

A M E N D E D C O R R E C T E D R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Conceptual Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

†\*WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board approved the Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008 for Greenbelt Station on July 26, 2001; and

†\*WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board granted a request by the applicant to reconsider the Conceptual Site Plan for transportation related issues on March 17, 2005; and

†\*WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on September 15, 2005 [July 26, 2001], regarding the reconsideration of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008 for Greenbelt Station the Planning Board finds:

1. The Conceptual Site Plan is for Greenbelt Station, a 243.01-acre site in the I-2 Zone, located north of Greenbelt Road, west of Cherry Wood Lane, and south of the Capital Beltway. The site is bounded on the west by the Greenbelt Metrorail and the MARC rail. The Greenbelt Metro Station and associated commuter parking lot, owned by the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority (WMATA), occupies 81.08 acres of the northern portion of the site. The southern part of the site, owned by Greenbelt Metropark, L.L.C., consists of 86.47 acres and was previously used for a mining operation, concrete plant and asphalt plant. The eastern 75.46 acres of the site were also used for mining and contain the Indian Creek 100-year floodplain and other environmentally sensitive land. This area has been conveyed to the State of Maryland for preservation by Greenbelt Metropark, L.L.C. The Conceptual Site Plan has been reviewed by staff for compliance to the requirements of CB-47-2000 for a Metro Planned Community in the I-2 Zone.

The Conceptual Site Plan proposes two main areas of development. In the North Core area, the plan proposes a high-density, mixed-use development around the Metro station with an array of uses consistent with the definition for a Metro Planned Community, such as office, retail, hotel and residential. Development for the South Core area is proposed to consist of medium-density, mixed-use development with residential, senior housing, retail and office as the primary uses. The two development areas will be connected by a north/south connector road intersecting with Greenbelt Road to the south and the Capital Beltway (I-495) to the north. Currently, there is limited access to the Metro station from the Capital Beltway. Access is also provided to the station via Cherrywood Lane. A new interchange is proposed where the north/south connector road is proposed to intersect with the Capital Beltway.

†\*Denotes Amendment

\*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets} indicate deleted language

2. Site data for the Conceptual Site Plan is as follows:

Zone	I-2
Gross Tract Area	243.01 acres
100-Year Floodplain	72.7 acres
Net Tract Area	170.31 acres
North Core Area	78± acres
South Core Area	54± acres
Total Open Space (Including State of Maryland Property)	111± acres

Proposed Uses and Densities

South Core Area (54± acres)

Retail	180,000-216,000 GLA
Office	120,000-140,000 GFA
Seniors= Residential	350-420 DU
Residential	550-660 DU
(Mixture of unit types; low to mid-rise aptmts/condos, townhouses or other)	

Total Square Footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	1,215,000-1,454,000 SF 0.52 - 0.62 FAR
---	---

North Core Area (78± acres)

Retail/Entertainment/Restaurant	1,610,000-1,932,000 GFA
	1,400,000-1,680,000 GLA
Office/Conference&Exhibition Center	1,740,000-2,868,000 GFA
Hotels	550-600 Rooms
Residential	760-865 DU

Total Square Footage and Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	4,377,000-5,173,000 SF 1.29 - 1.52 FAR
---	---

**Required Findings for Conceptual Site Plans in a Metro Planned Community (Findings 3-11 below.)** Note: These findings are also required for all future Detailed Site Plans.

3. **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division.**

The proposed Conceptual Site Plan (CSP) is in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division. The development meets the definition for a Metro Planned Community. The site has a contiguous land assemblage of more than 150 acres and includes an existing mass transit rail station operated by the Washington

Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. The Conceptual Site Plan also includes 75 acres of land which includes the Indian Creek that has been placed in preservation by the State of Maryland. The site is planned to be developed with an array of commercial, lodging, recreational, residential, entertainment, retail, social, cultural or similar uses which will be interrelated by one or more themes.

The Conceptual Site Plan proposes high-density, mixed-use development around the existing Greenbelt Metro Station (North Core) and medium-density, mixed-use development in the South Core area. The two areas will be connected by a north/south connector road that will serve as a major vehicular and pedestrian corridor from Greenbelt Road to the Metro station. The connector road would then continue north to intersect with Sunnyside Avenue. A new interchange is proposed at the Capital Beltway to serve the site.

In general, the proposed development plan promotes the optimum use of transit facilities by assuring the orderly development of land in the transit station area and access, both vehicular and pedestrian, to the Metro station and other major transportation systems by providing the highest densities around the Metro station and near the proposed interchange with the Capital Beltway. Although pedestrian access to the station is provided, the vast majority of the residential dwelling units are beyond one-quarter of a mile (1,320 feet), which is considered by planners to be the maximum distance from which pedestrians are likely to walk to the station. Beyond one-quarter of a mile, pedestrian activity drops off significantly. The majority of the residential dwelling units in the South Core are between one-half mile and three-quarters of a mile from the station. It is anticipated that there will be few pedestrians walking to the station from that distance. Staff believes that in order to promote the optimum use of the transit facilities, some of the residential density (200-300 DU) from the South Core should be transferred to the North Core. The area in the South Core that would be occupied by those dwelling units could be used for recreational facilities, as discussed in finding 18 below.

Two large, above-ground parking structures that are shown on the illustrative plan and flank the main street will provide the bulk of the parking for the Metro station and the enclosed mall. While it is understood that WMATA needs to maintain the number of parking spaces currently existing at the site, the structures as shown on the illustrative plan dominate an area that could be used to provide residential and office buildings closer to the station. This could be achieved if all or a portion of the parking structures were below grade and buildings were constructed on top of the parking structures. In order to optimize access to the Metro station, staff recommends that residential and office buildings be located closer to the Metro station and be constructed over parking structures.

The proposed mix of uses, including high-end retail, entertainment, hotel, office and residential, will enhance the economic status of the county and provide an expanding source of employment and living opportunities. Both the North Core and the South Core offer employment and living opportunities. The proposed mix of uses is diverse and will encourage a 24-hour environment. From an urban design perspective, the densities and

the proposed uses are not an issue. The densities and uses seem appropriate for development adjacent to a transit station and with access to the Capital Beltway, as long as public facilities are adequate to serve the development. It is the lack of specificity with regard to elements that would be used to create a distinctive visual character and identity that are the primary issues of concern.

In order to address these inadequacies, the first Detailed Site Plan should be required to establish the street layout that will determine where the uses will be placed, and also should provide the details necessary to create a distinctive visual character and identity. This is discussed further in the findings below.

4. **The uses within the proposed development are either physically or visually integrated in order to encourage interaction between and among the uses within the development and with those who live, work in, or visit the area.**

The applicant has provided three alternative illustrative plans (Alternatives A, B and C) that show the relationship between the various uses within the proposed development. Alternative C shows a pattern of development that offers the best potential for encouraging interaction between and among the various uses. In conjunction with Alternative C, the applicant has provided a APedestrian and Vehicular Circulation Diagram@ (Exhibit-B) in the addendum to the Conceptual Site Plan, dated June 13, 2001, that clearly shows the proposed vehicular/pedestrian circulation (where streets and sidewalks coincide), the locations of the proposed Amain streets,@ the locations of proposed plazas and pedestrian trails of the illustrative plan.

In the North Core area, the plan shows a pattern of interconnected streets that resemble a grid pattern with a main street connecting the Metro station to the enclosed mall. The applicant has provided a AMetro Station Pedestrian & Vehicular Circulation Diagram@ (Exhibit-C) in the addendum dated June 13, 2001, that shows some preliminary ideas as to how vehicular and pedestrian circulation might occur at the Metro station. The diagram is speculative at this time, because the applicant has only had preliminary discussions with WMATA , and the final design of the kiss and ride, bus drop-off area, parking access, etc., will ultimately depend on how the area directly adjacent to the station developss

The street that is perpendicular with the main street and parallel to the enclosed mall also has the potential to have main street qualities. Shops, restaurants, anchor tenants, offices and hotels should have entrances on that street. The parking garage shown on the other side of the street should have retail and/or restaurant uses on the street level as well to create a main street environment. The plan also begins to define areas where public spaces and plazas, commercial and residential buildings, the main streets, and the mall interface with the Metro station and with one another. Although very schematic at this stage, these types of outdoor spaces are critical for creating a lively, vibrant center. It is this type of plan that is most desirable for this high-density development in the North Core, a more urban pattern that is conducive to creating a sense of place.

In the South Core area, Alternative C also shows a pattern of interconnected streets in a

grid pattern. The north/south connector road has been shifted west toward the rail lines so that all of the development now occurs on the east side of the connector road. Alternatives A and B show the connector road splitting the development in the South Core area with a long, strip-commercial shopping center and office on the west side, and various types of residential development parcels on the east side. Alternative C is far superior in design because the plan incorporates a grid street pattern with a Atown green @ incorporated into a main street concept that provides for enhanced interaction between and among the various uses. The plan also provides for a linear park between the connector road and the rail lines that will serve as a vegetative buffer and a means for hiking or biking to the Metro station. The linear park, as shown on the applicant=s plans, is 10-20 feet wide with a 6- to 8-foot-wide hiker/biker trail. Staff is of the opinion that the linear park should be a minimum of 20-40 feet wide from the face of curb to allow for berming and landscaping, and that the trail should be a minimum of 8 feet wide, except where it has to be reduced for environmental reasons.

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

Staff is of the opinion that Alternative C will offer the best opportunity for a mix of uses, and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, that will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability, and therefore should be the basis for future development of the site. Although it is recognized that flexibility is desirable to allow for market conditions, all future development should reflect the general street patterns and land use relationships and quantities of Alternative C.

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

The Conceptual Site Plan shows staging for the project that identifies areas that could proceed to Detailed Site Plan at one time, but not the actual sequence of how the development will proceed. Staging of the development will depend on certain public facility improvements being in place.

7. **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development.**

In a memorandum dated May 2, 2001 (Chang to Wagner), the Community Planning Division indicated that the 1990 *Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan* and the *Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment*, adopted by the Planning Board in December 2000, recommend hiker-biker trails along Indian Creek and the west side of Cherrywood Lane. The sector plan also recommends bicycle and pedestrian linkages from the subject site to Springhill Lake and North College Park and the USDA/BARC office complex. The Community Planning Division indicates that the Conceptual Site Plan is in compliance with the pedestrian and bicycle network

recommendations, except it fails to show an entryway (or add an arrow symbol) for a future pedestrian bridge crossing the Metro/CSX railroad tracks near the Board of Education property, and it fails to identify a gateway at the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection and show a wide promenade (or add a distinct walkway symbol) between this intersection and the mixed-use center.

