

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 July 31, 2008, regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06003 for Addison Row, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The conceptual site plan proposes a mixed-use development consisting of residential, retail, office, hotel and a recreational building. The applicant proposes two scenarios for the development of the property with different intensities of uses for each.
2. **Development Data Summary**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant Warehouse	Mixed-use development including multifamily condominium dwelling units, retail, office, hotel and a private recreational center
Acreage of application of CSP	34.4	34.4
Area within 100 year floodplain	1.24	1.24
Net tract area	33.16	33.16
Dwelling Units	0	940–2000 multifamily
Lots		TBD
Parcels		TBD
Square Footage/GFA	324,300 sq. ft. to be demolished	<div>Use:</div> <div>Area/Units Range</div> <div>Scenario One</div> <div>Retail 121,900 sq. ft.</div> <div>MF Residential 940 d.u.</div> <div>Office 650,000 sq. ft.</div> <div>Recreation center 25,000 sq. ft.</div> <div>Scenario Two</div> <div>Retail 121,900 sq. ft.</div> <div>MF Residential 2,000 sq. ft. d.u.</div> <div>Office 14,300 sq. ft.</div> <div>Recreation center 25,000 sq. ft.</div> <div>Hotel 178,000 sq. ft.</div>
Proposed Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Based on net tract area within the CSP application 1,444,449.6 sq. ft		<div>Scenario One</div> <div>Total sq. ft. 2,022,230</div> <div>Proposed FAR 1.4 FAR</div>

		Scenario Two	
		Total sq. ft	2,346,700
			1.63 FAR

3. **Location:** The site consists of approximately 34.4 acres of land in the M-X-T Zone and is located on the north side of Addison Road, northeast of its intersection of North Englewood Drive. The property is located in Planning Area 72 within the Developed Tier.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** To the north of the subject property is vacant I-1 zoned property, and beyond that parcel is the Cheverly Metro Station. To the east are single-family detached residences in the R-55 Zone with the Fairmont Heights High School beyond. To the south of the subject property are the Chapel Apartments in the R-18 Zone, the Robert R. Gray Elementary School and the Abyssinia Baptist Church, located in the R-T Zone. To the west of the subject property is US 50, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) right-of-way (Orange Line) and the Penn Central Railroad.
5. **Previous approvals:** On December 26, 2007, the District Council approved the rezoning of the subject site from I-1, I-2 and C-O Zones to the M-X-T Zone. The District Council approved the rezoning with 17 conditions of approval. The Planning Board and Zoning Hearing Examiner recommended approval of the rezoning. It should be noted that at the time of the rezoning case, the evidence in the record of the Zoning Hearing Examiner explained the proposal as follows:

“The applicant seeks to rezone the property from the I-1, I-2 and C-O Zones to the M-X-T Zone to allow the development of a mixed-use community. The proposed ‘Addison Row at Cheverly Metro’, as originally submitted, will consist of approximately 2,500 residential units of varying types, and some commercial uses. The project will be completed in two phases. The first will include the 105,450 square feet of retail space, 60,000 of which will be marketed as a grocery store. Phase 1 is targeted for completion in 2009. The second phase includes the 2,136 residential condominium units, as noted in the traffic study and a 39,900 community center, and is projected to be completed by 2012.”

The justification statement repeatedly mentions that the applicant intends to provide a YMCA or YMCA-like facility as part of the mixed use component in the project. Since that time, the applicant has created the CSP and revised the project plans in regard to the number of dwelling units, the amount of retail, added an office component and hotel, and decreased the size of the recreational center, as stated in Finding No. 2 above.
6. **Design Features:** The project proposes to demolish an existing vacant warehouse building and to construct a high-intensity, mixed-use project consisting of residential, retail, office, a recreational facility and a hotel. The application proposes two different scenarios for the development of the property. The plan reflects both scenarios, by designating two of the buildings shown as either residential or office, and one of the buildings as either residential or a hotel. All three of these buildings are located at the rear of the property.

