

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George=s County Planning Board has reviewed A-9903/02, A-9280/07 and A-9281/07 requesting an amendment of the Largo Town Center Basic Plan to include residential use on Parcels 1A and 1B of Block D in the Largo Town Center, in addition to previously approved office/commercial use in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on June 22, 2006, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

- A. **Location and Field Inspection:** The subject property, Parcels 1-A and 1-B, Block D, of the Largo Town Center, is located at the northwest quadrant of the Lottsford Road and Harry S Truman Drive intersection, adjacent to the Largo Metro Station on the west. The triangularly shaped site is highly visible from adjoining roads, is undeveloped, and has flat topography. Grand Boulevard bisects the 19.9-acre property and connects Lottsford Road to the Metro parking garage/station. Parcel 1-A contains 11.8 acres south of Grand Boulevard and is cleared. Parcel 1-B contains 8.1 acres on the north side and is generally wooded.
- B. **History:** The original basic plan for the Largo Town Center (LTC) was approved for the Major Activity Center (M-A-C) Zone as part of the 1978 sectional map amendment for the Largo-Lottsford Planning Area (CR-75-1978). Subsequently, several basic plan amendments and second phase comprehensive design plans (CDP) have been approved that have slightly changed maximum development levels and locations of land uses from the original basic plan. The subject property has been known as Parcel D. The following table contains a chronology of LTC zoning and development review actions:

LTC basic plan Actions	Date Approved	Purpose
A-9280 A-9281	6/7/78	Basic plan approved upon adoption of the 1978 sectional map amendment (SMA) for Largo-Lottsford, placing 175.1± acres in the M-A-C (Major-Activity-Center) Zone (CR-75-1978). Dwelling units were capped at 1,950 on 78 acres, and up to 2.3 million square feet of commercial space and 300,000 square feet of retail space were approved.
A-9280 A-9281	5/23/88	First LTC amendment slightly changed density and intensity to reflect several right-of-way takings through the intervening years (ZO 31-1988). Base dwelling units were revised from 780 to 774 on 74 acres, with the potential to add another increment of 1,170 dwellings through providing public benefit features. A total of 1,935 dwellings were approved, with a base density of 774 dwellings and public benefit increment factors adding approximately 1,170 dwellings. Commercial and retail space remained unchanged at a combined total of 2.3 million square feet. Included 12

LTC basic plan Actions	Date Approved	Purpose
		conditions and 14 CDP considerations.
A-9280 A-9281	9/25/89	Second LTC amendment allowed gas stations as a permitted use (ZO 57-1989). Included the previous 13 conditions and 14 CDP considerations; retained same development potentials.
A-9280 A-9281	6/14/93	Third LTC amendment to allow senior housing on Parcel C (ZO 12-1993). Included 15 conditions and the 14 CDP considerations previously approved. Three conditions were added regarding Council review of uses on Parcel A and senior housing on Parcel C. Base dwellings were slightly adjusted (apparently due to rounding) to 780 units, with a public benefit increment factor adding 1,170 units for a maximum 1,950 dwellings.
A-9280 A-9281	10/5/93	Fourth LTC basic plan amendment was requested to increase retail by another 250,000 square feet while decreasing by like amount the office/commercial space. The application was held and never withdrawn.
A-9903-C	4/26/94	Fifth LTC amendment which rezoned 4± acres of Parcel (Block) D from the C-O Zone to the M-A-C Zone and added it to the LTC basic plan. Previous conditions and considerations were carried forward.
A-9280 A-9281	10/10/03	LTC basic plan amendment was requested for Block D to add 380 high-rise apartments and townhouses (subject property). Technical staff recommended disapproval and the application was withdrawn.
A-9280/06-C A-9281/06-C	7/11/05	Sixth LTC amendment only changed Parcel B from commercial and office use (868,000 square feet) to residential, allowing 594 high-density residential dwellings as part of the LTC approved cap of 1,935 total dwellings. The LTC base density was again set at 774 dwellings, with a public benefit increment factor adding another 1,170 dwellings for a total of 1,935 dwelling units in LTC.

On November 17, 1988, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-88195 for 174.43 acres, known as Largo Town Center, including the subject and other properties. Final plats were recorded on May 29, 1997 (5-97114).

The following table summarizes Planning Board and District Council actions taken on second-phase CDPs for the LTC.

CDP Actions	Date Approved	Purpose
CDP-8804	10/31/88	District Council affirms Planning Board approval (PGCPB No. 88-479) for various uses and densities for all Largo Town Center (LTC) parcels, including 665,000 square feet of commercial/office use on Block D (545,000 square feet if Parcels E and H are commercial). If Parcels E and H develop as residential, the overall LTC residential density would be capped at 1,440 dwellings (per PGCPB No. 88-479 and supplemental 10/6/88 staff report). This CDP approved 1.745 million square feet of commercial floor area for the LTC. The basic plan still allows 2.3 million square feet. Parcel (Block) D is designated as a commercial parcel with a two-acre urban park and an outdoor urban courtyard. Various design standards are established throughout the LTC
CDP-8905	9/25/89	District Council affirms Planning Board approval (PGCPB No. 89-396); decreases green space and requires an urban park on Parcel D to be sized in subsequent site plan approvals
CDP-9002	4/16/90	Amended CDP-8804 and CDP-8905 conditions regarding fee-in-lieu, recreational bonding, and building heights (affirmed PGCPB No. 90-94); required owner-occupied use on Parcels G-1 and G-2; set height of office buildings on Parcel B-4
CDP-9002/01	7/30/91	Affirms Planning Board approval (PGCPB No. 91-238) revising conditions regarding fee-in-lieu, recreational bonding, and design guidelines; required all SDPs be referred to area civic groups
CDP-9002/02	7/27/93	Affirms Planning Board approval (PGCPB No. 93-149) to allow 110 senior housing units on Parcel C in accordance with the third LTC basic plan amendment and modify fee-in-lieu conditions
CDP-9002/03	3/3/94	Planning Board denied request to amend Condition 2 of CDP-9002/01 (excluded subject Parcel D)
CDP-9002/04	3/31/94	District Council affirms PGCPB No. 94-119, focusing on Parcel D (subject property) by approving a maximum of 1.37 million square feet of commercial office and employment use on Parcel D; establishing green area; setbacks; heights; a one-acre urban park; structured parking; and by setting a vested base density on Block D of 545,000 square feet (665,000 square feet) if Parcels E/H develop as residential [as they have], “plus any additional transfer of density to Parcel D by the Planning Board and/or the District Council.” Additional office/employment development could be approved for Parcel D provided various transportation demand management strategies and/or rail transit connection to Addison Road is funded (allowing between 1.2 to 1.5 million square feet). However, the CDP approved 1.37 million square feet of office/employment space on Parcel D. Overall LTC development was capped by maximum AM and PM peak-hour vehicle trips to allow no more than 2.3 million total square feet of commercial space and 1,440 dwellings (per CDP-8804).
CDP-9002/05	5/17/94	District Council affirms PGCPB No. 94-121 to allow 264 multifamily condominiums on Parcel E (222 dwellings) and Parcel H (42 dwellings); retained original density cap of 1,440 dwellings in CDP-8804.
CDP-9002-06	4/30/98	PGCPB No. 98-120 converts Parcel E from condo to rental; the approved

