidance on the criteria for determining adequacy, as well as what steps can be taken if inadequacies need to be addressed.

As amended by Council Bill CB-2-2012, Section 24-124.01(b)(1) and (2) of the Subdivision Regulations includes the following criteria for determining adequacy:

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

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

- a. the degree to which the sidewalks, streetlights, street trees, street furniture, and other streetscape features recommended in the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and applicable area master plans or sector plans have been constructed or implemented in the area; and**
- b. the presence of elements that make is safer, easier and more inviting for pedestrians to traverse the area (e.g., adequate street lighting, sufficiently wide sidewalks on both sides of the street buffered by planting strips, marked crosswalks, advance stop lines and yield lines, “bulb out” curb extensions, crossing signals, pedestrian refuge medians, street trees, benches, sheltered commuter bus stops, trash receptacles, and signage. (These elements address many of the design features that make for a safer and more inviting streetscape and pedestrian environment. Typically, these are the types of facilities and amenities covered in overlay zones).**

As several of the lots within the subject application are already developed, many of the needed pedestrian facilities on-site have been constructed. These facilities include standard sidewalks along both sides of University Research Court, a standard sidewalk along the site’s frontage of River Road and an existing eight-foot wide sidewalk along the south side of River Road. The wide sidewalk along River Road extends well beyond the limits of the site and provides a complete connection to the College Park Metro to the northwest from the subject property. DPW&T is currently designing complete street improvements along Campus Drive to the north, which will further enhance the environment for pedestrians and cyclists in the immediate vicinity of the subject site. Lastly, the bus stop improvements proffered by the applicant will enhance the environment for pedestrians accessing the multiple bus routes serving the area. Pedestrian facilities are adequate based on the existing and planned facilities in the area, as well as the improvements proffered by the applicant.

2. **The finding of adequate public bikeway facilities shall, at a minimum, include the following criteria:**
 - a. **the degree to which bike lanes, bikeways, and trails recommended in the Countywide Master Plan of Transportation and applicable area master plans or sector plans have been constructed or implemented in the area;**
 - b. **the presence of specially marked and striped bike lanes or paved shoulders in which bikers can safely travel without unnecessarily conflicting with pedestrians or motorized vehicles;**
 - c. **the degree to which protected bike lanes, on-street vehicle parking, medians or other physical buffers exist to make it safer or more inviting for bicyclists to traverse the area; and**
 - d. **the availability of safe, accessible and adequate bicycle parking at transit stops, commercial areas, employment centers, and other places where vehicle parking, visitors, and/or patrons are normally anticipated.**

Bike lanes are planned along Campus Drive as part of the DPW&T Complete/Green Street project. There is an existing eight-foot sidewalk along the entire south/west side of River Road. Bike lanes are also planned along River Road, but construction of these lanes is not appropriate at this time due to the anticipated Purple Line construction along the road as determined by DPW&T. The placement of shared-lane markings (or “sharrows”) along University Research Court on which the subject site fronts, consistent with the master plan, shall be provided, unless modified by DPIE. Bike parking was required for the buildings on Lots 12, 13, and 14 through previously approved sites plans. Furthermore, trail access between the buildings and the adjacent Northeast Branch Trail is required by Detailed Site Plans DSP-05078, DSP-05079, and DSP-05080.

Given the facilities required on-site, the existing sidewalks along River Road and the planned Complete/Green Street improvements along Campus Drive, and the previously approved trail connections, the bicycle facilities are adequate in the vicinity of the subject site.