In a memorandum dated June 18, 2001 (Shaffer to Wagner), the Trails Planner from the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments.

In accordance with the Adopted and Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant=s heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide the following:

- a. Greenbelt Road (MD 193) is a priority planned east-west bicycle and trail route for Prince George=s County. However, due to right-of-way constraints and other factors, the actual type of trail/bikeway facility to be implemented has yet to be determined. A Class II multiuse trail is preferred. However, if this is not feasible, wide curb lanes or designated bike lanes may be implemented. The State Highway Administration is initiating a Neighborhood Conservation Program project for MD 193 in which road improvements and bicycle and pedestrian safety will be discussed. Through this process, it is hoped that the most appropriate facilities for the area will be determined. A recommendation regarding the appropriate trail/bike facility and/or appropriate bikeway and safety signage will be made at the time of detailed site plan.
- b. Construct a minimum eight-foot wide, asphalt, linear park-trail along the entire length of the planned Spine Road (north-south connector). In-road bike lanes are also recommended along both sides of the planned Spine Road in conformance with AASHTO guidelines.
- c. Construct sidewalks on both sides of the proposed Loop Road.
- d. Construct sidewalks on both sides of Metro Drive.
- e. A stream valley trail is recommended along the edge of the environmental envelope of Indian Creek. This trail shall be in an easement to the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) and shall be constructed to DPR standards. Staff also supports the provision of an interpretive program along this trail, as mentioned in the submitted conceptual site plan.

- f. Bicycle access shall be maintained along Cherrywood Lane. Staff supports the construction of a multiuse trail along the subject property=s frontage of Cherrywood Lane. In addition the existing in-road, designated bicycle lanes should be maintained.
- g. Bike racks and lockers should be provided. The appropriate number and locations will be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

8. **In areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, urban design characteristics, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial).**

The Conceptual Site Plan schematically shows some potential areas where pedestrian activities could occur. However, the plan does not provide the level of detail necessary to address the above information. The Conceptual Site Plan Text contains ADevelopment and Design Standards@ that indicate that a ALandscape, Lighting, Signage and Image Plan@ will be provided with the first Detailed Site Plan that will Aconvey a sense of place and scale, and provides a schematic visualization of the project in the future.@ Staff recommends that condition 15 below be adopted to address the above inadequacies.

9. **The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity.**

The eastern portion of the site contains the Indian Creek floodplain, consisting of approximately 75 acres of land to remain in preservation by the State of Maryland and which will serve as a natural, wooded buffer between the subject site and the Springhill Lake apartment complex. To the west, the property abuts the Metro/CSX railroad tracks. A linear park is proposed between the development and the rail line that will include berming and landscaping that will provide an adequate buffer between the subject site and the industrial area on the other side of the tracks from the South Core area.

A building height study was done for the North Core area to establish building heights for the development and to determine what, if any, impacts the building height would have on the Hollywood residential neighborhood development to the west. The study consists of computer-generated simulations of buildings superimposed on photographs from various vantage points from within the Hollywood neighborhood. The study used the Alternative C layout which provides for two 20-story office towers close to the Capital Beltway with 12- to 15-story buildings adjacent to the Metro station. The height study shows that buildings will be visible from the Hollywood neighborhood. But, because of the distance from the residential lots to the proposed buildings, the proposed buildings will not shadow any residential properties in the Hollywood neighborhood. The proposed 12- to 15-story buildings are approximately 700-800 feet from any residential lot. The 20-story buildings are over 1,300 feet from any residential lot. Additionally, there is an

M-NCPPC park between the subject property and the residential lots. Existing mature trees along the edge of the park will help to filter the views of the future buildings. Staff is of the opinion that the building heights will not be detrimental to the Hollywood neighborhood as long as buildings over 12 stories are located toward the center of the site and the 20-story buildings are located along the Capital Beltway as shown on Alternative Layout C.

10. **Unless a finding of adequacy was made at the time of preliminary plat approval, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, U.S. Department of Transportation and/or Federal Highway Administration Program, or to be provided by the applicant.**

The applicant submitted a Preliminary Plan for review concurrently with the Conceptual Site Plan. The order of approvals requires that the Conceptual Site Plan be approved first, therefore, the above finding applies at this time. See Findings 15 and 16 below for further discussion.

11. **The proposed development, if it includes a hotel use, will satisfy a public need for an additional hotel in the market area.**

In a memorandum dated May 1, 2001 (Valenza to Wagner), the Research Section of the Planning Department offered the following comments:

AThe applicant has identified 35 hotels with more than 4,000 rooms in the market area. During the last several years the number of rooms, the occupancy rates and the average daily rate per room have been increasing. This suggests a strong market for additional hotel rooms in the market area. Additionally, the idea of constructing one hotel with 250-300 rooms at the beginning of the project and another with 300-350 in about 10 years seems to be a reasonable way to ultimately increase the number of hotel rooms in the market area by 15 percent.@

12. An economic analysis is required by CB-47-2000 justifying that any proposed retail sales area will support a high quality main street retail shopping and entertainment complex. In a memorandum dated May 1, 2001(Valenza to Wagner), the Research Section offered the following comments:

Retail/Entertainment Facility

Two elements of the retail market study lead me to believe that the applicant=s evaluation is ambitious. One deals with the percent of income going to retail sales; the other, capture rates.

According to the applicant, the percent of income going to the retail purchases



identified by the applicant) is lower in the county than in the state, 30.3 percent vs. 35.4 percent. This difference is partially due to lower incomes in the county and a net leakage of retail sales to areas outside the county. Based on this assessment, the applicant applies the higher state percentage to income in the trade area to develop support for the regional retail/entertainment facility.

This approach ignores the income effect on the level of retail sales already identified by the applicant. Part of the explanation for the lower percentage of income going to retail sales in the county is the lower income in the county. Additionally, the lower average retail sales per household in the county is not necessarily evidence of a net leakage of retail sales to areas outside the county.

A national comparison based on the *1997 Economic Census* among 10 counties with at least 500,000 people that had incomes similar to the county=s showed that the share of income going to retail sales and also retail sales per capita in the county were in line with the averages for the other counties. The applicant=s finding may be more a reflection of the retail sales profile of a particular income group and not an indication of sales leakage.

Regarding capture rates, the applicant assumes very high capture rates in two of the five merchandise categories presented in the study. The general merchandise and the miscellaneous categories are each assigned a 10 percent capture rate. The applicant identifies ten competitive regional retail/entertainment facilities, nine existing plus the Bowie Town Center, which is currently under construction. This proposal would put 11 such facilities in the market area. Thus the applicant expects some retail stores in the proposed regional retail/entertainment facilities to capture an above average share of sales in these categories.

Stores in this proposed development may capture an above average share of sales, but they are not likely to capture ten percent of the general merchandise and miscellaneous category market. Sales figures used in the applicant=s calculations in these categories include the sales at stores not usually found in regional retail/entertainment facilities. The figures include sales at stores such as discount stores and warehouse clubs in the general merchandise category and florists and used merchandise stores in the miscellaneous category. While a few such stores may be found at some regional retail/entertainment facilities, most of them would not be located in such facilities. Therefore, most of the sales at these stores would not be captured by regional retail/entertainment facilities.

Based on figures reported in the *1997 Economic Census*, sales at discount stores and warehouse clubs accounted for 35 percent of sales in the general merchandise category, and sales at florists and used merchandise stores accounted for 28 percent of the sales in the miscellaneous category. Thus, approximately 65 percent of general merchandise store sales and 72 percent of sales at stores in the miscellaneous category come from establishments in

regional retail/entertainment facilities. This proportionately reduces the applicant's capture rates in these categories to 6.5 percent and 7.2 percent respectively.

The applicant's estimate of supportable retail square footage is reduced by about 25 percent when the calculation includes (1) the county's share of income going to retail sales, and (2) revised capture rates to reflect sales going to stores not likely to locate in this proposal.

**Required Finding, for Conceptual Site Plans, Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance**

13. **The Conceptual Site Plan represents a most reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Section 27-274 without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.**

The applicant describes, in detail, how conformance to the site design guidelines of Section 27-274 will be accomplished in the Addendum to the Conceptual Site Plan dated June 13, 2001. Staff is of the opinion that the applicant has provided adequate descriptive information with the CSP text and addendum dated June 13, 2001, to allow for the actual design specifications and materials for site and street amenities, signage, lighting, recreational facilities and landscaping to be determined at the time of the first Detailed Site Plan review. In addition, the first Detailed Site Plan should provide vehicular/pedestrian streetscape design, street tree standards, building setbacks, lot coverage and a refined layout that shows the locations and general dimensions of all civic components, including parks, plazas, recreational areas and green areas/open spaces.

14. The Conceptual Site Plan for a Metro Planned Community is in conflict with certain provisions of the *Landscape Manual* in which required landscaping more appropriate for Asuburban@ development would not be appropriate or even possible in a highly dense urban Metro Planned Community. Section 4.7., Buffering Incompatible Uses, states that AThe purpose of these regulations is to establish a comprehensive, consistent, and flexible system which will require a buffer . . . between adjacent incompatible land uses in all conventional zones.@ A Metro Planned Community is not a conventional zone. It is a mixed-use zone, patterned after the M-X-T Zone, that encourages horizontally and vertically mixed uses. In many cases, it will be physically impossible to provide a bufferyard between uses normally required by the *Landscape Manual* when buildings are touching or uses are mixed vertically in accordance with the design concepts inherent in the Metro Planned Community. Therefore, Detailed Site Plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.7., Buffering Incompatible Uses, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

Section 4.2., Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, also applies to conventional zones. It is not appropriate to apply this section to mixed-use development where buildings or parking structures may be close to the curb, and a more urban environment is desirable. Therefore, Detailed Site Plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.2.,

Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

In a mixed-use development, the Residential Requirements of Section 4.1. would be difficult to apply, particularly with high-density development where greenspace may be non-existent. Therefore, all Detailed Site Plans should be considered exempt from Section 4.1., Residential Requirements, if true mixed-use development is proposed.

In reviewing Detailed Site Plans for mixed-use development in a Metro Planned Community, Section 3, Landscape Elements and Design Criteria, of the *Landscape Manual* should be used for guidance in determining appropriate methods of landscaping. All other sections of the *Landscape Manual* not mentioned above shall remain in full effect for mixed-use development..