		SDP reduced total units on Parcels E/H from 264 to 243. With 995 units committed to development, only 470 units remained to be developed elsewhere under the LTC cap of 1,440 dwellings (per CDP-8804).
CDP-9002-07		Withdrawn

Several LTC specific design plans (SDPs) have been approved. The subject property, in SDP-8948 (PGCPB No. 89-625), was approved on December 28, 2005, with several conditions regarding an urban park, green space, signs, and fire safety, among others.

C. Master Plan and General Plan Recommendations:

Master Plan - The May 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* recommends mixed-use office, multifamily, and retail development for the subject property, with a notation on the plan map indicating the specific intended use for the subject property as the “office component” in the LTC. The plan does not recommend residential development in Block D (Exhibit 1).

In general, the sector plan envisions the overall LTC as, “... a Metropolitan Center with a horizontal mix of uses including residential and nonresidential uses at intensities appropriate for a center that is intended to draw office workers and shoppers from the Washington Metropolitan Area.” The subject property is located in Subarea 4 where the sector plan states (page 29): “High-density office development adjacent to the Metro Station will provide the opportunity for large numbers of office workers to use Metro. The transit-oriented development will provide for over one million square feet of office development at the town center. The existing M-A-C (Major Activity Center) Zone is retained.”

Staff notes that Block D is not within the sector plan’s designated Development District Overlay Zone, where the primary purpose is to encourage residential, commercial, and mixed-residential and commercial development in the underlying Mixed-Use Infill (M-U-I) Zone. Several properties in proximity to the Metro station and subject property were placed in the M-U-I Zone and DDOZ for the purpose of encouraging residential development and other mixed use.

General Plan—The 2002 General Plan identifies the property as part of a designated “metropolitan center.” The vision for metropolitan centers is to provide locations for “mixed residential and nonresidential uses at moderate to high densities and intensities, with a strong emphasis on transit oriented development.”

The General Plan strongly advocates the use of transit-oriented development (TOD) and pedestrian-oriented development (POD) principles to focus appropriate development at station areas (page 44 and 45). Key elements of integrated TOD/POD development include determining appropriate density in core areas, encouraging a diversity of mixed land uses, and requiring design elements that emphasize pedestrian-oriented scale and linkages between land uses and support for transit use. The rationale for TOD development is to increase transit use and reduce automobile dependency by locating land uses (live/work/shop) in close proximity to one another and to transit stations.

- D. **Request:** The applicant desires to implement General Plan policies by amending the LTC basic plan to classify the northern portion of Block D (Parcel 1B) as a residential and retail mixed-use area, in addition to retaining the current commercial office/employment use designation on the southern portion of the property (Parcel 1A) (Exhibit 2). The applicant has both parcels under contract and proposes to develop all of Block D with prime office space, supporting retail, and multifamily condominiums in an integrated, transit-oriented campus setting. The proposal consists of approximately 1.049 million square feet of commercial office space and 54,000 square feet of supporting retail use that is currently approved for Block D. In addition, the request would add approximately 350,000 square feet comprised of 350 “luxury, upscale” residential condominiums. Section E below provides an overview of the development concept.

The applicant provides the following background in support of the proposal (page 2):

“Unlike other previous applications, it should also be pointed out that the present applicant is committed to developing both Parcels 1A and 1B, unlike others which have requested development on one or the other, in a comprehensive integrated fashion that will continue to meet/retain the commercial/office goals previously established and presently desired for the subject site, and alluded to during public hearings for the nearby Parcel B project [see Zoning Map Amendment A-9280/81/06], while also providing the residential massing desired in and around metro stations for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) and design.

“Therefore, as discussed during hearings on Parcel B, the argument presented for commercial development on the subject site is in fact being furthered by the Applicant’s proposed development program. The intensity of desired commercial development remains intact.

“As a result of the Applicant’s community meetings, and in keeping with the direction that the applicant was provided by Council members in reviewing the application (desiring the commercial/office component on the subject site), and in meetings with Council members prior to the filing of this application, the Applicant assures the community and the reviewing entities that the commercial office space...will be built in a timely and in an integrated fashion with the stand alone residential condo units.” To ensure the community that development of the commercial/office use south of the proposed Grand Boulevard will occur, the applicant will proffer a covenant to be recorded in the county land records, that will prohibit the development of the residential use on the parcel north of the proposed Grand Boulevard, until construction of an office building has commenced.

“In developing the project [in] this manner, the Applicant furthers assures the community that development of the office portion of Block D is of paramount importance to the proposed development program.”

- E. **Proposed Development Concept Summary:**

Exhibit 3 (illustrative plan) shows the applicant’s development concept. Grand Boulevard is

proposed as a monumental gateway into and through the site, leading to the Metro parking garage. Office development is proposed south of Grand Boulevard in a series of four office buildings ranging from 10 to 12 stories for a total of 1,048,974 square feet. These buildings are sited so as to define a landscaped public square. Residential condominiums are located north of Grand Boulevard in four buildings up to five stories in height that contain 191,300 square feet. These residential buildings are sited directly across from townhouse development (Towns at Lake Largo). Mixed retail and residential use is envisioned along Grand Boulevard with 53,900 square feet of retail shops at street level with four additional floors (159,000 square feet) of condominium dwellings above. The total retail/residential mixed-use component is proposed in four buildings, two on each side of Grand Boulevard, five stories in height. The request will yield an overall gross residential density on Block D of 17.5 dwellings per acre. Two parking structures containing approximately 1.4 million square feet are located adjacent to the Metro station, behind the proposed office and residential uses. Fully developed, the site will contain a total of 2,889,876 square feet of floor and parking area. All uses and structures are to be integrated through compatible architectural design and pedestrian systems that will also link to adjacent land uses.