11. **Transportation**—The subject property is located on the north side of River Road, along University Research Court, and contains existing and proposed commercial office development. The site currently contains 529,550 square feet of general office (occupied and generating traffic), and additional office space of 270,450 square feet (under construction / not constructed and not generating traffic), analyzed in the submitted traffic study for a total of 800,000 square feet of gross floor area. The 800,000 square feet is part of the two million square feet originally approved

with 4-89228 and has been removed from the background development to be reanalyzed with this PPS to adjust transportation improvements based on the current TDDP. The traffic study has measured trip activity at the site access on University Research Court to compute trip generation for the existing development, and apply those computed rates to estimate trip generation for the proposed development (270,450 square feet). This approach is not consistent with the “Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1, 2012” (“Guidelines”) for the following reasons:

- a. The “Guidelines” indicate that the rates recommended in that document (the “Guidelines”) should be used in every traffic impact study (TIS) except where it can be demonstrated by acceptable field data that a more appropriate rate is applicable.
- b. The level of occupancy on the date(s) of the counts is not indicated. A low occupancy would directly affect measured trip generation.
- c. The rates used are based on a single observation. The “Guidelines” advise that multiple observations should be used to improve statistical soundness.

However, the trip generation for the existing development will be accepted as the existing counts and the additional trip generation will utilize the same rates because these rates result in greater trip impact than the “Guidelines” rates based on ITE/GFA. The resulting trip generation for the proposed development (270,450 square feet) would be 308 AM (281 in, 28 out) and 314 PM (38 in, 276 out) peak-hour trips. This trip generation will be used for the analysis and for formulating the trip cap for the site for the total of 800,000 square feet of GFA.

The traffic generated by the subject PPS (800,000 square feet) will impact the following intersections, interchanges, and links in the transportation system:

- River Road and Rivertech Court (unsignalized)
- River Road and Haig Drive/University Research Court (roundabout)

This is consistent with the scoping recommended in the TDDP. The plan limits the selection of critical intersections for property within the overlay to intersections along River Road and Campus Drive, and specifically excludes intersections along US 1 and MD 201.

This application is supported by a traffic impact study (TIS) dated April 2016 using counts dated November 2015. The counts were more than one year old on March 16, 2017, which was the date of acceptance of this PPS. The “Guidelines” indicate counts one-year old or less should be used, however, the provided counts exceed those that would be computed using the “Guidelines.” Therefore, the counts and the overall study are accepted for the probative value they might have. The study was provided by the applicant and referred to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), DPW&T, and DPIE. At the time of the Planning Board hearing, comments from the County and SHA had not been received, however, they are not needed for an adequate

transportation finding. The findings outlined below are based upon a review of these materials and analyses consistent with the “Guidelines.”

Existing Traffic:

The subject property is located within Transportation Service Area (TSA) 1, as defined in the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*. 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, is permitted at signalized intersections within any tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the Guidelines.

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

Roundabouts: Where the analysis using *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) indicates a volume-to-capacity (v/c) ratio greater than 0.850 for the intersection, geometric improvements or trip reduction measures should be considered that will reduce the v/c ratio to an acceptable level. The operating agency can deem a v/c between 0.850 and 0.900 to be acceptable, and that agency must do this in writing in order for the Planning Board to make a similar finding.

The following critical intersections, interchanges and links identified above, when analyzed with existing traffic using counts taken in November 2015 and existing lane configurations, operate as follows:

EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (CLV, AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
River Road and Rivertech Court	31.1*	18.7*	--	--
River Road and Haig Dr./University Research Ct.	0.14**	0.16**	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the "Guidelines," delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p> <p>**In analyzing roundabouts, a volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is computed. A v/c greater than 0.85 is generally the upper limit of acceptable operations.</p>				

Background Traffic:

None of the critical intersections identified above are programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation "Consolidated Transportation Program" or the Prince George's County "Capital Improvement Program." Background traffic has been developed for the study area using nine approved but unbuilt developments within the study area. A 2.5 percent annual growth rate for a period of two years has been assumed.