The above exemptions should only apply to Detailed Site Plans or those portions of Detailed Site Plans that provide a true mixed-use development in a Metro Planned Community. Where development is more suburban in nature, the *Landscape Manual* shall apply. The South Core area has more potential for development to occur in a more suburban pattern than the North Core area.

#### Referrals

15. In a memorandum dated May 8, 2001 (Stasz to Wagner), the Environmental Planning Section offered the following comments:

##### Site Description

The property is south of the Capital Beltway, north of Greenbelt Road, east of Cherry Wood Lane, and is bounded by the Metro on the west. There are floodplains, streams and wetlands on the site. Current air photos indicate that about one-sixth of the site is wooded. No Historic or Scenic Roads are affected by this proposal. The adjacent highways and Metro are significant nearby noise sources. The proposed use is not expected to generate significant noise. A rare/threatened/endangered species is known to occur in the project vicinity. The property is in the December 2000 cycle of the Ten Year Water and Sewer Plan in categories W-4C and S-4C. A Stormwater Concept Plan, CSD #2657-2001-00 was approved by DER on June 7, 2001. The soils information included in the review package indicates problematic soils occur in the proposed development area.

##### Environmental Review

- a. This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site is more than 40,000 square feet in area and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation

Plan is required to satisfy the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Discussion: Two forest stand delineations were submitted for review. The reports more than adequately describe the woodlands and condition and location of specimen trees. The Tree Conservation Plan listed on page 28 of the Conceptual Site Plan, dated March 15, 2001, was determined to be inadequate early in the review process. A revised Tree Conservation Plan was accepted for processing on April 26, 2001. The Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/27/00, includes the 169.4 acres of the Greenbelt Station site and the 75.46 acres of adjacent property owned by the State of Maryland.

The Tree Conservation Plan contains a minor graphic problem that may lead to some confusion. A narrow wavy line is used to indicate the limits of vegetation in general. This includes several areas that are not forested but dominated by Common Reed (*Phragmites communis*). A heavy wavy line is used to indicate the limits of woodland. Although the forest stand delineations clearly depict the differences, the Tree Conservation Plan should act as a stand-alone document.

The Greenbelt Station property has a woodland conservation threshold of 14.5 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The plan proposes clearing of 1.64 acres of the existing 1.84 acres of upland woodland. The plan also proposes to clear 8.1 acres of the existing 31.15 acres of wooded floodplain. The minimum woodland conservation requirement for the Greenbelt Station site is 24.25 acres. The plan proposes to meet the minimum woodland conservation requirement by providing 0.2 acre of on-site preservation, 7.45 acres of on-site planting within the 100-year floodplain where woodland does not currently exist, and planting 17.4 acres on the adjacent State of Maryland property, for a total of 25.05 acres.

The State of Maryland property has a woodland threshold of 30.96 acres (100 percent of the existing woodland). The plan proposes clearing 2.9 acres of woodland in order to lower the land elevation and provide floodplain storage. This area will be replanted after grading to retain no net loss of woodland area on the site. A 4.15-acre area, presently a mound of concrete rubble, will be regraded and planted with woodland. Two existing sediment basins, comprising 13.25 acres of manmade emergent wetland, will be regraded and planted with trees to provide a forested wetland. The worksheet for the State of Maryland property contains some erroneous information and is not complete. This worksheet must be reviewed and certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources.

*Recommended Action: Because the plan compensates for all woodland impacts on-site, staff recommends approval of TCPI/27/00 , subject to conditions 5-11 in the Recommendation section:*

*Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the Tree Conservation Plan*

*must be revised to include a legend differentiating between the limits of vegetation and the limits of woodland.*

*Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the Tree Conservation Plan must be certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources or any other representative designated by the State of Maryland.*

- b. The site contains significant natural features, which are required to be protected under Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations. The 100-year floodplain as shown on the plan meets the requirements. The wetlands delineation had been previously examined in the field and determined to be correct.

*Recommended Condition: At time of final plat, a Conservation Easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The Conservation Easement shall contain all 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, wetlands and wetland buffers except for approved variation requests, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The following note shall be placed on the plat:*

*A Conservation Easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation is prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is permitted."*

- c. The plan proposes impacts to stream buffers and wetland buffers. Impacts to these buffers are prohibited by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the Planning Board grants a variation to the Subdivision Regulation in accordance with Section 24-113. The approval of a conceptual impact as part of CSP-01008 by the Planning Board or District Council does not relieve the applicant of the need to obtain a variation from the Subdivision Regulations.

*Recommended Condition: At least 30 days prior to any scheduled Planning Board hearing for the Preliminary Plan, a variation request in conformance with Section 24-113 shall be submitted for each individual impact to streams, stream buffers, wetlands, or wetland buffers.*

*Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of any permit which proposes impacts to wetlands or wetland buffers or Waters of the United States, the applicant will furnish the Environmental Planning Section a copy of the approved federal and/or state permits.*

- d. A State endangered wildflower, Trailing Stichwort (*Stellaria alsine*), is known to occur on the site. Habitats of Rare/Threatened/Endangered

Species should be evaluated as part of the TCP. The location of the population is not known to staff of the Environmental Planning Section.

*Discussion: The Maryland Endangered Species Act requires review of all state permits by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). MDNR must issue a finding of no significant impact before the permit may be released by any state agency. As in prior cases, the Environmental Planning Section will coordinate with the applicant and MDNR during the state permit review process.*

- e. Some soils may pose problems for development. The site contains much reworked material from sand and gravel mining. Carefully engineered materials will be needed for most of the proposed development.

*Recommended Condition: As part of the Detailed Site Plan submission, the applicant shall submit a soils report. The report shall include a map with locations of boreholes and the boreholes logs. Problem soil areas shall be shown on a plan map and, when appropriate, with cross-sections. The report shall indicate proposed mitigation measures.*

- f. There are noise impacts associated with this property from both the Metro line and the Capital Beltway. Both CB-47-2000 and the Greenbelt Metro Sector Plan indicate a desire to provide a residential component in the development of this site. New noise generated by future activities on-site are overshadowed by the existing noise generated by traffic on the Beltway and the Metro.

*Recommended Condition: As part of the Detailed Site Plan submission, the applicant shall submit a Noise Study for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Section. The Noise Study shall measure noise impacts to the site, map the appropriate contours, and address appropriate mitigation measures to achieve acceptable noise levels.*

### Summary

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CSP-01008 and approval of TCP I/27/00, with conditions noted below in the Recommendation section.

- 16. In a memorandum dated July 2, 2001 (Masog to Wagner), the Transportation Planning Section offered the following comments:

The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual site plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 243.01 acres of land in the I-2 Zone. The property is located in an area generally bounded by the Capital Beltway, Cherrywood Lane, Branchville Road, and the CSX/Metrorail tracks. The applicant proposes to develop the property under the

I-2 zoning with up to 5.7 million square feet of commercial, retail, office and residential space in accordance with CB-47-2000 as a Metro Planned Community.

The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated March 2001, and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. Additionally, addenda dated June 1, 2001, detailing a number of additional analyses and June 4, 2001, considering the site without a connection to the U.S. Department of Agriculture site along Sunnyside Avenue (USDA) have been submitted and reviewed. The studies have been referred to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA), and comments from both agencies are attached. It is the transportation staff's understanding that the referral package to the adjacent municipalities included a traffic study. Since that package was sent by Development Review Division staff and not the Transportation Planning Section, transportation-specific comments have not been provided for inclusion in this memorandum. To the extent that transportation staff is aware of the comments given, they are being addressed in this memorandum. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of all materials received and analyses conducted by the staff which are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

#### Summary of Traffic Impact Study

The applicant has prepared a traffic impact study in support of the application using new counts taken in April 2000. The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections:

MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/Greenbelt Road - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/south site access - future signalized intersection  
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp - signalized now and in the future  
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp - signalized now and in the future  
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive - 3-way stop-controlled now and in the future  
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway - stop-controlled now and in the future  
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane - stop-controlled now and in the future  
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane - signalized now and in the future  
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp - signalized now and in the future  
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp - signalized now and in the future  
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access - signalized now and in the future  
MD 201/Ivy Lane - signalized now and in the future

MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue - signalized now and in the future

Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road - future signalized intersection

Beltway Inner Loop On-Ramp/USDA Access Road - future roundabout

Beltway Outer Loop On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway - future signalized intersection

With the development of the subject property, the traffic consultant has determined that adequate transportation facilities in the area can be attained with the construction of ramps to and from the east into the Greenbelt Metro Station, a connection from the site to USDA, and improvements at five other intersections within the study area.

#### Staff Analysis of Traffic Study

Existing conditions in the vicinity of the subject property are summarized in Table 1 (due to the size of the study area and the number of intersections under study, all tables are provided after the text of this memorandum).

A review of background development in the area was conducted by the applicant, and limited background development was identified. The traffic study also includes a growth rate of 1.0 percent per year along the facilities within the study area to account for growth in through traffic. This growth rate is applied to a 5-year, 9-year, and 12-year scenario for background. The background developments are assumed for all three scenarios. The City of Greenbelt noted that development within the Golden Triangle was not included in background. Staff's information indicates that approximately 216,000 square feet of general office space remains in the Golden Triangle, along with 71,000 square feet of retail space within the Greenbelt Triangle. Staff had not focused on development east of MD 201 in scoping this study, but the small amount within this area adjacent to MD 201 should have been considered, and staff has included this site in the analysis of background. Also, staff is not amused to see the office component of Gateway Park analyzed with rates other than those provided under General Office in the Guidelines. This is inconsistent with the analysis done for Gateway Park under Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-97121. Because there are no intersections along US 1 included in the study area for this property, the effect of using these rates is not deemed to be significant but the error is still noted for the record.

The most questionable component within background traffic is the inclusion of the proposed interchange at the Capital Beltway and the Greenbelt Metro Station. Although the Scoping Agreement indicated that this interchange would be considered, it was agreed upon given the possibility that a funding agreement could be achieved prior to a traffic study review. Furthermore, the access roadway to USDA was not recognized or noted in the Scoping Agreement.



