

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, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on May 31, 2001, regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015 for Town Center at Camp Springs - Core Area, the Planning Board finds:

1. The core area of the Town Center at Camp Springs property is a total of 106.75 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. Section 27-546 requires the approval of a Conceptual Site Plan (CSP) and a Detailed Site Plan (DSP) for all uses and improvements in the M-X-T Zone. Section 27-273 of the Zoning Ordinance explains the specific purposes of the Conceptual Site Plan as follows:

**(1) The specific purposes of Conceptual Site Plans are:**

- (A) To explain the relationships among proposed uses on the subject site and between the uses on the site and adjacent uses;**
- (B) To illustrate approximate locations where the buildings, parking lots, streets, green areas, and other similar features may be placed in the final design of the site.**
- (C) To illustrate general grading, woodland preservation areas, planting, sediment control, and storm water management concepts to be employed in any final design for the site; and**
- (D) To describe, generally, the recreational facilities, architectural form of buildings, and street furniture (such as lamps, signs, and benches) to be used on the final plan.**

In this case (as in the typical CSP application), the applicant has submitted an illustrative plan that will demonstrate some of the points above. The staff recommendation includes the revision of plans within this application such that the purposes of the Conceptual Site Plan and the M-X-T Zone will be fulfilled.

2. The subject property was previously zoned R-R and I-1 and was previously known as Capital Gateway Office Park. The property had a Preliminary Plat approved in 1990 and was subsequently approved and recorded as final plats of subdivision. The property was rough graded and infrastructure was placed on the site, including stormwater management, the main loop road (known as Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive), and

street trees. Sidewalks exist in some areas.

In October 2000, the District Council rezoned the property from the I-1 and R-R Zones to the M-X-T Zone. This Conceptual Site Plan includes three pods of development separated by the loop road. These three pods of development are located directly north and east of the Branch Avenue Metro Station. None of the pods are directly adjacent to one another because of the intervening roadway. Access is proposed at numerous points along the loop road. The following is a description of the development proposed within each pod of development:

**POD A** This area of development consists of 58.59 acres of land, of which 6.13 acres are within the 100-year floodplain. Pod A is adjacent to Henson Creek and all of the on-site tree preservation is proposed along the stream valley. The main use proposed is residential with a retail component floating within the site. The proposed residential development within Pod A includes three types: a senior housing facility in a single complex, a multifamily housing component in four groups of buildings centered on interior parking compounds, and a third housing type (new to Prince George's County), called stacked towns. These stacked towns are actually a multifamily-type product that arranges one unit over another. They are designed from the exterior to appear as a large single-family home, like a mansion dwelling. There is a single door in the front of the unit and individual unit entries are located in the interior.

A master plan trail is proposed in Pod A along the western border of the site to connect the future trail within the Henson Creek Stream Valley to the Metro. Other recreational facilities have not been shown on the plan, but the applicant has submitted supplemental text discussing the intent to provide recreational facilities within each pod of development as the Detailed Site Plans are submitted. This will allow for the maximum flexibility in design of the recreational facilities to accommodate specific demographic markets.

**POD B** This area is located within the loop road directly adjacent to the Metro station parking facility and transit area. Pod B consists of 35.87 acres of land and does not include any floodplain or other natural features. The property is relatively flat. The plan proposes a mix of office, residential and retail development. The illustrative plan has been drawn as an office development with buildings fronting the loop road and parking to the rear of the buildings. Three streets divide the property along the existing lot lines (the entire property is platted), converging on a linear green space that abuts the Metro property. The green space provides an interior space that is surrounded on three sides by streets and flanked by buildings fronting on the green space. Even though the illustrative plan has been drawn for an office development, the same concepts shown on the drawings would apply to a residential development.

**POD C** This area consists of 10.95 acres of land and is shown as a mix of office and retail. It is completely surrounded by lands owned by WMATA. The WMATA area is used as the service yard, as it is the southern terminus of the Green Line. The illustrative plan has been drawn as an office development with buildings surrounded by parking

facilities. A similar concept is applicable to a retail development.

3. The proposed site development data for the subject application is as follows:

|                                 |              |
|---------------------------------|--------------|
| Zone                            | M-X-T        |
| Gross Tract Area                | 106.40 acres |
| Area within 100 year floodplain | 6.13 acres   |
| Net Tract Area                  | 100.27 acres |
| Pod A                           | 59.58 acres  |
| Pod B                           | 35.87 acres  |
| Pod C                           | 10.92 acres  |

Proposed Uses and Square Footage of Development

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Residential                   | 1,200,000 - 2,500,000 square feet      |
| Commercial Retail             | 10,000 - 150,000 square feet           |
| Office                        | <u>500,000 - 2,700,000 square feet</u> |
| Total Square Footage proposed | 1,800,000 - 5,350,000 square feet      |

|                           |          |
|---------------------------|----------|
| Proposed Floor Area Ratio | 0.4-1.15 |
|---------------------------|----------|

4. The property is the subject of a preliminary plat and several record plats that cover the entire property. Preliminary Plat 4-90037 was approved with several conditions. The following record plats make up the property:

VJ 160 @ 56 - 61  
VJ 162 @ 2 and 3  
VJ 184 @ 50, 51 and 77

The earliest of these plats was recorded in 1991. The proposed Conceptual Site Plan presents a lotting pattern and road configuration substantially different from the approved preliminary and record plats. In fact, the CSP indicates that Winchester Commercial Parkway and Greenline Court will need to be vacated to accomplish the proposal. Since the property has already been platted, in order to achieve the proposed development, the applicant will need to execute lot line adjustment plats in accordance with Section 27-108 of the Subdivision Regulations. The applicant must also submit vacation petitions for the streets. Once these plats are approved, there will be no further subdivision issues if the trip generation cap is not exceeded. If the proposed uses generate trips in excess of the caps, necessitating a new adequacy test and finding, the applicant, his heirs or successors will be required to file a new preliminary plat.

5. The Community Planning Division provided the following information regarding the recently approved master plan in their referral from Paul Fields and Dineene O'Connor

to Susan Lareuse dated May 8, 2001:

ALand Use Recommendation: The recently approved master plan designates a mix of uses including office, retail and residential for this area. The master plan goal is to provide for an appropriate mix of land use opportunities at this location adjacent to the Branch Avenue Metro Station. The placement of the subject site in the M-X-T Zone allows for maximum flexibility in relation to land use, density and design requirements.

AThe master plan states the following: >The overall area lends itself to intensive development because of the Metro station. The rezoning of the Capital Gateway site to the M-X-T Zone will allow maximum development flexibility in terms of land use, development intensities and site design. For the Capital Gateway site, the future land uses could be mixed in a compatible manner throughout the development or portions of the overall property could be developed with similar uses. Any residential and office development could have varying intensities within the site. As the development of the site may evolve over time, it should respond to any long-term changes in the market. The M-X-T Zone and its review process allows for this flexibility.= (underlining added)

ATo promote the attractiveness of the site, landscaped plazas are recommended to be located in well-traveled pedestrian areas to offer convenient, yet inviting, outdoor setting for office workers, shoppers and residents. Well-lit and appropriately sized walkways should be provided throughout the area for efficient access to Metro and to promote interaction between the various land uses.