The applicant believes the subject property has become the gateway to the Largo Metro Station and neighborhood communities. The applicant indicates that a key component of project design was integrating and linking the proposal with the adjacent Metro station and Boulevard at Capital Center, consistent with TOD planning principles. Exhibit 3 and Exhibit 4 (concept plan) illustrate these design principles. The applicant states (page 4) that: "As envisioned...TOD design considerations for the subject site would provide compatible moderate to higher density development, located within an easy walk of the transit station, focusing on over one million square feet of office development, with an appropriate addition of high-end retail and residential condominiums designed in a pedestrian orientation."

F. Neighborhood and Surrounding Uses:

The property is surrounded by the following uses:

- North:** Access drive to the Largo Metro Station parking garage separates the site from an undeveloped parcel (Parcel I) fronting on Arena Drive that is in the M-A-C Zone.
- East:** Across Lottsford Road, generally north of the Grand Boulevard intersection, are townhouses (Towns at Lake Largo). The Vistas senior housing apartments continue south to Harry S Truman Drive. Both projects are in the M-A-C Zone.
- South:** Directly across Harry S Truman Drive, in the southwest quadrant of its intersection with Lottsford Road are commercial offices and warehouse storage in the E-I-A Zone. In the southeast quadrant, the land is being developed in the M-A-C Zone as the Mid-Town Largo Station Condominiums.
- West:** The Largo Town Center Metro Station and parking garage in the C-O Zone.

G. Zoning Requirements:

Section 27-197: This section establishes procedures for amending an approved basic plan,

including the filing; referral; public notification; evaluation, including time lines for processing, advertising; and holding public hearings and conducting appeals. The District Council may amend an approved basic plan if the amendment does not involve a change in land area or an increase in land use density or intensity for the overall area included in the approved basic plan and the requirements of Section 27-195(b) have been met.

Staff Comment: The proposed amendment does not increase land area or the density/intensity of the overall area included in the approved LTC basic plan, including subsequent amendments that have established a density cap of 1,935 dwellings and a maximum 2.3 million square feet of office/retail space. However, staff notes that the total 1,453,176 square feet proposed by the applicant (office, retail, and residential area) exceeds the development cap on Block D (1,369,500 square feet approved in CDP-9002/04 for office/retail use only) by 83,676 square feet. However, this is still below the overall residential and office/retail development caps in the approved LTC basic plan.

Section 27-195(b): Prior to the approval of the application and the basic plan, the applicant shall demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the District Council, that the entire development meets the following criteria:

(A) The proposed basic plan shall either conform to:

- (i) The specific recommendation of a General Plan map, Area Master Plan map; or urban renewal plan map; or the principles and guidelines of the plan text which address the design and physical development of the property, the public facilities necessary to serve the proposed development, and the impact which the development may have on the environment and surrounding properties; or**
- (ii) The principles and guidelines described in the Plan (including the text) with respect to land use, the number of dwelling units, intensity of nonresidential buildings, and the location of land uses.**

APPLICANT'S POSITION

The applicant offers the following background as context in support of the application and its relation to: conformance with the General Plan; compliance with TOD design and development principles; and conformance with the 2004 sector plan. The applicant's position is followed by staff comments.

1. **General Plan Conformance:** The following statements in support of the application are excerpted from the applicant's justification statement:

"Historically the subject site has been viewed by Prince George's County for future commercial/office use. The Boulevard at Capital Centre has been developed and now provides local residents and visitors alike with a more up-scale entertainment and shopping experience that was previously absent in the Largo area. And of equal importance is the opening of the Largo Town Center Metro Station immediately adjacent

to the subject site.” (Page 2)

“These two factors combined with the location of the subject site provide an excellent opportunity to further the efforts of the [General Plan] which approved this area as a Metropolitan Center recommending a concentration of medium to high intensity pedestrian-oriented development. In addition to commercial/office use, an integrated residential use is a critical component of successful transit-oriented design developments.” (Page 3)

Regarding the General Plan’s concept for transit-oriented development, the applicant states: “The concept of ‘transit-oriented’ development (TOD) in Prince George’s County is furthered by the 2002 General Plan which emphasizes mixed-use and TOD in centers around transit stations. In addition, both at New Carrollton and West Hyattsville, recent efforts involving Maryland DOT and the ‘Place Making’ process yielded consensus and support for employment and related transit oriented design. Largo Town Center offers similar opportunity for a concentration of office development and supporting retail and condominium uses.

“By more fully integrating residential with the office campus on the subject site, key growth policies of TOD design as emphasized in the General Plan would be achieved, such as: providing for quality jobs and economic development; creating increased opportunities for people to work and play; making efficient use of existing and proposed infrastructure and transportation investment; and enhancing the quality and character of the community.”

The applicant submitted and summarizes a February 2005 article by *Urban Land* stating: “America is in the midst of a transit building boom, and the availability of developable sites near transit stations, together with the new popularity of urban and suburban town neighborhoods, is stoking interest in transit-oriented development.”

The applicant also cites a national TOD market study published in 2004 by the Center for Transit-Oriented Development that quantifies the potential demand for higher density housing near transit stations by 2025. Referring to the study, the applicant states: “[T]heir assessment shows that at least one-quarter of all households entering the market could be looking for housing within a half-mile of a transit station in the next 20 years.” The study continues on to state that “accommodating this demand would necessitate doubling the amount of housing within that radius, equivalent to building an additional 2,100 housing units at every one of the 4,000 or so existing and planned stations in the United States.”

Overall, the applicant believes (page 13) that the request conforms to and furthers the following General Plan parameters to ensure diversity of uses that generate transit ridership and promote a 24-hour living, working, and shopping environment supportive of TOD principles that:

- Provide a more balanced and integrated mix of residential, retail, and employment uses that will decrease automobile trips.

- Create dense, mixed-use suburban centers averaging more than 20 times as many transit-commuter trips as low density, single-use office parks.
- Balance uses with peak-hour demand with those generating off-peak demands and leading to more efficient transit service.