Four background developments in the area have been identified and factored into the analysis. It should be noted that the Cafritz property development to the west will not impact the critical intersections until the Van Buren Street connection is complete. However, it is factored in as one of the background developments. The critical intersections, when analyzed with background traffic and existing lane configurations, operate as follows:

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (CLV, AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
River Road and Rivertech Court	+999*	+999*	--	--
River Road and Haig Dr./University Research Ct.	0.32**	0.41**	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the "Guidelines," delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p> <p>**In analyzing roundabouts, a volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is computed. A v/c greater than 0.85 is generally the upper limit of acceptable operations.</p>				

Total Traffic:

The following critical intersections, interchanges and links identified above, when analyzed with the programmed improvements and total future traffic as developed using the "The Guidelines," including the site trip generation as described above, operate as follows:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (CLV, AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
River Road and Rivertech Court				
Maximum Vehicle Delay (seconds)	+999*	+999*	Not pass	Not pass
Minor Street Approach Volume	454	1,197	Not pass	Not pass
Critical Lane Volume	1,747	1,822	Fail	Fail
River Road and Haig Dr./University Research Ct.	0.39**	0.50**	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the "Guidelines," delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.</p> <p>**In analyzing roundabouts, a volume to capacity (v/c) ratio is computed. A v/c greater than 0.85 is generally the upper limit of acceptable operations.</p>				

While the roundabout at River Road and Haig Drive/University Research Court operates acceptably under total traffic in both peak hours, the intersection of River Road and Rivertech Court requires further discussion.

River Road and Rivertech Court:

As noted earlier, a three-part process is employed for two-way stop-controlled intersections. As indicated in the table above, the River Road/Rivertech Court intersection does not pass the test under total traffic. This result was anticipated as part of the TDDP which includes the following language in its standards for parking requirements and transportation adequacy:

Until such time as a traffic signal at the intersection of River Road and Rivertech Court is installed or fully funded and permits have been issued by the County, each proposed development project with access on to River Road or Rivertech Court, and subject to Detailed Site Plan approval, shall submit a detailed analysis and a signal warrant study (using total projected traffic) at the time of their initial application for review by appropriate agencies to determine if a traffic signal, pedestrian crossing light, or other appropriate traffic safety measure is necessary to ensure pedestrians can safely and efficiently cross all legs of the intersection.

In the traffic study, the applicant makes the argument that the traffic signal is warranted only if two particular background developments are built out. However, pursuant to the language above, a traffic signal warrant study must be done for any properties in the area and may be required with any DSP proposing development in accordance with the standards of the TDDP. Under total traffic and with signalization, the CLV at this intersection would be 1,747 (LOS F) in the AM peak hour and 1,822 (LOS F) in the PM peak hour. This does not meet the service level standard. The Rivertech Court approach to the intersection shall be restriped to allow an exclusive right-turn lane and a shared through/right turn lane. With the added restriping, the CLV at this intersection would be 1,540 (LOS E) in the AM peak hour and 1,211 (LOS C) in the PM peak hour. This meets

the level of service standard for this area, and for that reason the signalization and the restriping improvements are required. Given that the proposed 75,000-square-foot building on current Lot 18 (proposed Parcel 2) has DSP approval, the improvements (restriping and signalization) shall be phased after that building. Also, there would be no need for the improvements until after the Van Buren Street overpass over the CSX tracks is complete and open to traffic, required as part of the Cafritz development (PPS 4-13002) to the west. A trip cap consistent with the trip generation assumed for the site, 308 AM and 314 PM peak-hour vehicle trips (270,450 square feet), plus the trip generation for existing development, 606 AM and 614 PM peak-hour vehicle trips (529,550 square feet), for a total of 914 AM and 928 PM peak-hour vehicle trips (800,000 square feet) under the cap, are approved.

Master Plan Right-of-Way – River Road

River Road is a master plan collector facility with a proposed right-of-way of 80 feet. Adequate dedication consistent with master plan needs has already occurred, and no further right-of-way dedication is required and access and circulation are found to be acceptable.

Master Plan Rights-of-Way – Future Transit Facility

The 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) shows a proposed transit line parallel and adjacent to River Road to the south. This line represents the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) Purple Line. The Purple Line is in the latter stages of design and is currently awaiting approval to begin construction. The Purple Line is proposed along the south side of River Road, the right-of-way would have no impact on this site.