While staff understands that this interchange is of great benefit to the subject development, it cannot be a part of background development until it is funded. Also, it is not clear that the new access roadway is environmentally feasible or if the USDA agrees with the concept. Aside from the question of funding, the traffic study clearly has not evaluated the full impact of the addition of new ramps at the subject interchange, along with the addition of an access roadway to the USDA complex along Sunnyside Avenue. In staff=s estimation, the interchange would have the following impacts:

- a. The study correctly reassigns traffic headed to USDA from the east onto the new ramps. Some traffic from the west which currently uses US 1 would probably utilize the existing ramps to use the new access roadway, and should have been added.
- b. There would definitely be traffic to and from the east using the new ramps to gain access to the Greenbelt Metrorail Station, as noted in the traffic study. But with 3,360 parking spaces and parking utilization exceeding 85 percent, the study is not clear how it was determined that 300 vehicles in each peak hour would use the new ramps. Although the number seems low, the supplemental information provided indicates that this estimate was the result of the SHA=s license plate study for the new ramps. Since SHA=s comments have not refuted the use of this number, the transportation staff accepts it.
- c. Currently the existing ramps to and from the Beltway do not allow a connection to Cherrywood Lane. Since the new and existing ramps would be connected into the planned development, which would also be connected to Cherrywood Lane, it is likely that Beltway traffic to existing uses along Cherrywood Lane would also be using the new and existing ramps. This effect is not estimated in the traffic study at all. The current state Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP) includes this interchange as a project planning study, with no funding for construction shown in the current program. The applicant submitted a traffic study addendum which analyzed background for 2005 without the interchange, and this analysis is appropriate in developing a recommendation for this plan. The connector roadway to USDA is not included because it has not been shown that the connector road is environmentally feasible or has some level of support by USDA. Background traffic for the year 2005 is summarized in Table 2.

In considering the impact of the site, staff believes that it is most appropriate to analyze 2005 conditions WITHOUT assuming that the interchange would be constructed. This will establish a level of development which can occur if environmental approval for the new ramps is not granted or if the ramps are not funded for construction

within the near term.

Phase I development as indicated in the initial traffic study would include the following: 250,000 square feet of general office, 850,000 square feet of retail, 775 multifamily residences, and 175 senior housing residences. However, given that staff is considering Phase I to be the quantity of development which can be accommodated without the proposed new ramps, the transportation staff is presenting Phase I as the quantity indicated by the applicant on page 2 of the 6/1/01 addendum. This would include: 180,000 square feet of retail, 550 multifamily residences, and 350 senior housing residences. Staff has the following comments about site trip generation:

- (1) In general, the transportation planning staff recommends that trip rates presented in the *Guidelines* be utilized in traffic studies. There are three exceptions to this practice:
  - (a) The *Guidelines* do not contain rates for the particular use.
  - (b) The staff believes, or the applicant can show, that the rates listed in the *Guidelines* are not representative of the proposal.
  - (c) There is a good reason to utilize other rates.

The traffic study uses rates in the Institute of Transportation Engineers= (ITE) *Trip Generation Manual* to analyze theater, multifamily residential, retail, hotel, and general office uses. Given that four of the five uses have rates listed in the *Guidelines*, the use of the ITE rates should be better justified. As was done for the National Harbor proposal (Conceptual Site Plan SP-98012), staff is approving of the use of ITE rates at the same time that a concurrent environmental study is being conducted, under the presumption that both studies should present the same numbers and that ITE numbers might carry more credibility for a federal review.

- (2) Given the above discussion, it is not at all clear why the applicant opted to analyze the senior housing residences using the traffic consultant=s own study. While the rates assumed appear to be reasonable and consistent with published data, ITE does include trip rates for various types of senior housing and given the above rationale the traffic study should probably have used one of the ITE use categories. Furthermore, the *Guidelines* specifically require that the use of anything besides published

rates be fully documented, and there is no documentation included (even by reference) in the traffic study.

- (3) Attachment C is the initial page of the discussion of trip rates for General Office in the ITE manual. This page includes specific instructions for the use of the published rates, and these instructions have clearly not been followed.
- a. Attention should be given to the two paragraphs in bold. These suggest that the aggregate amount NOT be used; rather, they suggest that either the Office Park category should be used or that trip generation under General Office be calculated for each building separately and then summed. The first method would seem to apply best within an area which is primarily office development. The second method would seem to best apply in cases where office buildings might occur among other uses and the buildings are not interrelated. In all but one case (in nearly 600 observations documented for the General Office and Office Park uses) used in the ITE manual, the quantity proposed by the applicant is outside of the range of data observations. This would suggest that an inaccuracy could be introduced if the data relationship were extrapolated. The trip rates actually used are 30-40 percent less than those shown in the *Guidelines*.
  - b. Even if the ITE rates are used correctly, the office trip generation would be somewhat lower than that which would be computed if the trip rates from the *Guidelines* were used. This reflects that some trips within larger office buildings are internally satisfied; this is not the case for typical office buildings which exist in the county

In the context of this discussion, for the purpose of trip generation the office component within the South Core is analyzed as two equally-sized buildings, and the office component within the North Core is analyzed as eight equally-sized buildings.

The discussion of modal share for the subject site is another matter for discussion. These factors are probably the most controversial factors because they are very speculative for nonexistent development. They are very dependent upon where patrons and residents are going when they enter or leave the site and the quality of transit service versus auto

service along the route. Finally, they are dependent upon the distance from the transit stop and the quality of the intervening walk trip.

There is a tendency for applicants and traffic consultants to choose a nice, round, ambitious number for transit mode share. There is also a tendency for planners to try to bargain over the number without hard facts such as a site plan with a pedestrian system, a trip distribution, and a knowledge of where the adjacent transit services actually go. This is completely misguided. At the same time, there is a need to consider that development near a Metrorail station may behave a little differently than nearby development which is outside walking range to the rail station. There is some room for a prudent consideration of the relationship to Metrorail when making basic assumptions.

Beginning at this point, considerable reference will be made to *Development-Related Ridership Survey II*, prepared for the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority in December 1989 (to be termed the 1989 Ridership Survey). This publication summarizes an extensive survey of residential, retail, office, and hotel uses near Metrorail station. This is done with the purpose of determining how likely persons accessing these land uses are to use Metrorail or other nonauto modes. This publication is the latest such publication done locally, and presumably has not been repeated due to the expense and complexity involved in obtaining and analyzing the data. Given the information presented on the site plan plus data in the 1989 Ridership Survey, staff has the following observations:

**Residential development** The data in the 1989 Ridership Survey indicates that transit mode share very clearly declines from about 70 percent for development about 0.1 miles from a rail station to approximately 25 percent near the half-mile point. Staff measured walk distances from the Greenbelt Metrorail Station to the various housing blocks shown on the conceptual plan, determined average walk distances to each block, and computed an average walk distance for the residential component to be approximately 2,700 feet. This walk distance, according to the data and regression models presented in the 1989 Ridership Survey, would suggest a mode share between 24 and 34 percent not the 60 percent utilized in the traffic study.

Staff approved the 60 percent modal share without benefit of a site plan something that will never happen again. Given the data at hand and the site plan that was submitted, staff cannot justify the use of a modal share any greater than 33.7 percent the result of the second regression model presented on page 102 of the 1989 Ridership Survey. Even this number is not particularly defensible 2,700 feet is beyond the distance of any of

the complexes surveyed in the 1989 document.

**Senior Housing development**CStaff was shocked to see the 60 percent modal share applied to the senior housing component of the site given that this component is placed about 4,500 feet from the Greenbelt Metrorail Station. Given the distance of the senior housing component from Metrorail, staff supports no trip reduction for this use. The low trip rate for the senior housing use presumably includes considerable usage of minibuses or van services by the elderly residents (a fact which would be known for certain had the trip rates been properly documented).

**Retail development**CNo Metrorail reduction was assumed for the retail center in the South Core of the site, and this is reasonable. Concerning the North Core, staff did not believe that the data in the 1989 Ridership Survey was very conclusive about the potential transit mode share for the subject site. Figure 38 of the 1989 Ridership Survey suggested a line which did not appear to fit the graphed data, and the equation itself was not well-explained. Even so, the retail component in the North Core averages about 1,040 feet from Metrorail, and the study assumes a modal share of 15 percent. This figure is well within the observed data documented in the study, and could be higher depending upon the mix of retail which is constructed. Therefore, staff concludes that the transit mode shares used for retail in the South and North Cores are reasonable.

**Office development**CThe average walking distance to proposed office development in this site is about 1,400 feet. Staff recently did an analysis for a large office component planned near the Branch Avenue Metrorail station (as a part of Conceptual Site Plans SP-01015 and SP-01016), and considered potential modal shares along the various elements of the trip distribution. The area was only served by the Metrorail Green Line and Metrobus; however, staff justified a modal share of 20.5 percent when given a similar walk distance.

Without embarking on an extensive analysis, the following should be noted:

- (1) Both Greenbelt and Branch Avenue are at the end of Metrorail lines.
- (2) Both stations have a similar quality of Metrobus and Metrorail service.
- (3) Greenbelt has the added attractiveness of Maryland Rail Commuter (MARC) service and other local bus services.

Given that Greenbelt has slightly better transit service in comparison to Branch Avenue, and given that the walk distances from the stations to the

office space are similar in each case, staff believes that a 20 percent transit modal share for the office uses is reasonable.

**Hotel development** CThe 1989 Ridership Survey suggests two equations to estimate modal shareCone a straight-line relationship and one an exponential relationshipCto estimate modal shares of 24.5 and 15.5 percent for hotel development having an average walk distance of 1,240 feet. In the context of those estimates, the 20 percent modal share which was used in the traffic study appears to be very reasonable.

**Internal trip satisfaction** CWhere different land uses exist within a common site, some vehicle trips which would ordinarily be expected to utilize area roadways to travel to other nearby or faraway uses for various purposes would instead remain within the site. Such trips WITHIN a site might be made by auto, but can commonly be made by walking or a similar nonauto mode. When trips are made within a site, the effect is termed internal trip satisfaction. The *Guidelines* do allow assumptions of internal trip satisfaction, and staff is surprised that no discussion of such was included in the traffic study. Given that staff has identified two significant issues with the site trip generation utilized (the general office trip rates and the modal share for the residential component), it is very possible that factoring internal trip satisfaction could bring site trip generation down to a level consistent with the traffic study. But that factor must be explored further by the applicant.