Staff Comment (General Plan): The Community Planning Division staff indicates that the application is generally consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for a metropolitan center with the exception of the residential and nonresidential development density targets specified for a metropolitan center (March 20, 2006, memorandum). Specifically the site is within the “core” of the LTC metropolitan center. Within such center core areas (1/4- to 1/3-mile radius), the General Plan establishes minimum residential density targets of 30 dwellings per acre. Also, nonresidential development within metropolitan centers should be a minimum floor area ratio (FAR) of 2.0. There are no maximum targets established for either residential or nonresidential development.

Applying these recommendations to the proposed basic plan indicates that both the proposed residential density and the office/commercial FAR are substantially below the General Plan’s minimum density/intensity targets for metropolitan center core areas. For instance, the existing and proposed basic plan for the overall LTC establishes a base residential density of 10 dwellings per acre with a maximum density of 25 dwellings, allowing a maximum 1,935 dwellings. The 350 units proposed by the applicant will yield 17.5 dwellings per acre on Block D, but will still remain within the maximum 1,935 units approved on the existing basic plan and the proposed basic plan. Even at 17.5 dwellings per acre, the proposal falls substantially short of General Plan density targets. Regarding FAR, the existing and proposed LTC basic plan has an overall maximum commercial FAR of .55 and the proposed office/commercial square footage on the subject property (1.27 FAR) remains within this overall LTC FAR. Nonetheless, the proposed density and intensity fail to achieve General Plan development minimums.

The Community Planning Division also finds that the design of the proposed Grand Boulevard is flawed in that its alignment appears to be focused on the entrance to the LTC Metro station-parking garage. This design favors vehicular access to the station’s parking garage at the expense of pedestrian access to the station. Staff notes that: “This modal bias in favor of vehicular access is not consistent with General Plan TOD design guidelines. Consideration should be given to modifying the alignment or terminus of the proposed roadway to allow secondary access to and/or visual focus on the Largo Town Center Metro Station entrance.”

2. **Sector Plan Conformance:** The following statements supporting conformance with the May 2004 sector plan and SMA regarding the LTC are excerpted from the applicant’s justification statement (pages 14/15):

“[T]he land use goal for the [Town Center] core areas is ‘quality residential, office and retail uses designed in a manner that fosters a sense of place with an active, vibrant and pedestrian-friendly setting.’ Key highlights of the sector plan [page 3] include:

- “Proposed mixed-use land uses throughout the Metro core areas with an emphasis on office and residential uses to take advantage of Metrorail, to promote a vibrant 24-hour environment in the Centers and to support local retail uses.
- “Encourage high-quality multifamily housing at the Metro station core areas.” [Staff notes that the sector plan’s ending parenthetical phrase for this statement “in designated locations” is ignored.]
- “Ensure new development will be compatible with existing residential and commercial areas....”

The applicant cites the sector plan’s reference to three key elements to TOD: density, diversity and design (page 9). The applicant believes the proposal reflects these elements because it seeks to provide compact and dense mixed-use adjacent to the Metro station, while increasing transit use and decreasing reliance on automobiles.

The applicant states (pages 14/15): “Currently, and as discussed in the sector plan, the core area (including the subject site) is developed at a relatively low density and has a limited mix of land uses. The core area also does not have a focus towards the Metro station. In order to increase density around the Metro station, the sector plan proposes not only increased commercial use, but residential density as well; with a proposed minimum residential density of 30 dwelling units per acre. In order to accomplish higher density development, the sector plan goes on to propose:

- “Transit-oriented land uses and development intensities in a manner that is consistent with the General Plan’s recommendations for a Metropolitan Center”
- “Provide for development that is compatible with the adjacent residential component of the Town Center”
- “Creation of a sense of place through appropriate land use, densities and design.”

“While the sector plan attempts to accomplish compact mixed-use TOD within a 1/3-mile walking distance to the Metro station/core area, it is set up in a manner that presently focuses a single/limited use to the subject site. However, in light of the subject site’s immediate proximity to the Metro Station, it presents an opportunity for the type of development envisioned by the principles of TOD; direct relationship with the immediate adjacency to a Metro station, 24-hour environment including office, residential, and retail uses, and compactness that generates a true sense of place for workers and residents alike. Unlike other parcels within the Largo Town Center planned community, it provides the most immediate relationship to the Metro station and will be developed under single ownership in a manner that most effectively incorporates the elements of [TOD]”.

The applicant provides a table that presents development activity within the LTC based on approved specific design plans (SDPs), the latest basic plan amendment approved for

Parcel B in January 2005, and this proposed amendment for Block D. The table indicates that the 350 condominium units being proposed for Block D do not exceed the basic plan's maximum development cap established at 1,935 dwelling units by basic plan Amendment 6 (January 2005). Twenty-one additional dwellings beyond those proposed by this applicant can be built before exceeding the density cap.

<u>Parcels</u>	<u>Commercial</u> (square feet)	<u>Residential</u> (dwelling units)
Built (Parcels A, C, E, H, F1-2, G1-2)	284,000	970
Block D (proposed)	1,048,974	350
Parcel B (approved)		594
Parcel I (proposed)	160,000	
Total	1,492,974	1,914
Maximum LTC Development Caps	2,300,000	1,935

The applicant notes in the following table that the LTC residential development cap (1,440 dwellings established by CDP-8804, CDP-9002/04, and CDP-9002/06) has been exceeded by 474 dwellings as illustrated in the following table. This is due to the approved amendment of use on Parcel B from commercial to allow 594 residential dwellings. Thus, the applicant indicates that if the proposed basic plan amendment is approved, they will propose additional public benefit features as part of the CDP review process to increase dwelling units beyond the 1,440 LTC dwelling unit cap.

	<u>Commercial</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Remaining</u>
Maximum Approved CDP Density			1,440
Built	284,000	970	470
Parcel B (approved)		594	-124
Block D (proposed)	1,048,974	350	-474
Parcel I (proposed)	160,000		
Total	1,492,974	1,914	-474

Staff Comment (Sector Plan)—As illustrated in the above tables, the applicant does not seek to change the number of dwelling units or commercial square footage approved in the existing LTC basic plan (1,935 dwellings). They recognize that permissible residential density is dependent upon providing public benefit features that will require amending the approved CDP to increase the number of units. Unfortunately, as pointed out in the following, residential use is not permissible on the subject property.