In Phase I of the project, along Addison Road, on the west side of the property, the plan proposes a retail commercial building shown close to the street line surrounded by surface parking. It is anticipated that this structure will be a single use which may be a grocery store or other big box retail. To the east, also along the frontage of Addison Road, the plan shows two mixed-use buildings indicating retail and office uses at the lower level and residential uses above, served by structured parking. Between these buildings is the main street, within the development, serving the property. Farthest to the east on the site, still with frontage on Addison Road, is a proposed 25,000-square-foot recreational center, which could be the YMCA or YMCA-like entity if the applicant is able to attract this use to the site. Between the recreational center and the adjacent mixed-use building is a proposed linear plaza. No building heights are shown on the plans.

Phase II of the project is located behind the first layer of development on the site on a private street that serves as frontage to two large multifamily residential condominium buildings, served by structured parking. These buildings appear to have interior courtyards where recreational facilities and other amenities would be provided for the residents.

Phase III of the project is located at the rear of the site and proposes either hotel, office or residential within three independent structures; this accounts for the large range in the amount of office and residential units proposed for the site. Beyond the third layer of development are steep slopes and wetlands and the undeveloped property to the north on the adjacent parcel, which is zoned I-1 and may evolve as an industrial use depending on environmental features of the site.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **M-X-T Zone:** All uses proposed are permitted uses in the M-X-T Zone. The conceptual site plan must also comply with the following findings listed in **Section 27-546(d)** for development in the M-X-T Zone:

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

Section 27-542(a)(1)—To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, major transit stops, and designated General Plan Centers so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable employment and living opportunities for its citizens;

Comment: The subject site was formerly a warehouse and distribution center, and is currently vacant. The proposal is to demolish the existing building and replace it with a mixed-use development on the site, which is not far from the Cheverly Metro Station. The CSP contains residential, retail, office, a hotel and a recreational center. The conceptual site plan proposes 940–2,000 multifamily dwelling units in vertically mixed-use buildings and single-use buildings. Most of the parking proposed for the site is shown in parking structures. Given its scale and the proposal for mixed uses, the project will replace a

vacant and deteriorating structure with an improved environment, providing living opportunities and shopping as well as some employment associated with the office, hotel and recreational center.

Section 27-542(a)(3)—To conserve the value of land and buildings by maximizing the public and private development potential inherent in the location of the zone, which might otherwise become scattered throughout and outside the County, to its detriment;

Comment: The subject site was previously zoned for industrial and commercial uses and currently has an existing vacant warehouse on the property. By planning a mixed-use center on the site, this proposal will enhance the value of the land. The development of this project will maximize the public and private development potential inherent in this location, within walking distance of the Deanwood Metro Station.

Section 27-542(a)(4)—To promote the effective and optimum use of transit and reduce automobile use by locating a mix of residential and non-residential uses in proximity to one another and to transit facilities to facilitate walking, bicycle, and transit use;

Comment: The proposed application is located within the Developed Tier and is accessible to the Cheverly Metro Station and the Deanwood Metro Station (within the District of Columbia). The original plan indicated a connection to the Cheverly Metro station within Prince George's County; however, this would require impacting the property to the north and sensitive environmental features on that property. The property owner to the north is not involved with the subject application and the current plans still show a possible future connection, but it seems unlikely that the connection would ever be made by this applicant. The success of the proposed development hinges on the effective use of various transportation systems.

Section 27-542(a)(5)—To facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment to ensure continuing functioning of the project after workday hours through a maximum of activity, and the interaction between the uses and those who live, work in, or visit the area;

Comment: The CSP shows a large scale development which has a mixture of uses that will encourage a 24-hour environment if the ultimate development of the project is realized. The various residential units will generate activity on the site from 6:00–9:00 a.m. and 3:00–10:00 p.m. The office tenants are anticipated to operate on regular 9:00 a.m.–5:00 p.m. business hours. The retail component is expected to generate activity all day, including anticipated service retail uses open from 7 a.m.–10:00 p.m. A hotel has been proposed in Scenario Two and is a potential element in creating a dynamic urban environment.

Section 27-542(a)(6)—To encourage an appropriate horizontal and vertical mix of land uses which blend together harmoniously;

Comment: The proposed CSP contains a variety of uses which will create a visually harmonious development, based on the information contained in the record provided by the design group Street Sense. These exhibits should be guiding design elements at the time of the detailed site plan review, including vertical mixed uses, architectural design, site amenities and an improved streetscape along Addison Road.