AThe Capital Gateway site was originally approved for 828,000 square feet of office or 1,775,000 square feet of flex-office or any combination of permissible M-X-T Zone uses not to exceed specified peak-hour trips. It is envisioned that this area will need to exceed those limits to accomplish the type of development that is appropriate for this area and envisioned by the plan through the use of transportation system management (TSM), transportation demand management (TDM) and other similar trip reduction measures.@

Comment: The discussion of flexibility in the master plan reflects the stated purpose of the M-X-T Zone. Section 27-542(a)(8) states one of the purposes of the zone is:

**(8) To permit a flexible response to the market. . . .**

The discussion in the master plan justifies the rezoning of the land from the I-1 and I-3 Zones to the M-X-T so that residential, retail and office development of the site can occur in response to the market. The Conceptual Site Plan reflects the applicant=s desire to allow for flexibility in the development of the site by showing various land use proposals for the three pods of development. The master plan goes on to state that the site lends

itself intensive development because of its proximity to the Metro. This is sound planning from both a local and regional standpoint. The Conceptual Site Plan proposes two phases of development plan, as it is recognized that as the market develops, the site may evolve in the intensity of the development within each pod.

*Other Plan Recommendations:* The plan includes *urban design recommendations for designated gateway roads* to be used to guide streetscape improvements, new development and redevelopment for the gateways and its frontage properties (Focus Area Land Use and Gateways Chapter). These recommendations are often focused on improvements within the road right-of-way, but in many instances they pertain to frontage property on-site improvements. The plan identifies five focus areas, each of which have individual recommendations. The subject site is included in Focus Area 1. Focus Area 1 includes Auth Road, Auth Way and Auth Place. Lot 34 (the companion CSP-01016) abuts Auth Way.

The plan further recommends for the three gateway roads in the focus area that a comprehensive and coordinated streetscape approach be developed. This includes addressing sidewalks, crosswalks, pedestrian lighting, furnishings and amenity treatments. While only Lot 34 (the companion CSP) fronts on one of the designated roads, it is envisioned that what is accomplished at the subject site in terms of the streetscape could be used as a benchmark for a comprehensive streetscape plan for the gateway roads.

The master plan also includes *urban design recommendations for commercial, employment and residential areas in general* (Urban Design Chapter). The following summarizes the plan urban design recommendations that can be applicable to the nonresidential portion of the development proposal:

\$      AProvide consistent sidewalk widths and sidewalk materials for a clearly defined pedestrian network throughout the development.@

Comment: It is appropriate to provide an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along Capital Gateway Drive in its entirety. Also, six-foot-wide sidewalks along secondary streets should be provided. Secondary streets within Pod B that should have six-foot-wide sidewalks include the three radiating streets connecting to Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive. The sidewalks surrounding the green space should also be six feet wide. The design of the details should be reviewed and approved in conjunction with the first Detailed Site Plan and apply to all subsequent DSPs.

\$      AProvide appropriate pedestrian connections to adjacent residential areas.@

Comment: This comment does not apply to this site because it is not directly adjacent to the residential properties in the area.

\$ AStreets trees should be planted along the roads to provide a consistent and unifying planting pattern.@

Comment: Most of the street tree plantings have already been installed and are located along the curb edge. On the other side of the sidewalk another row of trees of the same species planted at the same interval, but staggered from the street trees should be planted to create a continuous planting design. If existing trees are located within the right-of-way, the Detailed Site Plan should identify the existing trees and adjustments such as supplemental planting should be done.

\$ AMedians should be planted with shrubs, groundcover and/or trees depending on the width of the median.@

Comment: The Conceptual Site Plan does not identify medians on the plan but the staff recommends that the street design be adjusted at the time of Detailed Site Plan to incorporate two public streets with minimum eight-foot-wide medians. These streets will connect the loop road to the interior green area shown as a major focal point of the development. The reason for the wider street design is for the purpose of visually connecting the residential components within Pod A to the development of Pod B. As an alternative to the median design, this issue could also be resolved in another way, by redesigning the green area so that it has frontage on the loop road. This option should be investigated further and applied at the time of Detailed Site Plans, if feasible.

\$ AStreet furnishings should be provided at appropriate locations such as outdoor plazas, courtyards, bus stops, etc.@

Comment: Bus stop areas should be identified in the future and will be designed at the time of Detailed Site Plans. The Conceptual Site Plan provides for outdoor spaces that are not designed at this time, but the land area is clearly allocated within Pods A and B. These areas should not be compromised in size at the time of the DSP and should basically reflect the same amount of land area as shown on CSP as follows:

Pod A outdoor green space as shown on CSP = 60,000 square feet

Pod B outdoor green space as shown on CSP = 80,000 square feet

Each Detailed Site Plan should be evaluated for the needs of the future users of the site as to appropriateness of outdoor spaces, plazas, courtyards and recreational areas.

\$ AStreet lights should be pedestrian in scale.@

Comment: In addition to the street lighting required by the Department of Public Works and Transportation, a consistent approach to the lighting of the main pedestrian corridors should be established. These lighting fixtures should be located on both sides of Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive and along the main streets serving each pod of development.

The lighting is also necessary along any green areas with frontage on a visually prominent public space or common area. These lighting details will be identified at the time of review of each Detailed Site Plan.

\$ APublic urban spaces should be designed to function as a stimulus for pedestrian activity.@

Comment: The outdoor spaces within Pods A and B are critical design elements. The exact configuration of the development shown in the CSP is not necessarily required to be mimicked; however, the relationship of open space to the development of structures around it should be respected.

\$ AProposed development should provide a consistent architectural treatment by use of compatible building materials and exterior facade articulation.@

Comment: This concept is important to create a visually unified approach to the development and will be reviewed at the time of the Detailed Site Plans. However, as a beginning point, it should be discussed that building materials should be of high quality, and should be coordinated throughout the site, including the design of parking structures.

\$ AGround-mounted, low-height signs are encouraged.@

Comment: Staff believes that a comprehensive approach to signage for the subject development would be a benefit to promoting a positive image for the subject development. Low signage is appropriate to the residential development and the office development. Retail signage, both freestanding and building-mounted, should be compatible with the architectural features of the building. Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan review specific attention be given to the proposed signage and that a comprehensive signage design approach be undertaken for the commercial/retail and office components of the development.

AThe following urban design recommendations pertain to the residential development:

\$ ASidewalks should provide for appropriate pedestrian circulation within the community and particularly to the adjacent Metro station.