**Summary** CThe estimated trip reduction for the site, given the extensive discussions above, is summarized in Table 3 at the end of this memorandum. As noted earlier, the phasing plan suggested by the traffic study poses significant concerns because it is not at all clear yet that some of the transportation improvements needed to serve the traffic study phasing plan can be built. Staff prefers that the material and impacts be reviewed in the context of the following staging, with trip generation taken from Table 3:

**Phase I - Year 2005 - Existing Beltway Interchange and No Connection to USDA  
Site Trip Generation**

Use	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Office - 0 square feet</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Retail (North Core) - 0 square feet</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Retail (South Core) - 180,000 square feet</b>	103	67	170	289	313	602
<b>Hotel - 0 rooms</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Multi-Family Residences - 550 units</b>	29	153	182	139	69	208
<b>Senior Housing - 350 units</b>	25	35	60	74	49	123
<b>Total Net Auto Trips</b>	157	255	412	502	431	933

**Phase II - Year 2009 - Reconfigured Beltway Interchange and No Connection to USDA  
Site Trip Generation**

Use	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Office - 1,140,000 square feet</b>	1319	180	1499	246	1201	1447
<b>Retail (North Core) - 1,200,000 square feet</b>	342	219	561	1253	1358	2611
<b>Retail (South Core) - 180,000 square feet</b>	103	67	170	289	313	602
<b>Hotel - 250 rooms</b>	78	56	134	70	72	142
<b>Multi-Family Residences - 1,310 units</b>	70	365	435	331	164	495
<b>Senior Housing - 350 units</b>	25	35	60	74	49	123
<b>Total Net Auto Trips</b>	1937	922	2859	2263	3157	5420

**Phase III - Year 2012 - Reconfigured Beltway Interchange and Connection to USDA  
Site Trip Generation**

Use	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		

	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Office - 1,860,000 square feet</b>	2126	290	2416	391	1910	2301
<b>Retail (North Core) - 1,400,000 square feet</b>	399	255	654	1462	1584	3046
<b>Retail (South Core) - 180,000 square feet</b>	103	67	170	289	313	602
<b>Hotel - 550 rooms</b>	172	123	295	154	158	312
<b>Multi-Family Residences - 1,310 units</b>	70	365	435	331	164	495
<b>Senior Housing - 350 units</b>	25	35	60	74	49	123
<b>Total Net Auto Trips</b>	2895	1135	4030	2701	4178	6879

*Traffic Impacts: Phase I:* Table 4 shows the traffic impacts of Phase I development without improvements to the adjacent roadway network. The exception is that the South Core of the site would be connected to MD 193 via a new intersection between 58<sup>th</sup> Street and the Metrorail tracks. As noted earlier, the phasing plan suggested by the traffic study poses significant concerns because it is not at all clear yet that some of the transportation improvements needed to serve the traffic study phasing plan can be built. Staff prefers that the material and impacts be reviewed as follows:

Phase I CY 2005 Existing Beltway Interchange and No Connection to USDA  
Phase II CY 2009 Modified Beltway Interchange and No Connection to USDA  
Phase III CY 2012 Modified Beltway Interchange with Connection to USDA

With proposed Phase I development and roadway network, as analyzed by staff, four intersections in the study area would operate unacceptably in at least one peak hour. With improvements which have been proffered by the applicant, the following service levels are obtained:

MD 193/Rhode Island: AM - LOS D, CLV of 1,325. PM - LOS D, CLV of 1,313.  
MD 193/Greenbelt Road: AM - LOS A, CLV of 834. PM - LOS D, CLV of 1,324.  
MD 193/Cherrywood: AM - LOS C, CLV of 1,229. PM - LOS C, CLV of 1,217.  
MD 201/Cherrywood: AM - LOS B, CLV of 1,034. PM - LOS C, CLV of 1,177.  
MD 201/Sunnyside: AM - LOS B, CLV of 1,085. PM - LOS C, CLV of 1,159.

Under Phase I traffic, both the Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway and the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersections operate unacceptably as unsignalized intersections. The Prince George's County Planning Board, in the



*Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, has defined vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds as an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has often imposed a condition to perform a traffic signal warrant study in similar circumstances. Both intersections should be studied for signal warrants as a part of Phase I.

With all proffered improvements at these locations in place, Phase I can be constructed without modifications to the Beltway interchange or any connection to USDA but with all intersections in the area operating adequately.

*Traffic Impacts: Phase II:* Table 5 shows the traffic impacts of Phase II development. This is analyzed WITH improvements which would be constructed as a part of Phase I. The analysis also includes proposed ramps to the Capital Beltway which would allow traffic to directly access the subject property to and from the east.

With proposed Phases I and II development and roadway network, as analyzed by staff, one intersection in the study area would operate unacceptably in at least one peak hour. With improvements which have been proffered by the applicant, the following service levels are obtained:

MD 193/site access: AM - LOS D, CLV of 1,328. PM - LOS D, CLV of 1,376.

Under Phase II traffic, the Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane intersection operates unacceptably as an unsignalized intersection. The Prince George's County Planning Board, in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, has defined vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds as an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has often imposed a condition to perform a traffic signal warrant study in similar circumstances. This intersection should be studied for signal warrants as a part of Phase II.

With all proffered improvements at these locations in place, Phases I and II can be constructed AS LONG AS modifications to the Beltway interchange are in place but WITHOUT any connection to USDA. In this circumstance, once again, all intersections in the area would operate adequately.

*Traffic Impacts: Phase III:* Table 6 shows the traffic impacts of Phase III development. This is analyzed WITH improvements which would be constructed as a part of Phases I and II. The analysis also includes proposed ramps to the Capital Beltway which would allow traffic to directly access the subject property to and from the east. Finally, this phase also includes a connection from the

subject property to the north which would allow access to the USDA and to Sunnyside Avenue.

With proposed Phases I, II and III development and roadway network, as analyzed by staff, one intersection in the study area would operate unacceptably in at least one peak hour. Staff identified a need for a double left-turn lane on the eastbound approach to the intersection. With this additional improvement which would be the responsibility of the applicant, the following service levels are obtained:

MD 193/site access: AM - LOS D, CLV of 1,331. PM - LOS D, CLV of 1,402.

With all proffered improvements at all critical locations in place, Phases I, II and III can be constructed AS LONG AS modifications to the Beltway interchange are in place ALONG WITH a connection to USDA. In addition to these two large items and the proffered improvements, an additional improvement at the site access along MD 193 would be needed. In this circumstance, all intersections in the area would operate adequately.

The transportation staff has done its best to revise the analyses for the subject property utilizing the comments of all reviewing agencies and best judgement. In a project of this complexity, comments which arise during review are also very complex. In most cases, staff would discuss how the various comments were addressed by the review. Due to the sheer length of the discussions needed to cover all issues, the transportation planning staff will attach all information received and allow its own review to stand alone and presumably to speak for itself.

#### Plan Comments

MD 193 is a master plan arterial facility, and Cherrywood Lane is a planned collector facility. Both facilities are currently built to their functional recommendations. The Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan, which is currently a document which is adopted by the Planning Board but not yet approved by the District Council, recommends a north-south collector through the subject property and an east-west collector linking this new roadway to Breezewood Drive. Although the transportation staff supports both roadways, the environmental impact of the Breezewood Drive connector may be too great to allow conventional construction. Furthermore, much of this proposed roadway crosses land which will be held by the State of Maryland as an environmental preserve. The sector plan text appears to place a greater emphasis on providing a bicycle and pedestrian connection along this route, and the transportation planning staff supports this strategy.

The north-south connector roadway should have a right-of-way of no less than 80

feet with sidewalks on both sides along its entire length. In general, the transportation staff recommends sidewalks along both sides of all roadways within the planCboth public and private roadwaysCbut will consider the elimination of sidewalks along one side of a given roadway at the time of Detailed Site Plan in cases where specific land uses or environmental features might preclude the desirability of a sidewalk.

A high-quality pedestrian network is very important to achieving the levels of transit ridership appropriate for this location. Future Detailed Site Plans should give full consideration to the provision of extensive nonvehicular amenities and design features. The following should be considered:

- a. Providing direct pedestrian connections between land uses and the Metrorail station rather than circuitous ones.
- b. Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting related parking facilities farther away.
- c. Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.
- d. Providing a direct pedestrian/bicycle link between the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection, the North Core area, and the Metrorail station.

#### Findings and Recommendations

This property is proposed for development as a Metro Planned Community under CB-47-2000. This bill requires that the applicant demonstrate that adequate transportation facilities will be available within a reasonable period of time at the time of Conceptual Site Plan. Based on the preceding findings and analyses and the phasing plan developed by staff, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would be available within a reasonable period of time if the application is approved with conditions one through four below.

†\*At the Planning Board hearing on September 15, 2005, the applicant proffered new conditions 37 and 38 for the reconsideration of Greenbelt Station, in the Recommendation Section to further address issues related to adequate transportation facilities.

†\*Denotes Amendment

\*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets } indicate deleted language

----- TABLE 1 -----				
EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,535	1,298	E	C
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	950	1,349	A	D
MD 193/south site access	planned			
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,156	1,145	C	C
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,310	1,323	D	D
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	924	901	A	A
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	559	926	A	A
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	708	777	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	44.8*	18.4*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway	33.3*	56.3*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	19.9*	18.4*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,218	1,467	C	E
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,076	934	B	A
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	986	903	A	A

MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,034	923	B	A
MD 201/Ivy Lane	807	801	A	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,387	1,411	D	D
Beltway Northbound Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Southbound On-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Northbound On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway	planned			
<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 <i>Guidelines</i>, an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.</p>				

----- TABLE 2 -----				
BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - 2005				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,592	1,377	E	D
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	1,036	1,434	B	D
MD 193/south site access	planned			
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,208	1,203	C	C
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,362	1,379	D	D
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,078	1,058	B	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	591	1,013	A	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	750	932	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	88.7*	26.9*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway	37.9*	61.7*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	48.0*	27.2*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,293	1,684	C	F
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,300	1,118	C	B
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,193	1,113	C	B
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,299	1,031	C	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,144	927	B	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,596	1,557	E	E
Beltway Northbound Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Southbound On-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Northbound On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway	planned			
*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 <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range				

of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.