The applicant's above reference to the 2004 sector plan highlights (page 3) fails to recognize that multifamily housing in Metro station core areas is only intended to occur "in designated areas." Specifically, Subareas 2, 3 and 5 were identified to encourage residential and other mixed-use development. The SMA placed these subareas in the M-U-I Zone and Development District Overlay Zone (DDOZ). The sector plan states (page 29): "The preferred land use scenario of Largo Town Center Metro core area based on the [proposed] rezoning (Subareas 2, 3, and 5)

results in the following development yields: 600 multifamily units; 475,000 square feet of commercial space (of which 20,000 square feet could be retail).” It is staff’s opinion that these are the only LTC subareas where additional residential use is deemed by Prince George’s County as appropriate locations to implement General Plan policies. The determination of appropriate use for the subject property was arrived at through the arduous process of approving the sector plan and SMA as the policy and regulatory tools required to implement the 2002 General Plan policies for this area.

Overall, staff finds that the request does not conform to the policy recommendations of the General Plan or their specific implementation through the 2004 sector plan’s land use and zoning recommendations. With a de-emphasis on pedestrian access to the Metro station and a proposed density/intensity that fails to meet General Plan targets, the proposal does not conform to the principles and guidelines of the plan text that address the design and physical development of the site. Nor does the proposal respect the sector plan’s recommended locations for residential development. Appropriate density and intensity levels as envisioned by the General Plan can still occur on the other properties placed in the M-U-I Zone and designated for mixed-use development. The provisions of the DDOZ will ensure that the design on these other properties will provide compact and dense development that apply TOD and POD principles as envisioned by the General Plan and sector plan. A final point relates to the fact that the subject property and adjacent Parcel I are the only LTC (M-A-C-zoned) sites that are available to develop for office use.

(B) The economic analysis submitted for a proposed retail commercial area adequately justifies an area of the size and scope shown on the basic plan:

Staff Comment: The request proposes to add 350 residential condominium dwellings to the already approved commercial and office square footage. Block D has already been approved for 53,900 square feet of retail space. Furthermore, an application requesting the M-A-C Zone is exempt from the requirement of submitting an economic analysis in accordance with Section 27-179 (c)(1)(F). Therefore, this criterion does not apply.

Regarding the retail space proposed, the Urban Design Section (April 6, 2006, memorandum) suggests the proposed 53,915 square feet of floor area seems insufficient to conveniently serve an estimated 6,000 or more residents and workers at the subject property and daily Metro commuters.

(C) Transportation facilities (including streets and public transit) (i) which are existing, (ii) which are under construction, or (iii) for which one hundred percent (100%) of the construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry the anticipated traffic generated by the development based on the maximum proposed density. The uses proposed will not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plans, or urban renewal plans;

APPLICANT POSITION:

The applicant's traffic analysis recognizes an existing trip cap of 1,920 AM peak-hour trips and 1,869 PM peak-hour trips taking Metro and TDM measures into consideration. The traffic analysis indicates the combined 1.45 million square feet of commercial/office, residential condominiums, and retail square footage in the proposal will result in reduced AM and PM trips below the trips possible from the original basic plan approval of 1.3 million square feet of commercial/office space. Therefore the applicant claims (page 18) "no new trips" and "no impact upon existing [LTC] trip cap requirements." This is confirmed by the staff analysis below.

Staff Comments: The Transportation Planning Section staff reviewed the applicant's trip generation analysis and concluded that the proposed basic plan amendment would not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved general or area master plans (April 4, 2006, memorandum). The staff memorandum indicates the following:

"In May 1994, the District Council approved CDP-9002/04, which allowed the transfer of density from other parcels into Parcel D. The same application also allowed additional density through the provision of additional public benefit features.

"Considerable analysis was done in support of CDP-9002/04. At that time, a number of determinations regarding the ultimate development of Parcel D were made. These findings include the following:

- "1. The approved basic plan for the overall Largo Town Center property, zoned M-A-C, allows for the construction of up to 2,300,000 square feet commercial space. To date, approved CDPs within the overall Largo Town Center allow for the construction of 1,745,000 square feet.
- "2. Parcel D, the subject parcel for this application, is currently approved for the construction of up to 545,000 square feet, with a provision that up to 665,000 square feet can be developed on Parcel D if Parcels E and H are developed as residential, not commercial, parcels. Parcels E and H have in fact been developed as residential parcels. Therefore, Parcel D is assumed to have a right, from the standpoint of transportation, to develop up to 665,000 square feet.
- "3. The CDP included a finding that if funding for a rail transit connection from a station adjacent to Parcel D to the existing Metrorail system at Addison Road could be demonstrated, an additional increment of up to 380,000 square feet of gross floor area would be approved within Parcel D. This would allow up to 1,045,000 square feet.
- "4. With the introduction of various transportation demand management (TDM) policies within Parcel D, the CDP allowed an additional increment of 175,000 square feet within Parcel D. This would allow up to 1,220,000 square feet, but this increment would be subject to verification of the effectiveness of the TDM program prior to being permitted for construction.
- "5. The applicant has shown that the approved CDPs were originally proposed to contain

1,176 residences on Parcels F-1, F-2, G-1, and G-2. Those parcels have developed with 617 residences, and an additional 351 residences have been developed on Parcels C, E, and H. This is less than the residential quantity originally approved within the Largo Town Center. Thus, the entire 270,000 square feet that were originally approved on Parcels C, E, and H should be transferred to Parcel D, instead of the 120,000 square feet discussed under the second point above. This is a reasonable request, and in consideration of this, the balance (270,000 less 120,000) should be considered to be transferred to Parcel D. If this is done, total development on Parcel D with TDM could be 1,370,000 square feet.

“The trip generation analysis...attempts to convert some of this commercial density into residential density. The analysis is not entirely consistent with the CDP approval, however, since the CDP approval attempted to impose TDM and transit measures in order to construct additional square footage beyond 665,000 square feet (545,000 + 120,000) without having additional trip impacts. Since the quantity of office space transferred has been increased by 150,000 square feet (per the fifth bullet above), the basis for any trip analysis should be 815,000 square feet, with additional square footage (555,000) earned through TDM and transit measures. Therefore, the trip generation of all approved office space should be 1,630 AM and 1,508 PM peak hour trips.