\$ AProposed developments should provide for usable open space for passive recreation and landscape amenities.

\$ AMultifamily developments should be designed to ensure a safe environment.

\$ AParking areas for multifamily complexes should be located behind or between buildings and well buffered from the street.

- \$ Appropriate fences or walls should be incorporated into the landscape to help define the property.
- \$ Multifamily complexes should provide a comprehensive system of lighting that is compatible in design and materials to the buildings and other amenities.
- \$ Building endwalls visible from the streets should incorporate windows, doors and other architectural elements to eliminate blank walls. @

Comment: These guidelines for the development of residential development should be demonstrated at the time of Detailed Site Plan review.

6. The subject plan was referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and comments were made in a memorandum (Shaffer to Lareuse) dated May 21, 2001. In accordance with the Adopted and Approved Heights Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assigns should construct the master plan trail connection from the subject site to the Henson Creek Stream Valley. This connection will provide access to the future extension of the Henson Creek Trail. The exact location of the trail connection will be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan, but a connection directly to the portion of the stream valley owned by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation is preferred. A trail location (within a public use easement) on or in the vicinity of the existing stormwater management pond access road may be appropriate.
7. The subject application was referred to the Environmental Planning Section, and in a memorandum (Ingrum to Lareuse) dated May 17, 2001, the following comments were provided:

This memorandum supercedes the May 7, 2001, memorandum from this section. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the additional information provided for the above referenced Conceptual Site Plan and Type I Tree Conservation Plan and has found that the additional information has addressed some of the issues previously reported. This Conceptual Site Plan and Type I Tree Conservation Plan are recommended for approval subject to the findings and conditions discussed below.

#### Background

This site has been previously reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section as 4-89207, 4-90037, DSP-92012, and DSP-91029. This site is subject to the previously approved Tree Conservation Plans, TCPI/7/90 and TCPII/26/01, and the development must be in conformance with these plans. It should be noted that the Type I Tree Conservation Plan was approved under the 1989 Woodland Conservation Ordinance, which has different requirements than the current Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The current application is a Conceptual Site Plan for a town center at Camp Springs consisting of residential and commercial uses.

#### ASite Description

AThis 106.4-acre site is located just south of Suitland Parkway at the Branch Avenue Metro. A review of the information available indicates that streams, wetlands, wetland buffers, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes are found to occur on the property. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George=s County Soil Survey are predominantly gravel pit or disturbed soils. Since the exact nature of the soils is not known, DER may require a soils study prior to issuance of building permits. Suitland Parkway and the Branch Avenue Metro are considered significant noise generators that may create adverse noise impacts for the proposed use. Suitland Parkway is also a National Register Site for which viewsheds are an issue. The sewer and water service categories are S-3 and W-3. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity. This site borders Henson Creek Stream Valley Park.

#### AEnvironmental Review

- Aa. This site is subject to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it is larger than 40,000 square feet and contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland. A Tree Conservation Plan is required. TCPII/26/91 was originally approved for a 220-acre site that includes the current site area of 106 acres. The current application is subject to the requirements of TCPII/26/91.

AThe original 220-acre site has undergone ownership changes which has resulted in required woodland mitigation from the building of the Metro Center. Revised Type I and Type II Tree Conservation Plans are required. The original TCPI was approved under the 1989 Woodland Conservation Ordinance and as such is subject to different requirements than are currently in place. Because the TCP submitted is not a substantial revision to the originally approved TCPI it is subject to the regulations from the 1989 Woodland Conservation Ordinance, not the current ordinance.

AThe TCPI submitted with the Conceptual Site Plan does not include a Woodland Conservation Worksheet. This worksheet is required on all Tree Conservation Plans. In addition, the TCPII needs to be revised to reflect the current conditions. A revised TCPII will need to be submitted with the Detailed Site Plan.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan the TCPI shall be revised to include a Prince George=s County Woodland Conservation Worksheet. The TCPI shall meet all requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance in effect at the date of approval of TCPI/7/90.

ARecommended Condition: A revised TCPII shall be submitted as part of the

Detailed Site Plan application.

- Ab. The plan shows a stream buffer around an area that, according to aerial photographs, does not appear to be a stream. This area is north and east of the two existing wetland ponds. This area does contain wetlands and a wetland buffer has been shown, however, it does not appear to contain a stream. If it does contain a stream, the stream needs to be shown on the plan and the stream buffer needs to be either protected, if it is still intact, or restored, if it has already been disturbed. If it does not contain a stream, the plan needs to be revised to eliminate the stream buffer line.

AIn addition, the plan shows two areas of wetland buffer disturbance. One area is located west of Auth Place and the other area is located near the border of Lots 23 and 24. These areas will need to be shown as revegetated buffers on the TCPI.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan the TCPI shall be revised to show the areas of disturbed wetland buffer as revegetated.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan all streams shall be clearly identified on the TCPI and Conceptual Site Plan and the correct location of the stream buffer shall be shown . On all appropriate plans the wetland buffers and adjacent steep slopes shall be shown as preserved and/or restored.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan a wetlands study and all applicable permits shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.

- Ac. It appears that many of the parcels will not have access to waterways where discharge of stormwater is possible. Some of the properties could be essentially land-locked from adequate outfalls. On a site such as this stormwater should not be controlled on a site-by-site basis. A centralized and coordinated stormwater management system through the provision of one facility to serve the entire site is necessary to ensure integrated development under the proposed Conceptual Site Plan in conformance with the master plan. In addition, the Conceptual Stormwater Management Plan previously approved makes no commitment to bioretention or other water quality measures to protect Henson Creek.
- ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall provide evidence that the existing stormwater management facility is adequately sized to serve the entire development. If it is not sized to accommodate all future stormwater runoff, the Stormwater Management Conceptual Plan shall be revised to show a single coordinated stormwater management facility to serve all of the proposed development that is part of the Conceptual Site Plan.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall submit evidence that stormwater management on this site shall include water quality measures that treat the first flush of stormwater runoff from all paved surfaces to protect the water quality of Henson Creek.

- Ad. This property is located in the noise corridor for Suitland Parkway, a freeway. The modeled 65 dBA contour, based on a freeway, is projected to fall 2,200 feet from the centerline of the road. The 65 dBA noise standard for residential uses is applied in this case because a significant amount of residential area is proposed. This property is also in close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro, a potential noise generator for the proposed residential and commercial uses.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan a Phase I Noise and Vibration Study shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.

ARecommended Condition: Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan and based on the Phase I Noise Study, the Conceptual Site Plan shall be revised to show the 65 dBA noise contour. A

Comment: The conditions recommended by the Environmental Planning Section were modified prior to the Planning Board adopting them in the approval of this plan.