### TABLE 3 - SITE TRIP GENERATION

Use	Modal Share	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
		In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b>Office</b>							
1,860,000 sq. ft. general office		2657	363	3020	489	2388	2877
Less Metro trips	20%	-531	-73	-604	-98	-478	-576
Net Auto Trips		2126	290	2416	391	1910	2301
<hr/>							
<b>Retail (North Core)</b>							
1,400,000 sq. ft. retail		470	300	770	1720	1864	3584
Less Pass-By trips	0%	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
Less Metro trips	15%	-71	-45	-116	-258	-280	-538
Net Auto Trips		399	255	654	1462	1584	3046
<hr/>							
<b>Retail (South Core)</b>							
180,000 sq. ft. retail		138	89	227	444	482	926
Less Pass-By trips	35%	-35	-22	-57	-155	-169	-324
Less Metro trips	0%	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
Net Auto Trips		103	67	170	289	313	602
<hr/>							
<b>Hotel</b>							
550 rooms		215	154	369	193	198	391
Less Metro trips	20%	-43	-31	-74	-39	-40	-79
Net Auto Trips		172	123	295	154	158	312

## Multi-Family Residences



1,310 units		105	550	655	499	248	747
Less Metro trips	33.7%	-35	-185	-220	-168	-84	-252
Net Auto Trips		70	365	435	331	164	495

#### Senior Housing

350 units		25	35	60	74	49	123
Less Metro trips	0%	0	0	0	0	0	0
Net Auto Trips		25	35	60	74	49	123
<b>Total Net Auto Trips</b>		<b>2895</b>	<b>1135</b>	<b>4030</b>	<b>2701</b>	<b>4178</b>	<b>6879</b>

----- TABLE 4 -----				
TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - 2005 - PHASE I DEVELOPMENT				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,641	1,456	F	E
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	1,084	1,546	B	E
MD 193/south site access	1,212	1,290	C	C
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,244	1,298	C	C
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,423	1,552	D	E
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,093	1,090	B	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	605	1,063	A	B
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	765	932	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	95.4*	29.3*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway	44.6*	69.0*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	55.3*	32.7*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,329	1,740	D	F
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,311	1,118	C	B

MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,193	1,143	C	B
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,302	1,031	C	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,147	935	B	A
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,616	1,613	F	F
Beltway Northbound Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Southbound On-Ramp/USDA Access Road	planned			
Beltway Northbound On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway	planned			
<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 <i>Guidelines</i>, an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.</p>				

----- TABLE 5 -----				
TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - 2009 - PHASE II DEVELOPMENT				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,352	1,346	D	D
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	884	1,415	A	D
MD 193/south site access	1,386	1,640	D	F
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,350	1,412	D	D
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,318	1,291	D	C
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,220	1,204	C	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	689	1,187	A	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	857	970	A	A
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	93.2*	27.4*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway	31.8*	50.2*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	51.1*	33.3*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,135	1,413	B	D
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,352	1,163	D	C
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,241	1,157	C	C
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,417	1,100	D	B
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,194	1,019	C	B
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,216	1,287	C	C
Beltway Northbound Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road	376	362	A	A
Beltway Southbound On-Ramp/USDA Access Road	10.7*	11.3*	--	--
Beltway Northbound On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway	675	987	A	A
*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 <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range				

of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.

----- TABLE 6 -----				
TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS - 2012 - PHASE III DEVELOPMENT				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue	1,379	1,385	D	D
MD 193/Greenbelt Road	948	1,445	A	D
MD 193/south site access	1,464	1,506	E	E
MD 193/Branchville Road/58th Street	1,400	1,450	D	D
MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street	1,394	1,371	D	D
MD 193/MD 201 Southbound Ramps	1,305	1,275	D	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound Off-Ramp	742	1,224	A	C
MD 193/MD 201 Northbound On-Ramp	921	1,040	A	B
Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive	91.0*	25.5*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway	28.3*	58.8*	--	--
Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane	50.1*	34.6*	--	--
MD 201/Cherrywood Lane	1,109	1,290	B	C
MD 201/Beltway Inner Loop Off-Ramp	1,393	1,198	D	C
MD 201/Beltway Outer Loop Off-Ramp	1,278	1,193	C	C
MD 201/Crescent Road/SHA Access	1,448	1,164	D	C
MD 201/Ivy Lane	1,222	1,062	C	B
MD 201/Sunnyside Avenue	1,253	1,445	C	D
Beltway Northbound Off-Ramp/USDA Access Road	1,306	1,166	D	C
Beltway Southbound On-Ramp/USDA Access Road	10.7*	11.5*	--	--
Beltway Northbound On-Ramp/Metro Access Roadway	596	923	A	A
*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 <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay				

exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.

17. In a memorandum dated June 26, 2001 (Williams to Wagner), the Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section of the Countywide Planning Division offered the following comments with regard to fire, rescue and public schools:

#### **FIRE SERVICE**

The existing fire engine service at Branchville Fire Station, Company 11, located at 4905 Branchville Road, has a service response time of 2.18 minutes, which is within the 3.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ambulance service at Berwyn Heights Fire Station, Company 14, located at 8811 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue, has a service response time of 1.14 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing paramedic service at College Park Fire Station, Company 12, located at 8115 Baltimore Avenue has a service response time of 3.41 minutes, which is within the 7.25-minute response time guideline.

The existing ladder truck service at Berwyn Heights Fire Station, Company 14, located at 8811 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue, has a service response time of 1.14 minutes, which is within the 4.25-minute response time guideline.

These findings are in conformance with the *Adopted and Approved Public Safety Master Plan 1990* and the *Guidelines for the Analysis of Development Impact on Fire and Rescue Facilities*.

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

#### **POLICE SERVICE**

The proposed site is within the service area of District ICHyattsville. The staff conclude that the existing county's police facilities will be adequate to serve the proposed Greenbelt Station development.

#### **PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

South and North Cores (Parcels A , B, E and parts of F)

Retail and office on Parcels A and the senior residential on Parcel B of the South Core; the office and hotel on Parcel E and the office, retail, and hotel on Parcel F of the North Core development are exempt from the public school adequate public facilities test.  
South and North Cores (Parcels C , D, parts of F)

The Growth Policy and Public Facilities Planning Section has reviewed the plans for adequacy of public facilities in accordance with Sections 27-107.01 and 27-475.06.03 of the Zoning Ordinance and the *Regulations to Analyze the Development Impact on Public School Facilities* (revised January 2001) (CR-4-1998).

Section 27-475.06.03 (b) (2) (F) states in addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that Section 27-475.06.03(b)(2)(F)(viii) unless a finding of adequacy was made at the time of preliminary plat approval, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, U.S. Department of Transportation and/or Federal Highway Administration Program, or to be provided by the applicant.

### **School Findings**

Using the low end of the range, as is shown on 4-01026, for the total number of units projected by the applicant, staff conclude the following with regard to the nonsenior residential development in the South and North Cores, Parcels C, D, and F.

**Projected Impact on Affected Public Schools**

Affected School Name	D.U. by Type	Pupil Yield Factor	Development Pupil Yield	5-Year Projection	Adjusted Enrollment	Total Projected Enrollment	State Rated Capacity	Projected % Capacity
Springhill Lake Elementary School	1310 mfd	0.24	314.40	846	0	1160.40	709	163.67%
Greenbelt Middle School	1310 mfd	0.06	78.60	694	0	772.60	802	96.33%
Eleanor Roosevelt High School	1310 mfd	0.12	157.20	2715	0	2872.20	2291	125.37%

Source: Prince George's County Planning Department, M-NCPPC, January 2001.								

Since the affected Springhill Lake Elementary and Eleanor Roosevelt High Schools projected percentage of capacities are greater than 105 percent, the Adequate Public Facilities fee is \$3,360.00 per dwelling unit.

In the *Regulations to Analyze the Development Impact on Public School Facilities* (revised January 2001) (CR-4-1998) it is stated that if any affected elementary school, middle school or high school is greater than 130 percent of capacity, the Planning Board may make a finding of adequate public facilities with the payment of a fee based on the pupil yield factor, type of school and the number of students generated by the proposed subdivision, and no permits may be issued for the development until capacity is equal to or less than 130 percent in all the affected school(s) or four years have elapsed since the time of the approval of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision.

18. In a memorandum dated May 2, 2001 (Chang to Wagner), the Community Planning Division offered the following comments:

The proposed Metro Planned Community development will not impair the integrity of the 1989 *Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan*. However, the site plan contains an error in noting that the entirety of the subject property is currently zoned I-2. In fact, a narrow strip (150 feet X 2,100 feet) of land along the east side of the Greenbelt Metro Station platform is currently zoned R-P-C/R-R (Planned Community/ Rural Residential) rather than I-2 as shown in the Conceptual Site Plan. It should be noted that other comments included in the Planning Issues section are provided for information only since the *Adopted Greenbelt Metro Sector Plan* is pending the District Council's approval in October 2001.

#### MASTER PLAN AND SMA

##### Master Plans:

The 1990 *Approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan (Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67)*.

\$ Planning Area/Community: Planning Area 67, Greenbelt Community.

\$ Land Use Recommendation: Transit station and mixed-use development.

\$ Environmental: The Plan Map (1"=1,000') shows that extensive floodplains



exist on the site. The Environmental Features Map also shows extensive environmentally sensitive features on the site, including 100-year floodplain, woodland and soils with limitation for community development.

- \$ Historic Resources: There is no historic site or resource on the subject site. However, two historic communities or survey areas are located in the vicinity. These are Daniels Park and Charlton Heights/Berwyn Heights and the Greenbelt Middle School which is included in the Greenbelt Historic District. The Beaverdam Creek bridge at the intersection of Edmonston Road and Beaverdam Creek is a historic resource.
- \$ Transportation: The master plan recommends that Cherrywood Lane (C-107) from Greenbelt Road to Kenilworth Avenue Extended (MD 201) be retained in its current collector road profile. The plan also recommends that Greenbelt Road (MD 193) be retained in its current profile as an arterial road.
- \$ Parks and Trails: The master plan recommends hiker-biker trails along Indian Creek and the west side of Cherrywood Lane.

The 1990 *Adopted Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Sectional Map Amendment* retained the I-2, and R-P-C/R-R Zones for the subject site.

The 2000 *Adopted Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan and Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment*

- \$ The *Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* were adopted and endorsed by the Planning Board in December 2000 and are now pending final approval by the District Council in October 2001. The following section is provided for information only. However, the recommendations excerpted from the sector plan and SMA should be considered as the Planning Board's advisory policies.
- \$ Planning Area/Community: Part of Planning Area 67, Greenbelt Community.
- \$ Land Use Recommendation: The sector plan recommends a mixed-use development in the previously developed or disturbed areas of the subject site and a recreational and open space destination in the central portion of the site.
- \$ Environmental: The sector plan recommends an Environmental Envelope which consists of four areas: 1) Preservation Area, 2) Preservation and Conservation Management Area, 3) Conservation Area, and 4) Restoration Area. The general definition of the four areas is as follows:
  - (1) Preservation Area: Where little or no disturbance is permitted to

preserve the area=s most environmentally sensitive features.

- (2) Preservation and Conservation Management Area: Where little or no disturbance is permitted to preserve the most environmentally sensitive features, but allows passive recreation activities such as perimeter trails and interpretive stations and for appreciation of the area=s unique environmental features.
- (3) Conservation Area: Protects environmental features allowing certain types of disturbance, such as active and passive recreation, transit activities, public gathering spaces and interpretive facilities.
- (4) Restoration Area: Restores or improves degraded stream sections, dumping sites, and stream fish blockages.