“The trip generation analysis continues by utilizing standard rates for the proposed residential condominiums and retail space on the site. The analysis indicates that the resulting difference in Parcel D trip generation from that currently approved will be a decrease of approximately 162 AM and 168 PM peak hour trips.

“Given the above analyses from the CDP approvals, the site could contain 1,245,000 square feet (815,000 plus 555,000 less 125,000) and 350 residences. Therefore, the proposed densities of 1,049,000 square feet of office space, 53,915 square feet of retail space and 350 residential condominiums within Parcel D remain within the level of density that has been approved by previous CDP applications for the entire Largo Town Center site.

“In summary, the Transportation Planning Section determines that the proposed basic plan amendment would not change the transportation level of service anticipated by the master plan on any transportation link within the study area of this site. Consistent with the required finding in Section 27-195(b)(1)(C), the uses proposed on this basic plan amendment would not generate traffic which would lower the level of service anticipated by the land use and circulation systems shown on the approved General or Area Master Plans.

“There are several conditions on the CDP which will be enforced as the subject application advances to later stages of review. They need not be imposed to affect the basic plan amendment.”

The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), Engineering Access Permits Division (letter dated January 31, 2006), indicates that SHA has no objection with the application.

The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) recommends the following improvements be provided in accordance with applicable DPW&T specifications and standards (March 2, 2006, memorandum):

- Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements are required for any proposed internal subdivision streets and along the Grand Boulevard frontage.
 - Construction of a median in Grand Boulevard, an additional vehicular lane, and a bike lane along the site frontage are required in order to bring this entrance road up to standards established during development of the Largo Metro Station.
 - Right-of-way dedication, curb and gutter, sidewalk, and street trees have been provided along both Harry S Truman Drive and Lottsford Road. Streetlights exist along Lottsford Road, but will be required along Harry S Truman Drive and shall be installed by the developer.
 - Street construction permits are required for improvements within private roadways serving townhouse developments and maintenance of private streets is not the responsibility of the county.
 - Full-width, two-inch mill and overlay is required for all county roadway frontages.
 - Sidewalks are required along all roadways within the property limits.
 - All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T and Department of Environmental Resources' requirements.
 - An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.
 - A soils investigation report which includes subsurface exploration and a geotechnical engineering evaluation for public streets is required.
- (D) Other existing or planned private and public facilities which are existing, under construction, or for which construction funds are contained in the first six (6) years of the adopted County Capital Improvement Program (such as schools, recreation areas, water and sewerage systems, libraries, and fire stations) will be adequate for the uses proposed;**

Staff Comment: The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (February 14, 2006, memorandum) reviewed the application in accordance with Section 27-195. There were no findings of inadequacy, provided appropriate school surcharge fees are paid.

Fire and Rescue

The property is within the required seven-minute response time for the first due fire station,

Kentland II, Company 46, using the *7 Minute Travel Times and Fire Station Locations Map* provided by the Prince George's County Fire/EMS Departmentt

Police Facilities

The property is located in Police District II, Bowie. All tests for adequacy of police service are conducted during the preliminary plan of subdivision review process because the test is time and date sensitive. The request will have no greater impact upon police and fire service than expected under the approved development of office and commercial use on the subject property.

School Facilities

The students generated by the proposed residential development will be assigned to attend the following schools:

School	Enrollment	Capacity	Percent of Capacity
Lake Arbor Elementary	835	778	108 %
Earnest Everett Just Middle	1,111	990	113 %
Charles Flowers High	2,539	2,200	116 %

The 2002 General Plan considers 105 percent or greater as significantly over capacity. In this case, all three assigned schools are over capacity, and there no CIP projects proposed in the subject vicinity.

School Surcharge Fee

Residential developments are reviewed during the subdivision process for compliance with County Council Bill CB-31-2003. This bill establishes a \$7,000 school facilities surcharge per dwelling if the dwelling is located within a basic plan or conceptual site plan area that abuts an existing or planned mass transit rail station. The current surcharge, adjusted for inflation, is \$7,412 and is to be a paid at the time of issuance of each building permit. The school surcharge may be used for the construction of additional or expanded school facilities and renovations to existing school buildings or other systemic changes.

Parks and Recreation

Written comments from the Department of Parks and Recreation had not been received upon drafting this technical staff report. However, in a telephone conversation on April 10, 2006, with Ms. Helen Asan, it was recommended that the applicant shall provide a recreation facilities package or fee for the improvements of construction of public recreation facilities in the LTC basic plan area as part of the CDP review package.

Trail Facilities

The senior trails planner advises that a complete evaluation of bicycle, pedestrian, and trail facilities will be made at the time of CDP and SDP review (March 30, 2006, memorandum). It is noted that the 2004 sector plan recommends bicycle and pedestrian facilities along Harry S Truman Drive, Lottsford Road, and Grand Boulevard. These facilities can be accommodated through the provision of standard and wide sidewalks, side paths, and/or designated bike lanes. Currently, standard sidewalks exist along both Harry S Truman Drive and Lottsford Road.

A general network for pedestrian/bicycle circulation is indicated on the approved basic plan. However, different treatments or facilities may be warranted by increased pedestrian activity from proposed residents. The existing standard sidewalks may not be wide enough to accommodate the heavier pedestrian movement to Metro or to encourage TOD. When specific land use and density proposals are made at the time of CDP and SDP review, the necessity for wider sidewalks and/or trails or other pedestrian connections will be evaluated. The feasibility of in-road bicycle facilities will also be evaluated, although it may not be possible to implement these improvements until the time of road resurfacing or a DPW&T road improvement project.

(E) Environmental relationships reflect compatibility between the proposed general land use types, or if identified, the specific land use types, and surrounding land uses, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District.

APPLICANT POSITION: The applicant identifies 0.20 acre in the extreme northern tip of the property that will be retained in open space. The applicant intends to comply with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance and will submit a revised forest stand delineation and proposed tree conservation plan as part of the CDP application package. It is proposed that a portion of Forest Stand E, north of Grand Boulevard, will be removed to allow development.