8. Transportation: The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and in a memorandum (Masog to Lareuse) dated May 21, 2001, the following comments were provided:

AThe Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the conceptual site plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 106.4 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone. The property is located in an area generally bounded by the Metrorail Green Line tracks, the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station, the Metrorail service yard, and Henson Creek. The applicant proposes to develop the property under the M-X-T zoning with up to 5.4 million square feet of retail, office and residential space.

AAAlthough the subject application is the initial Conceptual Site Plan under the M-X-T zoning for the subject property, with the zoning having been granted through a Sectional Map Amendment, the applicant has not prepared a traffic impact study in support of the plan. Instead, the applicant is relying upon a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 1990 with the approval of Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-90037. In attached correspondence dated April 14, 2000, the chief of the Development Review Division, after consultation with senior transportation staff, agreed that the subject property was entitled to a level of development compatible with a prior approved trip cap. The property has existed for several years as a number of recorded lots, with some lots having been purchased by Metro for station facilities. Most, if not all, of the

transportation-related conditions placed on the development in 1990 have been met, even though no permits have been issued on the property. All site-generated trips have been a part of all subsequent traffic studies. Therefore, the findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a comparison of the proposal with the underlying trip cap, a review of some background materials received from the applicant, and analyses conducted by the staff which are consistent with the *Guidelines for the Review of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*.@

#### AStaff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

AThe trip cap placed upon the subject property by Preliminary Plat of Subdivision 4-90037 is an unusual cap in that it is not based upon total vehicle trips. Rather, the cap allows A MAXIMUM of **1,490** INBOUND AM peak hour vehicle trips and **1,243** OUTBOUND PM peak hour vehicle trips. It is more common for trips caps to be expressed in terms of total (the sum of inbound and outbound) vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hourss

AThe applicant has proposed a maximum of 2,500 dwelling units, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 2.7 million square feet of office space. Further discussions with the applicant indicate that the applicant is willing to phase the development, with the initial phase to include 1,700 dwelling units, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 1.0 million square feet of office space. In response to that proposal and materials provided by the applicant, the transportation staff has prepared a Trip Generation Summary table:

PGCPB No. 01-120  
File No. CSP-01015  
F

AThis table forms the basis of the staff=s analysis for Phase I. The assumptions are complex, and are explained in great detail below:

ATrip Cap

AThe trip cap is explained above and is shown in the table. Only the numbers in bold (1,490 inbound AM trips and 1,243 outbound PM trips) control the quantity of the development which can be approved, as those were the only numbers specified in the condition for 4-90037.

ATrip Generation

AThis portion of the table indicates trip generation of each proposed land use with no allowance given for the site=s proximity to the Metrorail station (virtually all of the proposed development is within a one-half-mile walking distance of the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station) or for the ability of the uses within the site to exchange trips (internal trip satisfaction). All trip generation rates are given in accordance with those in the *Guidelines* except as noted below:

- Aa. The proposal indicated that 250 residences would be elderly housing, and rates from the Institute of Transportation Engineers= *Trip Generation Manual* were used to estimate trip generation for elderly housing.
- Ab. The *Guidelines* presume that most retail businesses open after the morning peak hour, and therefore show no AM peak hour trip generation. Given that most neighborhood centers have uses which serve morning commuters, AM peak hour rates from the *ITE Manual* were used to estimate morning trip generation.
- Ac. Condominiums and stacked towns are housing types which are identified on the site plan. Assuming that stacked towns are much like condominiums without individual lots or significant yards, the stacked towns are analyzed using the same rates as condominiums.

ATIt should be noted that 1,000,000 square feet of office space has not been utilized in the table. Staff attempted to iterate the results in the table to show a point at which the existing trip cap was fully encumbered, and while 1,700 residences and 150,000 square feet of retail could be accommodated, only 968,500 square feet of office space could be accommodated by the cap. The resulting Total Site Traffic provides a baseline for the analysis.

ATrip Satisfaction

ATWhere 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 are usually made by walking or a similar non-auto mode. When trips are made within a site, the effect is termed internal trip satisfaction, and the staff's assumptions are explained below:

- Aa. 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 a Metrorail station. This is done with the purpose of determining how likely persons accessing these land uses are to use Metrorail or other non-auto 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.
- Ab. Residential to Office is an indication of how many persons will live and commute to work within the site. The 1989 Ridership Survey was examined to determine, for non-downtown office buildings near Metrorail, the number of employees walking to work. An average of 2.75 percent was determined as an appropriate indicator of this factor.
- Ac. Retail to Residential and Retail to Office were determined less empirically. Based upon service areas for similar-sized concentrations of retail space shown in various master plans, staff determined that the retail population and office population of the site would provide about 60 percent of the business in a 150,000-square-foot retail area. The quantity of retail did not appear to be of sufficient size to become a destination. The staff assumed that the housing would provide about one-third of the market, and the office a little less. About one-quarter.

AThe resulting Internal Trip Total would be subtracted from baseline Site Traffic.

#### *AMetrorail and Feeder Bus Ridership*

AThese 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.

AThere 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 size plan with a pedestrian system, a trip distribution, and a knowledge of where the adjacent transit services actually go.

AThis 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:

**AResidential developmentC**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 22 percent near the 0.5-mile point. Staff measured walk distances from the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station to the various housing blocks shown on the illustrative plan, determined average walk distances to each housing type, and computed appropriate modal shares. Staff did not consider that residents of the various housing types would have appreciable differences in transit usage outside of walk distance.

**ARetail developmentC**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. Based on an average location of proposed retail of 2,000 feet from Metro, and assuming one-half the value suggested in the report, staff estimated a mode share of 12.5 percent. Even this estimate might be high Cthe retail component is not large enough to draw trips outside of the immediate area, and there is no other retail adjacent to the site which might draw shoppers.

**AOffice DevelopmentC**The average walking distance to proposed office development in this site is about 1,400 feet. Staff considered the trip distribution of office trips for this site along with the quality of transit service in assessing a potential modal split to the site as follows:

### Evaluation Factors for Transit Mode Share for Office Uses

| Direction                 | Trip Distribution | Transit Mode Share | Comments   |
|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|--|
| From N via MD 5           | 24.00%            | 55.00%             | Trips from DC; excellent availability of Metrorail and bus service   |
| From NE via MD 458/MD 414 | 12.00%            | 15.00%             | Trips from Prince George=s County inside Beltway; Metrorail inconvenient; some good bus service  |
| From E via I-95/I-495     | 26.00%            | 4.00%              | Trips from Montgomery, Anne Arundel, Calvert, Prince George=s outside Beltway; Metrorail inconvenient for few & absent for most              |
| From S via Auth Road      | 4.00%             | 16.00%             | Trips from local area or diverted from MD 5; some good bus service   |
| From S via MD 5           | 9.00%             | 24.00%             | Trips from southern Prince George=s and Charles Counties; some good local bus service and quality express bus service                        |
| From W via I-95/I-495     | 18.00%            | 3.00%              | Trips from 210 corridor and Northern Virginia; some good bus service but Metrorail absent for most   |
| From W via MD 414         | 7.00%             | 16.00%             | Trips from southern Prince George=s inside Beltway w/some diversion from 210 & Northern Virginia; some good bus service but Metrorail absent |

ABased upon these evaluation factors, the transportation planning staff estimates a transit mode share of 20.5 percent for the office development proposed for the subject property. Figure 32 in the 1989 Ridership Survey suggests that at a suburban station, the rapid transit mode share should be about 15 percent for an office building 1,400 feet from the station. However, the transportation staff=s analysis considers that employees of the area might use the feeder bus system which converges upon the Branch Avenue Metrorail Station. The staff believes that about one-third of employees will arrive by feeder bus, with the remainder of about 13.75 percent arriving by Metrorail.