\$ Historic Resources: The sector plan indicates that a significant archaeological resource site was recently discovered at the Metro Service and Inspection Yard just north of the subject property. A symbol of possible archaeological resources was placed on the Sector Plan Cultural Resources Map on page 80 of the sector plan. The plan recommends preserving the historic and cultural heritage of the sector plan area.

\$ Transportation: The sector plan recommends access improvement at the Greenbelt Metro Station to and from the Capital Beltway. The plan recommends a north-south connector road between the two proposed mixed-use centersCthe WMATA property and the Smith property. The plan recommends that an integrated package of alternatives to single-occupant vehicle (SOV) travel be implemented in proportion to development approved for the sector plan area, particularly in the Core Area. The package should feature integrated rail and bus services to be used as the principal means of access to development in the Core Area.

\$ Parks and Trails: The plan recommends that a stream valley park be located in the midst of the subject site through public purchase or mandatory dedication of parkland by developers during development. The plan recommends bicycle and pedestrian linkages from the subject site to Springhill Lake and North College Park and the USDA/BARC office complex.

The *Endorsed Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area* recommends that the subject property and its surrounding properties be rezoned from the R-R, R-P-C/R-R, I-1, and I-2 Zones to the M-X-T and the Development District Overlay (DDO) Zones. New development or redevelopment within the Development District Overlay Zone must be in compliance with applicable Development District Standards, except for certain exemptions.

## PLANNING ISSUES

- a. The Conceptual Site Plan erroneously identifies the I-2 Zone as covering the entire subject property. A narrow strip (150 feet X 2,100 feet) of land along the east side of the Greenbelt Metro Station platform is, in fact, currently zoned R-P-C (Planned Community) and R-R (Rural Residential). The R-P-C and R-R Zones for the subject property were adopted on June 5, 1957.
- b. Parcels E and D are located in the Conservation Area of the Environmental Envelope defined by the sector plan as follows:

A Conservation Area is established to protect environmental features in a multiple use situation, allowing certain types of disturbance, such as active and passive recreation, transit activities, public gathering spaces and interpretive facilities and nonmotorized commuter facilities. However, active recreational uses should not be allowed for the WMATA wetland mitigation area. @

- c. The Conceptual Site Plan proposes residential and office/motel uses for these two parcels. It should be noted that these two parcels are located within a man-made wetland mitigation area. However, the vegetation for creating a wetland planted in the area did not grow. The environmental envelope delineated by the adopted sector plan is designed to allow flexibility. The exact boundary of the environmental envelope can only be determined by site inspection, inventory and surveying during the development application stage.
- . The Conceptual Site Plan=s mixed-use components are generally consistent with the standards recommended in the adopted sector plan, except the minimum percentage of residential recommended by the sector plan. The following chart compares the applicant=s proposal and the adopted sector plan recommendations.

Mixed-Use Components	Adopted Sector Plan	Applicant=s Proposal**
Land Use Category	Minimum Percentage and Maximum Percentage of Mixed-Use Development in the North Core and South Core*	Mixed-Use Development in the North Core and South Core *
Retail Commercial, Entertainment, Hotel	30% (minimum) 60% (maximum)	36% (low) 37% (high)
Office Commercial	10% (minimum) 40% (maximum)	35% (low) 35% (high)
Residential	30% (minimum) 60% (maximum)	28% (low) 29% (high)

\* The percentage listed in the chart represent the proportion of the floor area in that category of land use to the development=s total floor area.

\*\* The applicant presents a floor area range for each component. Staff calculated the high and the low figures for each range.

It is recommended that the applicant consider slightly increasing the dwelling units in the residential component.

- d. The Conceptual Site Plan is in compliance with the pedestrian and bicycle network recommended in the adopted plan except (1) it fails to show an entryway (or add an arrow symbol) for a future pedestrian bridge crossing the Metro/CSX railroad tracks near the Board of Education property, and (2) it fails to identify a gateway at the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection and show a wide promenade (or add a distinct walkway symbol) between this intersection and the mixed-use center on Parcel F.
  - e. The Conceptual Site Plan is in compliance with the proposed roadways recommended by the adopted sector plan except for a connection between Breezewood Drive and the north-south connector road, which is recommended in the sector plan to relieve traffic on Cherrywood Lane destined for the southern section of the Core Area.
19. In a memorandum dated May 21, 2001 (Asan to Wagner), the Park Planning and Development Division recommended that the development be provided with private recreational facilities.

The Urban Design Section has determined that, based on 1,800 dwelling units for the project

(the mid-point between the maximum and minimum projected dwelling units), utilizing the \* Formula for Determining the Value of Recreational Facilities, the amount of recreational facilities that should be provided should be a minimum of \$1,100,000.00. Facilities such as tennis courts, ballfields, picnic areas, sitting areas, play areas, multipurpose courts, trails, fitness stations and swimming pools should be provided. A private neighborhood park should be provided in the South Core area that should include, at a minimum, four tennis courts, one soccer field, one softball field and one baseball field, or other facilities such as a community building with bathhouse and swimming pool. The location of all recreational facilities should be provided at the time of the first Detailed Site Plan.

20. The Prince George=s County Department of Environment Resources has approved a Stormwater Management Concept Plan, case number 2657-2001-00, dated June 7, 2001, and subject to 11 conditions.
21. The Town of New Carrollton has not submitted comments.
22. In a letter dated July 3, 2001 (Mayor Davis to Elizabeth Hewlett), the City of Greenbelt opposes the Conceptual Site Plan.
23. In a letter dated July 11, 2001 (Terry Schum to Elizabeth Hewlett), The City of College Park recommends approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, subject to conditions that have been incorporated into the Recommendation Section below:
- \*24. In a letter dated July 25, 2001 (Mayor Gaines to Elizabeth Hewlett), the Town of Berwyn Heights indicated their concern for the level of density proposed by the development and its impact to area schools, the police force, area road ways and other public facilities. The Town also desires that every possible effort be made to protect their community from stormwater damage and to further protect Indian Creek from further degradation\*

\*Denotes correction  
Underlining denotes addition

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 APPROVED the Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/27/00) and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 1,660 residences, of which no fewer than 350 shall be senior housing residences; 1,580,000 Gross Leasable Area (GLA) of retail space; 1,860,000 square feet of general office space; and 550 hotel rooms; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (4,030 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 6,879 PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development.
2. Development of this site shall be developed as phases within the context of planned transportation improvements. All planned transportation improvements may be funded by the applicant or by others. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property during the given phase, the following road improvements associated with the phase shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency=s access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:
  - a. Phase I: Limited to 900 residences, of which no fewer than 350 shall be senior housing residences, and 180,000 square feet of retail space; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (412 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 933 PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development. Transportation improvements:
    - (1) MD 193/Rhode Island Avenue: Construct a second left-turn lane along the southbound Rhode Island Avenue approach. Construct a third westbound through lane beginning east of the intersection and extending west to the northbound US 1 ramp. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
    - (2) MD 193/Greenbelt Road: Construct a second left-turn lane along the westbound MD 193 approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
    - (3) MD 193/Cherrywood Lane/60th Street: Convert the existing right-turn lane to a free-flowing right-turn lane along the southbound Cherrywood Lane approach. Construct a second left-turn lane along the eastbound MD 193 approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
    - (4) MD 201/Cherrywood Lane: Construct a second northbound through lane along MD 201. Construct a second left-turn lane along the eastbound Cherrywood Lane approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
    - (5) Cherrywood Lane/Metro Access Roadway: Prior to the approval of the detailed site plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency(ies)

at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.

- (6) Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive: Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency(ies) at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.
  - (7) MD 193/site access: Construct this access point to SHA standards as a signalized intersection, with separate outbound right-turn and left-turn lanes and exclusive left-turn and right-turn lanes into the site.
- b. Phase II: Limited to 1,660 residences, of which no fewer than 350 shall be senior housing residences, 1,380,000 square feet of retail space, 1,140,000 square feet of general office space, and 250 hotel rooms; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (2,859 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 5,420 PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development. Transportation improvements:
  - (1) MD 193/site access: Construct a second left-turn lane along the southbound site access approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
  - (2) Cherrywood Lane/Ivy Lane: Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan for portions of the subject property under Phase II, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the appropriate operating agency(ies) at this location. If deemed warranted by the responsible agency, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.
  - (3) Provide a new ramp into the site from northbound I-95/I-495 and a new ramp from the site onto southbound I-95/I-495.
- c. Phase III: Limited to 1,660 residences, of which no fewer than 350 shall be senior housing residences, 1,580,000 square feet of retail space, 1,860,000 square feet of general office space, and 550 hotel rooms; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (4,030 AM peak hour vehicle trips and 6,879 PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development. Transportation improvements:

- (1) MD 193/site access: Construct a second left-turn lane along the eastbound MD 193 approach. Modify signals and pavement markings as needed.
  - (2) Provide a connection between the subject property, the USDA facility, and Sunnyside Avenue, or other improvement(s) that create equivalent capacity.
3. The north-south connector roadway shall have a right-of-way of no less than 80 feet with sidewalks on both sides from the Metro Station to Greenbelt Road.
4. Future Detailed Site Plans shall give full consideration to the provision of extensive non-vehicular amenities and design features. The following should be considered: (a) providing pedestrian connections between land uses and the Metrorail station that are as direct as feasible; (b) siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting related parking facilities farther away; (c) placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network; and (d) providing a pedestrian/bicycle link between the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection, the north core area, and the Metrorail station that are as direct as feasible.
5. At time of final plat, a Conservation Easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The Conservation Easement shall contain all 100-year floodplain, stream buffers, wetlands and wetland buffers except for approved variation requests, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to final plat approval. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

A Conservation Easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation is prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is permitted. @
6. At least 30 days prior to any scheduled Planning Board Hearing for the Preliminary Plan, a variation request in conformance with Section 24-113 shall be submitted for each individual impact to streams, stream buffers, wetlands, or wetland buffers.
7. Prior to the issuance of any permit which proposes to impact wetlands or wetland buffers or Water of the United States, the applicant shall furnish the Environmental Planning Section a copy of the approved Federal and/or State permits.
8. As part of the Detailed Site Plan submission, the applicant shall submit a soils report. The report shall include a map with locations of boreholes and the boreholes logs. Problem soil areas shall be shown on a plan map and, when appropriate, with cross-sections. The report shall indicate proposed mitigation measures.