Staff Comment: The Environmental Planning Section (March 16, 2006, memorandum) indicates that the application has been found to generally address environmental constraints. The following analysis addresses environmental relationships:

“A review of available information indicates that there are no streams, 100-year floodplain, severe slopes, or steep slopes with highly erodible soils located on the site. Transportation-related noise impacts associated with Lottsford Road, an arterial highway, may adversely impact proposed residential uses. The soil is comprised of fine sandy loam, which has no significant limitations for development at this site. The Maryland Department of Natural Heritage Program publication titled ‘Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George’s Counties,’ December 1997, indicates there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic or historic roads located in the vicinity. The property is located in the Southwest Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin.... The site contains no elements of the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan.”

Other environmental findings are as follows:

- “1. A forest stand delineation (FSD) report for Largo Town Center, Lot D, prepared by McCarthy and Associates, Inc., and dated February 1993, was submitted with this application. The statement of justification includes the following information:
- “Approximately 25% of the site was forested at the time of the Forest Stand Delineation. Since that time, the woodlands identified on the southern half of the site, and depicted on the Forest Stand Delineation as Forest Stands A, B, C, and D, were removed in 1994. The permit allowing the woodland removal was issued while this site was grandfathered from the requirements of the... Woodland Conservation Ordinance.”
 - “. . . It is the Applicant’s intent to comply with the requirements of the... Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance... a revised Forest Stand Delineation and Proposed Tree Conservation Plan will be submitted as part of the [CDP review stage], if required.”
 - “Because the FSD is older than five years, it is no longer valid for the preparation of a Natural Resources Inventory or a Type I Tree Conservation Plan. Prior to the submission of the Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) application, a revised FSD text and plan shall be submitted for Parcels 1-A and 1-B, Block D as part of a Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) application. A staff signed NRI shall be included in the application package for the CDP.”
- “2. The site is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is more than 40,000 square feet in area, and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodlands as determined from the FSD submitted in 1993, and a review of the 2000 GIS aerial photos. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan is required at time of CDP Plan review. The change to add a residential component on the site will not affect the 15% woodland conservation threshold requirement based on zoning. However, a Type I Tree Conservation Plan shall be submitted with any applications for a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, CDP, Conceptual Site Plan or Special Exception. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan shall be submitted with all applications for Specific Design Plan, Detailed Site Plan or grading permits.
- “3. This site is located along the west side of Lottsford Road, a Master Plan arterial in a 90-foot wide right-of-way; and along the north site of Harry S. Truman Drive, a Master Plan collector. Lottsford Road, an arterial, is identified as a transportation-related noise generator. Based on the Environmental Planning Section Noise Model the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour for Lottsford Road extends approximately 124 feet west from the centerline of the roadway.”

Residential units located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour may require interior and exterior noise attenuation measures. Recommended conditions addressing noise are contained in the Conclusion section of this technical staff report.

Historic Resources Archeology

A January 11, 2006, memorandum from the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section indicates the request has no effect on county-designated historic resources. However, a March 16, 2006, memorandum from the Planning Department's archeology consultant indicates the following:

1. An 1861 Martenet map shows a structure labeled 'S. Berry' (no longer standing) located south of the subject property. The Berry families were large landholders and owned slaves during the antebellum period.
2. There is a moderate to high probability that archeological sites can be located within the subject property. Therefore, staff recommends that the applicant submit the following to be reviewed as part of the Comprehensive Design Plan submission package:
 - a. In accordance with Subtitle 24-104, Section 24-121 (a)(18), and 24-135.01, the applicant shall prepare a Phase I archeological investigation to identify any archeological sites that may be significant to the understanding of the history of human settlement in Prince George's County, including the possible existence of slave quarters and graves, as well as archeological evidence of the presence of Native American peoples. Potential archeological sites must be considered in the review of development applications, and potential means for preservation of these resources should be considered.
 - b. In accordance with the approved Planning Board *Guidelines for Archeological Review* (May 2005), a qualified archaeologist must conduct all investigations and follow *The Standards and Guidelines for Archeological Investigations in Maryland* (Shaffer and Cole, 1994) and the report preparation shall follow MHT guidelines and the *American Antiquity* or *Society of Historical Archaeology* style guide.
 - c. Archeological excavations shall be spaced along a regular 15-meter or 50-foot grid and excavations should be clearly identified on a map to be submitted as part of the report. These investigations must be presented in a draft report following the same guidelines. Following approval of the draft report, four copies of the final report must be submitted to M-NCPPC Historic Preservation staff. Evidence of M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to signature approval.
 - d. The Phase I archaeological field investigations should also include a pedestrian survey to locate attributes such as surface depressions, fieldstones, and vegetation common in burial/cemetery environs.
 - e. Upon receipt of the report by the Planning Department, if it is determined that potentially significant archaeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall provide a plan for:
 - (1) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level.

(2) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.

- (F) Notwithstanding subparagraphs (C) and (D), above, where the application anticipates a construction schedule of more than six (6) years (Section 27-179), public facilities (existing or scheduled for construction within the first six (6) years) will be adequate to serve the development proposed to occur within the first six (6) years. The Council shall also find that public facilities probably will be adequately supplied for the remainder of the project. In considering the probability of future public facilities construction, the Council may consider such things as existing plans for construction, budgetary constraints on providing public facilities, the public interest and public need for the particular development, the relationship of the development to public transportation, or any other matter that indicates that public or private funds will likely be expended for the necessary facilities.**

Staff Comment: This criterion is not applicable because a construction schedule of less than six years is anticipated.

(G) Conformance with the Purposes of the Zone Requested:

The purposes of the M-A-C Zone are to:

- (1) Establish (in the public interest) a plan implementation zone, in which (among other things):**
- (A) Permissible residential density is dependent upon providing public benefit features and related density increment factors; and**
 - (B) The location of the zone must be in accordance with the adopted and approved General Plans, Master Plan, or public urban renewal plans;**

Staff Comment: The applicant indicates that during prior basic plan approvals, the Council determined that proposed public benefit features would permit development somewhere between the base-density of 774 dwellings to 1,935 dwellings. Staff agrees with the applicant that the proposed 350 dwellings on Block D will not exceed the overall approved LTC dwelling unit cap of 1,935 dwellings; 21 dwellings will remain to be developed under the dwelling unit cap. However, the applicant indicates public benefit features will be proposed during the CDP phase, to increase maximum units over the 1,440 units approved in CDP-9002/04.