**ASummaryC**The estimated trip reduction for proximity to transit is an estimate. Staff believes that the estimate is realistic although slightly conservative. Consequently, at the level of development considered, the transportation planning staff believes that these levels of trip reduction can be achieved with very little intervention from the applicant. The primary assumption is that the pedestrian network will be as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan. The resulting Metrorail and Feeder Bus Total would be subtracted from baseline Site Traffic.

#### ASummary - Trip Generation Table

AIN the summary portion of the table, the Internal Trips and the Metrorail and Feeder Bus Trips are subtracted from the baseline Site Traffic to estimate External Trip Generation.

External Trip Generation is then compared with the Trip Cap (note the bold numbers), and this comparison is shown at the bottom of the table. A negative number would indicate that the trip generation of the proposal exceeds the trip cap, and cannot be allowed under the existing cap. A positive number indicates that extra trips remain unused under the trip cap. A zero value indicates that the proposed use is balanced with the trip cap.

AAs noted earlier, staff has determined that 1,700 dwelling units, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 968,500 square feet of office space balances the proposed land use with the trip cap. That is the quantity which can be approved under Phase I with the existing finding of adequate transportation facilities utilizing the existing trip cap. Additional office space or residential units, up to a total of 2.7 million square feet of office space and 2,500 residences, can be approved under this plan with the requirement that a traffic study be done in the future. The future study must either (a) demonstrate compliance with the trip cap under the provisions of Condition 10 of the resolution approving 4-90037 or by other means resulting from the proximity of the development to Metrorail; or (b) seek to expand the trip cap through the expansion of allowable roadway capacity in the area.

#### APlan Comments

AAll road facilities through the site are at their master plan-recommended sections, and no dedication will be required by future plans.

AThe pedestrian network shown on this plan is very important to achieving the levels of transit ridership appropriate for the location. Therefore, future Detailed Site Plans should, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the current plans. Future Detailed Site Plans should consider the following:

- Aa. Providing more direct pedestrian connections rather than more circuitous ones.
- Ab. Siting buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting parking farther away.
- Ac. Placing building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.

AThe area inside of the semicircular loop of Auth Way holds the greatest promise of becoming very transit-oriented, but is somewhat isolated from the Metrorail station by an adjacent park-and-ride lot. Development within this semicircle should consider that a joint development could occur in the future, most likely by replacing the at-grade parking with a parking structure and accompanying high-rise development. The concept of a central pedestrian link through this semicircle to the station should be retained on all future plans.

AOn Sheet 1 of the Conceptual Site Plan, the street labeled as >Auth Road= should be

labeled as >Auth Way.=

#### Transportation Findings and Recommendations

This property was placed in the M-X-T Zone by means of a sectional map amendment. Therefore, Section 27-546(d)(8) requires that the applicant demonstrate adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan. Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed development as required under Section 27-546(d)(8) of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with the following conditions:

- Aa. Total development within the subject property under Phase I shall be limited to 1,700 residences, of which no fewer than 250 shall be senior housing residences, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 968,500 square feet of general office space; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (1,490 inbound AM peak hour vehicle trips and 1,243 outbound PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development.
- Ab. Total development within the subject property under Phase II shall be limited to 2,500 residences, of which no fewer than 250 shall be senior housing residences, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 2,700,000 square feet of general office space. Development under Phase II must be preceded by traffic study. This future traffic study must either (1) demonstrate compliance with the trip cap under the provisions of Condition 10 of the resolution approving 4-90037 or by other means resulting from the proximity of the development to Metrorail; or (2) seek to expand the trip cap through the expansion of allowable roadway capacity in the area.
- Ac. Future Detailed Site Plans should, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the current plans. Additionally, future plans should include the following considerations:
  - A(1) Provision of more direct pedestrian connections rather than more circuitous ones.
  - A(2) The siting of proposed buildings closer to the Metrorail station, and siting parking facilities farther away.
  - A(3) The placement of building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.
  - A(4) The area inside of the semicircular loop of Auth Way holds the greatest promise of becoming very transit-oriented, but is currently somewhat isolated from the Metrorail station by an adjacent park-and ride lot. In

order to best take advantage of joint development possibilities for the adjacent park-and-ride lot, the concept of a central pedestrian link through this semicircle to the station should be retained on all future plans.@

9. The subject application was referred to the National Park Service and in a letter (John Hale, Superintendent of the National Capital ParksCEast to Chairman Hewlett) dated May 18, 2001, several concerns were raised with respect to the proposed development.

AWe understand that, because this property adjoins the Branch Avenue Metro Station, fairly intensive development of this property will be permitted, and even encouraged by county policy. However, this property also adjoins the Suitland Parkway, a scenic park roadway on the National Register of Historic Places, and a significant forested natural corridor as well. We believe that, with care, this development can be made compatible with both the Parkway=s scenic and natural values, and the strategy of clustering development around major public transportation facilities.

AWe concur with the massing of forest conservation areas in a buffering zone adjoining the Parkway lands at the bottom of the parcel. While there is some confusion regarding the tree conservation and other buffer zones (the drawing we were provided appears to have been adapted from older plans) we feel this is a good concept. During the seasons when trees are in leaf, the combination of forested park land and tree conservation zones within the parcel should provide adequate screening of the Parkway, provided building heights, siting, and choice of materials are carefully planned. When leaves are off trees, there is significantly greater chance of intrusion into the parkway=s scenic viewshed. However, we believe that proper building siting, architectural treatments and augmentative plantings designed to >break up= the buildings= mass, appropriate screening can be achieved with this conceptual development.

AWe are also concerned with the potential effect of this development on Henson Creek and its associated floodplain and wetlands. Henson Creek is already subject to significant storm flows and sediment loading. Nonetheless, it is a significant aquatic resource, and an important component of the natural system contained within the Suitland Parkway corridor. It is critical that this development not add to the storm water and sediment loading already impacting this watershed. Again, we believe that best management practices for storm water quality and quantity should work well in this regard.@

Comment: The Environmental Planning Section has considered the National Park Service =s concerns regarding the impact of stormwater runoff into the Henson Creek and has included conditions in their review of the plans. Urban Design recommends that the applicant submit section drawings at the time of the Detailed Site Plan in order to determine the visual impact of development as viewed from Suitland Parkway.