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

12. **Schools**—The PPS has been reviewed for impact on school facilities in accordance with Section 24-122.02 of the Subdivision Regulations and the Adequate Public Facilities Regulations for Schools (County Council Resolutions CR-23-2001 and CR-38-2002) and concluded that the subdivision is not subject to a review for schools because it is a nonresidential use.
13. **Fire and Rescue**—The PPS has been reviewed for adequacy of fire and rescue services in accordance with Section 24-122.01(e)(1)(E) of the Subdivision Regulations.

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

The project is served by Riverdale Heights Fire/EMS Co. 813, a first due response station (a maximum of seven minutes travel time), is located at 6101 Roanoke Avenue.

“In the Fire/EMS Department’s Statement of Adequate Apparatus, as of July 15, 2016, the Department states they have developed an apparatus replacement program to meet all the service delivery needs of the County.”

Capital Improvement Program (CIP)

The Prince George’s County FY 2016-2021 Approved CIP provides funding to construct a new fire station that will allow the consolidation of two existing stations, Riverdale Fire/EMS, Company 807, and Riverdale Heights Fire/EMS, Company 813, which will serve the surrounding communities currently served by both stations.

The above findings are in conformance with the 2008 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan* and the “Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities.”

14. **Police Facilities**—The development is within the service area of Police District I, Hyattsville. There is 267,660 square feet of space in all of the facilities used by the Prince George’s County Police Department and the July 1, 2015 (U.S. Census Bureau) county population estimate is 909,535. Using 141 square feet per 1,000 residents, it calculates to 128,244 square feet of space for police. The current amount of space, 267,660 square feet, is within the guideline.

15. **Water and Sewer**—Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations states that “the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval.”

The 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan* placed the subject property in water and sewer Category 3, Community System, and will therefore be served by public systems.

Water and sewer lines in University Research Court abut existing Lots 10, 12–14, and 18, Block C, from which extension are provided to serve the existing lots.

16. **Health Department**—The Prince George’s County Health Department has evaluated the PPS and has no comments.
17. **Public Utility Easement (PUE)**—In accordance with Sections 24-122(a) and 24-128(b)(12) of the Subdivision Regulations, when utility easements are required by a public utility company, the subdivider should include the following statement in the dedication documents recorded on the final plat:

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

The PPS correctly delineates a ten-foot public utility easement (PUE) along the public rights-of-way as requested by the utility companies.

18. **Historic**—Two Archeological Sites, 18PR258 and 18PR263, were previously identified on the subject property. Site 18PR258 was related to the Engineering and Research Corporation (ERCO) factory and the airfield associated with it. Site 18PR263 was a prehistoric lithic scatter. A Phase I archeological study for the Purple Line project noted that the archeological component of Site 18PR258 had lost its integrity due to new construction and multiple disturbances within the larger site area. Therefore, the site was determined to not meet the criteria for eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. Site 18PR263 was impacted by the construction of River Road and is no longer intact. Therefore, no further work is required on Sites 18PR258 and 18PR263 due to the lack of integrity.

There are no Prince George's County Historic Sites on or adjacent to the subject property. This application will not impact any historic sites, historic resources or known archeological sites.

19. **Use Conversion**—Total development included in this PPS is 800,000 square feet gross floor area for commercial office use. The subject application does not include any residential development. There are comparatively different adequate public facility tests between residential and nonresidential uses, and there are considerations for recreational components for a residential subdivision. If a revision to the mix of uses or the site layout is proposed that affects Subtitle 24 findings of adequacy as set forth in the resolution of approval, that revision shall require the approval of a new PPS prior to the approval of any building permits.
20. **Municipalities**—This PPS is located within the municipal boundaries of College Park (part of Lot 14 only) and Riverdale Park (Lots 10,12,13,18 and part of 14). The application was referred to the municipalities and, at the time of the Planning Board hearing, the City of College Park provided recommended conditions, which were incorporated into this approval.

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

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Bailey, Doerner, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 29, 2017, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20th day of July 2017.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:SC:rpg