9. As part of every Detailed Site Plan submission, the applicant shall submit a Noise Study for review and approval by the Environmental Planning Section. The Noise Study shall measure noise impacts to the site, map the appropriate contours, and address appropriate mitigation measures to achieve acceptable noise levels.
10. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the Tree Conservation Plan shall be revised to include a legend differentiating between the limits of vegetation and the limits of woodland.
11. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the Tree Conservation Plan shall be certified by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources or any other representative designated by the State of Maryland.
12. All future development shall reflect the general street patterns and land use quantities and relationships as depicted on Alternative C, and as modified by condition 17 below. Emphasis shall be place on a mixed-use development that is pedestrian and bicycle friendly, a grid street pattern with buildings close to the sidewalk, and civic areas with plazas and parks at regular intervals.
13. When reviewing Detailed Site Plans, the Development District Standards of the Greenbelt Area Sector Plan, as related only to design elements, shall be taken into consideration, but shall not be binding requirements.
14. Concurrently with the review and approval of the first Detailed Site Plan, plans, sections and details of the streetscape for the >Main Streets= shall be provided for Planning Board approval, including building setbacks, the dimensions and details of all travel lanes, parking bays, sidewalks, street tree spacing and planting areas. Main Streets shall include, at a minimum, two travel lanes, on-street parking and sidewalks on both sides.
15. The design specifications and materials for site-wide amenities, signage, lighting, street furniture and recreational facilities shall be approved by the Planning Board with the first Detailed Site Plan for the North Core and the first Detailed Site Plan for the South Core, which plans may be submitted separately. Also, at the time of the first Detailed Site Plan for the North or South Core, specific amenities that will be considered site-wide will be identified, and those amenities that may be different between the North and the South Core will be identified. In addition, the first Detailed Site Plan shall provide a refined layout that shows the locations and general dimensions of all civic components, including parks, plazas, recreational areas and green areas/open spaces. Special attention shall be paid to address size, lighting, design and scale of any signage facing the Hollywood neighborhood.

16. In general, the maximum building height in the North Core area shall be 12-stories. Buildings up to 12 stories in the North Core may only be constructed directly along the Metro rail line. Buildings over 12 stories and up to a maximum of 15 stories may only be located toward the center of the site and will require the approval of a height study by the Planning Board at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Buildings up to 20 stories may only be located along the Capital Beltway as shown on Alternative Illustrative Layout AC@ and shall also require the approval of a height study by the Planning Board at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Building heights in the South Core area shall be 2-8 stories. Any height analysis submitted shall reflect the height review guidelines delineated in the Greenbelt Sector Plan.
17. In order to optimize the use of transit, the following shall be taken into consideration:
  - a. Residential and office buildings in the North Core area should be located close to the Metro station.
  - b. Below grade parking structures should be provided with buildings constructed over the parking structures.
  - c. Large, above-grade parking structures next to the Metro station are discouraged.
18. When parking structures face a Amain street,@ no more than 1/3 of the structure may be exposed at the pedestrian level. The other 2/3 must contain retail/service stores, residential restaurants, and/or other uses. All exposed areas of parking structures shall be designed with high-quality materials.
19. Each Detailed Site Plan shall specify that all tree pits along the streets that have shops, restaurants, plazas, and/or other uses shall be connected with a continuous non-compacted soil volume under the sidewalk. Details of how this will be accomplished shall be included on the plans and shall be agreed upon by the Planning Board or its designee. The use of ACU-Soil@ as aaAstructural soil@or other equal product for shade trees planted in tree pits is strongly encouraged.
20. Prior to the issuance of residential building permits, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall pay an Adequate Public Facilities fee of \$3,360.00 per dwelling unit for the schools, unless fully offset by a school facility surcharge payment. Any amount not offset shall be paid and divided among the schools at a rate determined by the guidelines. This adequate public facilities fee would be placed in an account to relieve overcrowding at Springhill Lake Elementary and Roosevelt High Schools.
21. No residential permits shall be issued for this development until the projected percentage of capacities at all the affected schools are less than or equal to 130 percent or four years have elapsed since date of the adoption of the resolution of the approval of the preliminary plat of subdivision.

22. At the time of Detailed Site Plan submission for any retail in the North Core, a refined economic analysis is required to justify the support of a high quality main street retail shopping and entertainment complex. This analysis shall justify the amount of retail space proposed for the high intensity, regionally oriented North Core area. Additionally, a separate analysis shall be provided at the time of Detailed Site Plan for the South Core which addresses any proposed medium intensity, neighborhood-oriented retail space.
23. Prior to certification by the Planning Department staff, the Conceptual Site Plan shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Show an entryway (or add an arrow symbol) for a future pedestrian bridge crossing the Metro/CSX railroad tracks near the Board of Education property.
  - b. Identify a gateway at the Cherrywood Lane/Springhill Drive intersection and show a wide promenade (or add a distinct walkway symbol) between this intersection and the mixed-use center.
  - c. The illustrative plans, sketches and sections shall be revised to show a minimum 20- to 40-foot-wide linear park between the face of curb of the north/south connector road and the Metro/CSX rail line, except where environmental impacts may dictate a narrower section. A minimum eight-foot-wide hiker/biker trail shall be provided in the linear park from the most southern property line to the Metro Station.
  - d. A note shall be added to the plan that indicates that street furniture, lighting, berming, and a variety of landscape materials shall be provided in the linear park.
  - e. Show a possible connection between Breezewood Drive and the north-south connector road on the Conceptual Site Plan.
  - f. Revise the plan and all applicable site acreages and densities to reflect that a narrow strip (150 feet X 2,100 feet) of land along the east side of the Greenbelt Metro Station platform is, in fact, currently zoned R-P-C (Recreational Planned Community) and R-R (Rural Residential).
  - g. Adjust the land-use mix in the North Core to provide a mix of uses that is more transit oriented and consistent with the Greenbelt Sector Plan adopted by the Planning Board. Increase residential uses to a minimum of 20 percent (20%) of the total developed floor area and limit retail uses to not more than 40 percent (40%) of the total developed floor area in the North Core area.
24. The following conditions pertain to trails:

- a.. Provide in-road bike lanes along both sides of the planned north/south connector road in conformance with AASHTO guidelines.
  - b. Construct sidewalks on both sides of the proposed Loop Road within the public right-of-way.
  - c. Construct sidewalks on both sides of Metro Drive within the public right-of-way.
  - d. A stream valley trail shall be provided along the western edge of the environmental envelope of Indian Creek, subject to the approval by the appropriate public agency. This trail shall be constructed to DPR standards. The trail shall include an interpretive program, as mentioned in the submitted conceptual site plan.
  - e. Bicycle access shall be maintained along Cherrywood Lane. The applicant shall construct a multiuse trail along the subject property=s frontage of Cherrywood Lane. In addition, the existing in-road, designated bicycle lanes shall be maintained.
  - f. Bike racks and lockers shall be provided. The appropriate number and locations will be determined at the time of detailed site plan.
25. The applicant, his successors, and/or assigns, shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. A complete recreational package shall be provided at the time of the first detailed site plan and shall include facilities in the amount of \$1,100,000.00 at a minimum. Private facilities available to members open to all residents, employees, and/or guests of the above may be counted towards this amount.
1. A private neighborhood park shall be provided in the South Core area that shall include, at a minimum, four tennis courts, one soccer field, one softball field and one baseball field, or other facilities such as a community building with bathhouse and swimming pool.
27. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of Development Review Division (DRD) for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of a Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.
28. The developer, his successors, and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
29. Submission of three original, executed Private Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) or similar alternative to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a grading permit for each development parcel controlled by one entity. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA or alternative instrument shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

30. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD for all recreational facilities, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits for each RFA as noted.
31. The north-south connector road alignment may shift at the time of Preliminary Plan, Detailed Site Plan, Final Plat, and/or permit to reflect adjustments required to reduce environmental or other impacts. The technical and economic feasibility of bridging over these environmental features should be considered in analyzing alternatives.
32. Prior to the issuance of a grading permit for an area that includes the WMATA wetland mitigation area, should a permit to develop that area be granted by the Army Corps of Engineers, the developer, his successors, heirs or assignees shall provide the City of College Park with existing hydrology data for North College Park to serve as a base line of information for the assessment of actual flooding impacts. This will also include the Federal and State permits, including the supporting data. The developer shall be required to take whatever reasonable measures necessary to prevent any actual flooding impacts.
33. A the time of Detailed Site Plan review for any area that includes 100 year floodplain impacts, modeling data generated in conjunction with the Maryland Department of the Environment permitting process for floodplain fill shall be provided to the City of College Park. The City shall also be notified of any proposed changes to floodplain elevations. Floodplain mitigation shall fully compensate for all floodplain impacts in the project area including upstream and downstream.
34. At the time of Preliminary Plan, realign the internal loop road to avoid the permanent impacts to stream buffers and streams, unless a variation is approved by the Planning Board at the time of Preliminary Plan approval.
35. Any Detailed Site Plan submitted for development in the North Core shall include the following elements:
  - a. A large public open space in the vicinity of the Metro Station that provides a memorable identity for the area.
  - b. Vertical mixed-use buildings around the Metro Station.
  - c. Some residential uses located along the loop road to take advantage of views into the preservation area and to screen parking garages.
  - d. Office buildings configured along the Beltway to screen parking garages.
36. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review, the location of a police substation of approximately 2,000 square feet for either the North or South core shall be provided.

- †\*37. The applicant (and his successors and/or assignees) shall fund all off-site transportation improvements required by this resolution through funding that secures a minimum of ten percent of facilities construction costs. Such funding will be accomplished by bonding (or a similar approved funding instrument) with either the Federal Highway Administration, the State Highway Administration, or the County Department of Public Works and Transportation, with said bonding amounts established pursuant to agreements by and between the applicant with the respective agency. Proof of such funding shall be required prior to Detailed Site Plan approval.
- †\*38. A report detailing the cost of all off-site transportation facilities shall be submitted at the time of review of the Detailed Site Plan. Such report shall be referred to the appropriate operating agencies for their review. Full concurrence of the agencies shall be required prior to Detailed Site Plan approval, and any modifications to the report agreed upon by the applicant and the agencies shall be a part of the record for the Detailed Site Plan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board=s action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George=s County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board=s decision.

†\*Denotes Amendment

\*Denotes Correction

Underlining indicates new language

[Brackets} indicate deleted language

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Eley, with Commissioners Squire, Eley, Vaughns and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, September 15, 2005, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 6th day of October 2005.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:GW:rmk