10. The subject application was referred to the Parks Department and in a letter (Helen Asan to Susan Lareuse) dated May 7, 2001, several concerns were raised with respect to the proposed development including the provision of private recreational facilities, lands to be conveyed to a Homeowners Association, and environmental concerns regarding Henson Creek. The recommended conditions have been included in the Recommendation section of this report.
11. Conformance with the Requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-X-T Zone, including the Requirements of the Prince George=s Landscape Manual. The requirements of Section 27-546(d) for development in the M-X-T Zone are as follows:

**A. The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;**

Comment : The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division. The site is located within close proximity to the Branch Avenue Metro Station and the major vehicular interchange of I-95/495 and MD 5. The development of this property will promote the effective and optimum use of transit if the density of this area is in accordance with the staff recommendation. A minimum Floor Area Ratio, high enough to ensure Metro ridership, is necessary to enhance the economic status of the county and the region. The proposal will provide for an expanding source of employment and living opportunities for the citizens of the county because the development provides for all three of the required uses in the M-X-T Zone, Residential, Retail and Office. The proposed development has the potential to encourage a 24-hour environment with the inclusion of a retail and office component, particularly so if the retail component includes eating and drinking establishments, or other uses that function in the evening hours. The plan indicates retail components in Pods A and B which are necessary to ensure mutually supporting relationships between the proposed uses. The visual character of the various components of the development will relate harmoniously to one another by means of the architectural character of buildings if the staff recommendation regarding high quality materials and compatibility is adopted.

**B. The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

Comment: The subject property is adjacent to the National Park Service lands which contain Suitland Parkway. It is discussed in the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Heights and Vicinity* (2001). Suitland Parkway is recognized in the plan as a historic and scenic corridor. It is listed in the National Register of Historic Places for both its significance as a route of travel between federal installations, connecting Bolling Air Force Base and the District of Columbia to Andrews Air Force Base, and for its significance as one of the parkways that make up the network of entryways to the Capital. The

preservation of the landscaped scenic corridor is important to the federal, regional and county governments. Parkways have been recognized in county plans, but there is a need to establish viewshed controls as well as landscape buffers to maintain the character of this major scenic asset.

The plan recommends that the viewshed of Suitland Parkway be maintained and protected. The plan recommends that legislation should be drafted that would require, for all developing parcels abutting the parkway, provision for vista analysis to ensure compatible building heights and setbacks and landscape buffering.

The proposed development provides for a mix of uses that should be a stimulus for economic revitalization for this area of the county. Staff believes that the infusion of quality residential, commercial and retail components in this area will ultimately improve the quality of life and present a positive image for the community as a whole.

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

Comment: The subject site is bordered by the National Park Service lands which contain Suitland Parkway and lands owned by WMATA. The staff believes that the proposed development is compatible with, and complementary to, existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

**D. 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;**

Comment: The mix of proposed uses and the arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. The mix of uses includes a major residential component in Pod A, with a small retail component to serve the needs of the residents; office and/or residential component in Pod B, with retail to serve employees and/or residents, and an area specifically designated as open space within Pod B for use by the employees; and in Pod C, an office and/or retail component. The proposed arrangement of uses reflected in the building layout should be capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability if a retail component is developed in a timely manner to support the residential population. Therefore, the staff recommends that development over the minimum 1,200 dwelling units proposed on the Conceptual Site Plan will require the development of a retail component to serve the residents.

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

Comment: The plan proposes phasing of the project into two phases. The main reason for the phasing is that the property is subject to the underlying plat restriction on the property relating to trip generation caps. The first phase of the development includes 1,700 residential units, 150,000 square feet of retail development, and 968,500 square feet of office development. The first phase of development is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration and maximum flexibility within Phase I. Phase II of the development includes the entire Pod C and five acres within Pod B to be set aside as a high-density preservation area. Within Pod B development is anticipated to concentrate around the street edge in the first phase of development. Phase II is generally located interior to Pod B and is comprised of five acres of development area. It will most likely define the final layout of the interior green area which is shown as a common use area and is in addition to the five acres of development. The exact configuration of the green area may change as the project evolves.

The five acres in Phase II will be set aside as a high density/intensity area so that the Floor Area Ratios (FAR) of the project evolve at a minimum level 0.85 FAR. The FAR for Pod B could be satisfied quickly if development proceeds at high intensities; however, the flexibility built into the Conceptual Site Plan provides for intensities of development to evolve depending on the market. If lower intensities are built initially, then Phase II will be required to be developed at a high FAR in order to achieve the desired minimum FAR for the overall development. Fifteen acres between Pod B and Pod C will be preserved for higher market demand in the future. This area will be required to be developed at a minimum 0.85 FAR, unless an earlier application proffers a higher intensity development that fulfills the requirements of Phase II. The development should not be allowed into the land area of Phase II development until and unless Phase I demonstrates a minimum .85 FAR on the entire development. Each Detailed Site Plan should be developed no less than 0.3 FAR in accordance with the applicant's proffer in the Conceptual Site Plan.

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

Comment: The pedestrian system near a Metro becomes very important in promoting Metro ridership. It must be convenient and comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development to the Metro. Proposed pedestrian circulation within the individual pods will promote and encourage pedestrian activity. All of the pedestrian traffic will filter from the individual pods of development to the loop road and connect to other uses within the development or the Metro. The illustrative plan provides for a convenient

pedestrian link to the Metro via the designed village green; however, the current design of the Metro station does not readily accommodate the connection. Both the Conceptual Site Plan and the illustrative plan propose a connection, at least visually, if not implying a direct pedestrian connection. The staff contacted the Office of Property Development and Management, WMATA, and spoke with Elisa L. Hill. According to Ms. Hill, in order to make a connection to a WMATA property, a developer must submit the plans for review to their office. This submission has not been made by the applicant. Therefore, the staff recommends that the applicant submit evidence indicating that the Office of Property Development and Management has reviewed the plans and will permit the physical connection to their property if a Detailed Site Plan is submitted proposing as much.

- G. On a Conceptual Site Plan for a property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidation Transportation Program, or will be provided by the applicant, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

Comment: See Finding No. 8 for a detailed discussion of all existing and proposed transportation facilities.

The Conceptual Site Plan is in general conformance with the regulations governing development in the M-X-T Zone.