The Urban Design Section (April 6, 2006, memorandum) indicates that: "...in order to achieve the proposed number of dwelling units, the applicant has to provide additional amenities that are above and beyond the minimum required to qualify as a density increment factor. In addition to the factors as shown in Section 27-491(b), the applicant should consider upgraded structural forms. This could include steel frame structures and quality exterior finishes like clay brick masonry facades for the residential buildings as a condition of approval. Other aspects of the residential development that should be carefully reviewed are as follows:

- “• Recreational facilities—both outdoor and indoor (including a pool) serving residents of all ages.
- “• Streetscape/architectural elevations of the residential buildings along Lottsford Road.
- “• Proper buffer between the subject site and the existing Metro Station.
- “• Noise mitigation.”

The Urban Design Section memorandum indicates that architectural and signage design guidelines are essential to ensure that the three sections of the site are developed harmoniously. At time of comprehensive design plan, design guidelines regarding basic style/design, finishing material, and color for buildings and signage should be established for review and approval of specific design plan. In addition, the residential units generate certain concerns regarding buffering and screening dwellings from the adjacent Metro station and retail uses to the south. Standards should be established at the time of CDP review to address buffering, screening and landscaping.

(2) Establish regulations through which adopted and approved public plans and policies (such as the General Plan, Master Plans, and public urban renewal plans for Major Metro Centers, New Town Centers, and Corridor City Centers) can serve as the criteria for judging individual physical development proposals;

The applicant contends the request to permit high-quality, transit-oriented residential advances the elements of TOD design for properties adjacent to Metro stations, including satisfying a growing real estate demand. Staff does not disagree with the contention that the addition of residential use is a critical component to the success of the proposed development and is consistent with TOD practice (Urban Design Section memorandum of April 6, 2006).

Nonetheless, it is emphasized that one of the purposes of the 2004 sector plan is “...to implement the General Plan recommendations for Centers and Corridors as applicable to this area...” (sector plan, page 9). In implementing the sector plan, the District Council specified on the land use plan map that the subject property be developed as the “office component” of the LTC Metro Core. Therefore, although residential use furthers TOD concepts, it is not consistent with the General Plan as implemented by the sector plan, or with previous Planning Board or Council findings in previous basic plan or CDP plan approvals for the LTC.

(3) Assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with existing and proposed surrounding land uses, and existing and proposed public facilities and services, so as to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District; and

The District Council previously determined that restricting Block D of the LTC to commercial office and employment use was necessary to ensure a comprehensively planned mixed-use Metro core community that is compatible with surrounding uses and public facilities/services to promote

the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the Regional District. The District Council determined through the sector plan planning process that other sections of LTC were better suited for residential use and that the subject property should be retained as the designated office component.

Staff notes that the applicant has proffered to record covenants prohibiting the development of residential use on the parcel north of Grand Boulevard until construction of an office building has commenced. However, staff finds this proffer vague and difficult to implement and enforce. A better approach would be to establish a predetermined phasing plan regarding the timing of the residential development, such as indicating that residential development cannot begin until an acceptable percentage of office/retail floor area has been constructed.

Regarding compatibility with surrounding uses, the Urban Design Section staff recommends the provision and application of various site and recreation amenities, architectural, landscaping, and other design and development phasing guidelines during the CDP review phase. This will help ensure compatibility of the proposal with surrounding uses. Regarding on-site compatibility, the staff finds that the circulation between the vertical mixed-use section and commercial office section is problematic because a narrow street provided between the two uses will be used mainly for a service street for the first-story retail along Grand Boulevard. Certain space should be retained in order to provide a buffer between the office frontage and service traffic for the retail uses. Other on-site circulation options should be fully explored and special treatment of pedestrian crossings should be identified to facilitate safe pedestrian movements. To these ends, the Urban Design Sections recommends the following in the event the application is approved:

1. Prior to approval of the basic plan, a specific phasing condition should be required so that no residential use can be developed until fifty percent of the proposed gross floor area of the office use, north of the Grand Boulevard, has been built and occupied. The phasing of the residential development shall be a condition of approval.
2. At the time of comprehensive design plan, the applicant shall:
 - a. Submit design guidelines that establish design and review parameters, including design, material and color, for architecture, signage, and landscaping for the entire site. The design guidelines shall also address the streetscape design along both Lottsford Road and Harry S Truman Drive and the streetscape for proposed Grand Boulevard.
 - b. Provide a site-wide pedestrian circulation plan including the location of a bus stop and its supporting pedestrian path network, the location and design of pedestrian crossings, and other protective measures that protect pedestrians from vehicular traffic.
 - c. Propose buffering and screening designs specifically relating the residential development to internal and external uses.
 - d. Provide a recreational facilities package.
 - e. Address noise mitigation measures for the proposed residential use.

- f. Provide additional space between the proposed office building and the vertical mixed-use middle section for improved streetscape design, including additional landscaping and service related amenities.
- g. Establish the timing of completion of the proposed recreational facility package.

(4) Encourage and stimulate balanced land development.

The county's planning efforts are intended to guide land use policy in a manner that encourages and stimulates balanced land development. In the case of the subject property within the context of the LTC, commercial-office and employment use has consistently been determined to be most appropriate. Although the General Plan suggests additional residential uses may be appropriate in areas adjoining Metro stations, the subsequent 2004 sector plan in implementing the General Plan specifically designates Block D (Subarea 4) for the office component of the LTC. The applicant suggests the addition of residential use is an added benefit/feature over and above the approved commercial and office use that supports TOD and Metro. While this argument supports aspects of TOD and POD development as envisioned by the General Plan for metropolitan centers, staff cannot find evidence that the request conforms to the General Plan or sector plan. Accordingly, approval of the request would upset the balance of land use that was determined appropriate by the 2004 sector plan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George=s County Code, the Prince George=s County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and recommends to the District Council for Prince George=s County, Maryland that the above-noted application be DENIED, because the applicant has failed to demonstrate conformance with the requirements for amending the LTC Basic Plan as contained in Section 27-195(b) of the Zoning Ordinance. Foremost, this request does not conform to the May 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas*, which specifically recommends commercial office use for the subject property. While it is true that the 2002 General Plan suggests a greater residential mix is preferred around Metro stations, Block D has not been recognized as an appropriate site for such uses.

* * * * *

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 Eley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Eley, Vaughns, Squire, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 22, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 20th day of July 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RB:bjs