12. Design Guidelines: Section 27-274 (a)(6) of the Zoning Ordinance, which establishes the required Design Guidelines for site and streetscape amenities for Conceptual Site Plans, states the following:

**ASite and streetscape amenities should contribute to an attractive, coordinated development and should enhance the use and enjoyment of the site. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**

- (ii) The design of amenities should take into consideration the color, pattern, texture, and scale of structures on the site, and when known, structures on adjacent sites, and pedestrian areas.@**

In addition, Section 27-274 (a)(5)(A), Green Area, states the following:

**AOn-site green area should be designed to complement other site activity areas and should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill its intended use.**

**To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**

- (vii) Green area should generally be accented by elements such as landscaping, pools, fountains, street furniture, and decorative paving.@**

There are no existing structures, pedestrian areas, or development of any kind on the subject property. The nearby existing residential developments do not provide any viable streetscape treatment that may be appropriate for, and/or replicated in, the proposed development, given the commercial/retail and office components proposed. In order to provide conformance with the guidelines above, and in an effort to ensure an attractive, quality development, this treatment should include the use of sidewalks at least eight feet wide; special, decorative paving in proposed sidewalks; shade tree plantings on both sides of the sidewalk, landscape plantings along all roadway frontages, substantial interior landscape planting at building frontages and all surface parking areas, and amenities throughout the site. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report which requires that the specific details of the streetscape treatment along the loop road and the green spaces shown on the illustrative plans shall be established at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

13. Section 27-548(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

**ALandscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the *Landscape Manual*. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.@**

Sections 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements, 4.3(b)(c), Parking Lot Requirements, including Landscape Strip Requirements, Perimeter Landscape Strip Requirements, and Interior Planting, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, apply to the subject site. Sections 4.2 and 4.3 will be addressed at the time of Detailed Site Plan review when the appropriate detail is shown on the plans. The Conceptual Site Plan should graphically show conformance to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*.

Development Pod A is located on the northeast side of Auth Way and backs up to lands owned by the National Park Service which contain the stream valley of Henson Creek and Suitland Parkway. On the east and west of Pod A are lands owned by WMATA. Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* requires a AD@ bufferyard to screen and buffer the proposed development from the WMATA lands. The conceptual site plan has been revised to show the required buffer areas.

Development Pod B is directly adjacent to the WMATA parking facility and terminal. Again, Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* requires a AD@ bufferyard to screen and buffer the proposed development from the WMATA lands. The Conceptual Site Plan recognizes the need for a buffer in this area, so the plans are in accordance with the

*Landscape Manual.*

Development Pod C is surrounded by lands owned by WMATA. Again, Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* requires a AD@ bufferyard to screen and buffer the proposed development from the WMATA lands. The conceptual site plan indicates the required buffer areas.

14. The Urban Design Section is concerned about the future character of the residential component of the development proposed in Pods A and B (Pod C is proposed as office/retail). Pod A is totally comprised of residential units and is located directly adjacent to the National Park Service land which contains Henson Creek. This area of the site is well suited for residential development because of the existing woodland and other natural features of the site. The proposed density of residential development within close proximity of a Metro should be at least 20 units to the acre, or approximately 0.5 Floor Area Ratio, in order to support the regional transit facility. In general, the concept plan reflects this type of density on the plan by the building layout shown on the illustrative plan. There are basically two areas of concern in regard to development of the residential component:
  - a. Quality of construction materialsCThe Astacked town@ product is very similar to townhouse development in general and the use of brick on the units will be expected at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Brick should be considered on all the residential structures within the development. It is expected that the residential components of this development will project an image of high quality and luxury.
  - b. Amenities, including recreational amenitiesCSome of the recreational needs of the residents should be met by providing indoor facilities such as an indoor play facility for children, fitness facilities for adults, and an indoor swimming pool.
15. Section 27-574 requires the number of parking spaces required in the M-X-T Zone to be calculated by the applicant and submitted for Planning Board review at the time of Detailed Site Plan. Likewise, Section 27-583 requires that the number of loading spaces required are also to be calculated by the applicant and submitted to the Planning Board for review. The staff has added this requirement as a condition to the approval in order to place the applicant, his heirs and/or assigns on notice.
16. The Conceptual Site Plan represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the Site Design Guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the Prince George=s County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

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/7/90) and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015 for the

above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Total development within the subject property under Phase I shall be limited to 1,700 residences, of which no fewer than 250 shall be senior housing residences, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 968,500 square feet of general office space; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (1,490 inbound AM peak hour vehicle trips and 1,243 outbound PM peak hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development.
2. Total development within the subject property under Phase II shall be limited to 2,500 residences, of which no fewer than 250 shall be senior housing residences, 150,000 square feet of retail space, and 2,700,000 square feet of general office space. Development under Phase II must be preceded by a traffic study. This future traffic study must either (a) demonstrate compliance with the trip cap under the provisions of Condition 10 of the resolution approving 4-90037 or by other means resulting from the proximity of the development to Metrorail; or (b) seek to expand the trip cap through the expansion of allowable roadway capacity in the area by filing a Preliminary Plat.
3. Future Detailed Site Plans shall, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the current plans. Additionally, future plans shall include the following considerations:
  - a. Provision of direct pedestrian connections rather than [more] circuitous ones.
  - b. The siting of proposed buildings in Phase II closer to the Metrorail station, and siting parking facilities farther away.
  - c. The placement of building entrances closer to rather than farther from the pedestrian network.
  - d. The concept of a central pedestrian link through the semicircle to the station shall be retained on all future plans.
4. A trail connection shall provide access to the future extension of the Henson Creek Trail. The exact location of the trail connection shall be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan, but a connection directly to the portion of the stream valley owned by the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation is preferred. A trail location (within a public use easement) on or in the vicinity of the existing stormwater management pond access road may be appropriate. The width of the trail shall be determined at Detailed Site Plan.
5. Each Detailed Site Plan (not including those for infrastructure or recreational facilities) in Phase I shall be developed at no less than 0.3 Floor Area Ratio (based on Net Lot Area). Phase II of the development (as defined in condition 2) shall include an area for high intensity development such that, the overall development covered by Phases I and II shall not be less than 0.85 Floor Area Ratio (based on Net Lot Area). Phase II shall include

Pod C in its entirety and five acres of developable land within Pod B but shall not include the central green area. Phase II development may proceed concurrent with Phase I, provided that, the cumulative combined FAR of Phase I approved, and all proposed Phase II, equals or exceeds the minimum 0.85 FAR. The high intensity preservation area is flexible in location and configuration within Pod B as long as it achieves the goal of high intensity/density and incorporates the design elements associated with the common green area .

6. Prior to certificate of approval, the TCPI shall be revised to include a Prince George=s County Woodland Conservation Worksheet. The TCPI shall meet all requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance in effect at the date of approval of TCPI/7/90.
7. A revised TCPH shall be submitted as part of each Detailed Site Plan application.
8. Prior to certificate of approval, all streams shall be clearly identified on the TCPI and Conceptual Site Plan and the correct location of the stream buffer shall be shown . On all appropriate plans the wetland buffers and adjacent steep slopes shall be shown as preserved.
9. Prior to approval of a Detailed Site Plan a wetlands study and all applicable permits shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.
10. Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall provide evidence that the existing stormwater management facility is adequately sized to serve the entire development. If it is not sized to accommodate all future stormwater runoff, the Stormwater Management Conceptual Plan shall be revised to show one or more coordinated stormwater management facility to serve all of the proposed development that is part of the Conceptual Site Plan. The concept shall not include the provision of ponds on a lot by lot basis.
11. Prior to certificate of approval, the applicant shall submit evidence that stormwater management on this site shall include water quality measures that treat the first-flush of stormwater runoff from paved surfaces to protect the water quality of Henson Creek.
12. Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site Plan, a Phase I Noise and Vibration Study shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section.
13. Prior to certificate of approval, the Conceptual Site Plan shall be revised to show the 65 dBA noise contour based on the Phase I Noise Study.
14. The applicant, his successors, and/or assigns shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities for each Detailed Site Plan in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. The applicant, his heirs or successors shall consider the feasibility of organizing the recreational facilities into one or more central recreational areas.

15. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division (DRD) for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the Detailed Site Plan by the Planning Board.
16. Submission of three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) or similar alternative to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a grading permit. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
17. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee, in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.
18. The developer, his successor and/or assigns shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and a future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
19. The land to be conveyed to a Homeowners Association shall be subject to the application conditions below:
  - a. Conveyance shall take place prior to the issuance of building permits.
  - b. A copy of unrecorded, special warranty deed for the property to be conveyed shall be submitted to the Subdivision Section of the Development Review Division (DRD), Upper Marlboro, along with the final plat.
  - c. All waste matter of any kind shall be removed from the property prior to conveyance, and all disturbed areas shall have a full stand of grass or other vegetation upon completion of any phase, section or the entire project.
  - d. The conveyed land shall not suffer the disposition of construction materials, soil filling, discarded plant materials, refuse or similar waste matter.
  - e. Any disturbance of land to be conveyed to a Homeowners Association shall be in accordance with an approved Specific Design Plan or shall require the written consent of DRD. This shall include, but not be limited to the location of sediment control measures, tree removal, temporary or permanent stormwater management facilities, utility placement and stormdrain outfalls. If such proposals are approved, a written agreement and financial guarantee shall be required to warrant restoration, repair or improvements required by the approval process.
  - f. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on land to be conveyed to a Homeowners Association. The location and design of drainage outfalls that adversely impact property to be conveyed shall be reviewed and approved by DRD prior to the issuance of grading or building permits.

- g. Temporary or permanent use of land to be conveyed to a Homeowners Association for stormwater management shall be approved by DRD.
  - h. Stormdrain outfalls shall be designed to avoid adverse impacts on adjacent land owned by or to be conveyed to The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC). If the outfalls require drainage improvements on land to be conveyed to or owned by M-NCPPC, the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) shall review and approve the location and design of these facilities. DPR may require a performance bond and easement agreement prior to issuance of grading permits.
  - i. There shall be no disturbance of any adjacent land that is owned by, or to be conveyed to, M-NCPPC without the review and approval of DPR.
  - j. The Planning Board, or its designee, shall be satisfied that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the property to be conveyed.
20. Prior to approval of a Detailed Site Plan, the following shall be demonstrated on the plans:
- a. The streetscape treatment shall include an eight-foot wide sidewalk along Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive, special pavers in crosswalks, special pedestrian lighting, and furnishings including seating elements. Six-foot wide sidewalks shall be provided along secondary streets and/or drives (the main streets within each development pod) and the green areas. Tertiary streets and/or drives shall have four foot wide sidewalks.
  - b. Street trees shall be located approximately 35 feet on-center if they do not exist in the right-of-way. A staggered row of the same species shall be planted at the same interval on the other side of the sidewalk, unless the buildings are located at or near the street line.
  - c. The building materials, architecture and height of structures shall be high quality and compatible to each other. In order to create a harmonious theme to the overall development, the DSP shall employ one or more design elements such as similar or same types of exterior finish materials, massing, articulation, window fenestration or color. Parking garages, where a substantial portion of the garage is visible from a street, shall be visually compatible with surrounding buildings.
  - d. In Phase I, the minimum height of office and residential structures shall be three stories. In Phase II, the minimum height of office and residential structures shall be five stories. Retail uses are encouraged to be located on the first floor of a mixed-use building.

- e. A visual connection from the residential development in Pod A to the green space component within Pod B shall be provided via the street connections by incorporating medians, or by connecting the greenspace to frontage along the road across from the residential development in Pod A.
  - f. The outdoor public space/green area shown as 60,000 square feet in Pod A and 60,000 square feet in Pod B shall not be reduced in size on the Detailed Site Plans. The configuration of the space may change, if the balance of the space to the development of structures around it is in scale.
  - g. The provision of a gasoline station use within Pods A and B is prohibited.
  - h. The need for a bus stop shall be determined and designed if found to be needed.
  - i. Surface parking shall not be located along the street edge of Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive. Surface parking shall be heavily buffered through the use of landscaping or decorative brick walls, whichever is determined to be appropriate at the time of Detailed Site Plan, when visible from Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive.
- 21. Any residential development located within Pod B shall be located across from Pod A.
  - 22. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review for any land within Pod A, the applicant shall provide section drawings to determine the visual impact of the proposed development from Suitland Parkway.
  - 23. At the time of the first Detailed Site Plan submission, a comprehensive design approach is required for the proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. Freestanding signage shall not exceed ten feet in height.
  - 24. Development beyond 1,200 dwelling units shall require the development of a retail component to serve the residents; the development of an office building with a retail component is acceptable. This condition may also be fulfilled by the same development on Lot 34 (the Companion CSP-01016). Issuance of a use and occupancy permit for the retail will be required prior to the release of the 1200<sup>th</sup> residential building permit.
  - 25. Prior to a Detailed Site Plan Plan submission in the area shown in the CSP as the outdoor public space/green area within Pod B, indicating a pedestrian connection to the Metro Station, the applicant shall submit evidence indicating that the Office of Property Development and Management has accepted for review a plan showing a pedestrian connection to Metro.

26. Prior to acceptance of a Detailed Site, the applicant shall submit a parking and loading study in accordance with Sections 27-574 and 27-583. The study shall be consistent with traffic analyses done in support of the Conceptual Site Plan, particularly in regard to assumptions made for transit mode share for the various uses and internal trip satisfaction between the uses.
27. If a DSP is submitted for a portion of Pod B that deviates from the Illustrative Plan, a revised layout for the remaining portion of Pod B shall be included as part of the submittal. It shall demonstrate an alternative layout that includes the outdoor public space/green area in keeping with the concept demonstrated in the Illustrative 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.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Eley, seconded by Commissioner Scott, with Commissioners Eley, Scott and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion, and Commissioners Brown and Lowe absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, May 31, 2001, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 28th day of June 2001.

Trudye Morgan Johnson  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:SL:rmk