Section 27-542(a)(7)—To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;

Comment: To create a unique identity and distinctive visual character, additional green area will be required to make this a truly pleasant place to live. Integration of residential living and retail and office requires open space components that will provide visual and physical relief from the hardscape of the urban environment. The plans do not adequately demonstrate the various levels of the project, i.e. the ground floor components vs. the upper floors of the project. It is not unusual for residential living to be located above retail uses on the first floors, but the plans do not clearly provide the amenities required to assure stable functional relationships between the uses. Prior to signature approval, the plans should be revised indicating limited residential uses on the first floor and uses on each floor above. Building height information should also be provided.

Section 27-542(a)(8)—To promote optimum land planning with greater efficiency through the use of economies of scale, savings in energy, innovative stormwater management techniques, and provision of public facilities and infrastructure beyond the scope of single-purpose projects;

Comment: The mixed-use approach creates a harmonious mix within the M-X-T Zone, substantially more than could be achieved through the construction of this variety of uses as single-purpose projects. The provision of the privately held recreational center, possibly a YMCA, would provide a benefit to the future residents and surrounding community, as was claimed by the applicant at the time of rezoning.

Section 27-542(a)(9)—To permit a flexible response to the market and promote economic vitality and investment; and

Comment: The scope of the project and its multiple uses will allow the flexibility to be responsive to market forces in a variety of sectors. The project could represent a well-integrated set of complementary uses, which together create a unified sense of place. Phasing development in a realistic and orderly way that establishes the design quality and character of the project is important. The phasing plan proposes Phase I as a tier of development along Addison Road. Phase II is shown as a tier behind the Addison Road frontage area consisting of single-use residential, and the Phase III is proposed at the rear of the project as either residential or office and hotel uses. This phasing of the project is slightly different from the phasing proposed at the zoning phase of development. According to the Zoning Hearing Examiner's report the project was to be completed in two phases as stated below:

“...The first will include the 105,450 square feet of retail space, 60,000 of which will be marketed as a grocery store. Phase I is targeted for completion in 2009. The second phase included the 2,136 residential condominium units, as noted in the traffic study, and a 39,900 community center, and is projected to be completed by 2012.”

The current Phasing Plan proposes three phases of development. Staff believed that a mandatory phasing provision should be included in the conditions of approval for this project to insure a mixed-use development. In both proposed scenarios for the development, only two out of the nine-ten buildings that are proposed would be vertically mixed use structures. All of the rest of the buildings are single-use structures. In order to provide for a development that addresses the immediate neighborhood from the onset of the project, the staff recommended that the development of Phase I be made a priority for the release of building permits for the project. Highly visible redevelopment of this property will provide the economic infrastructure for the development of other projects in the area and may spur revitalization of the area. Staff recommended the following phasing schedule be adhered to:

Prior to the issuance of any building permits within Phase II or III, building permits shall be issued and construction shall have commenced for Buildings A, B and C.

However, the Planning Board was concerned about the timing of the recreational building and the applicant proffered Condition No. 24.

Section 27-542(a)(10)—To allow freedom of architectural design in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social, and economic planning.

Comment: The applicant proposes preliminary bulk restrictions with the CSP. More detailed design standards that will focus on the urban character and the form of the public realms will be provided at the time of detailed site plan review.

- 3. 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 project appears to be oriented toward Addison Road, but no real public feature is provided that would invite the community into the project. There will be retail along the street line where a plaza and outdoor seating might contribute to the neighborhood, particularly where the main street intersects with Addison Road.

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

Comment: Land uses immediately adjacent to the development include a single-family detached development. The proposal for parking structures directly adjacent to the single-family

development will create an incompatible relationship and should be addressed at this time by requiring a 50-foot-wide bufferyard by means of conditions attached to the approval of the conceptual site plan.

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

Comment: The development is designed as a mix of various uses that will allow future residents to live and shop without traveling elsewhere. The design of the area incorporates a mix and integration of uses including hotel, retail, residential, and office in an urban pedestrian-friendly grid pattern in order to provide complete urban living. The information provided on design principles and standards, the proposed architectural elements, quality and mix of materials demonstrated in the CSP text, illustrative plan and renderings ensure sustainable quality and reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. However, in order to assure the quality of development as proposed in the CSP, conditions are included that require conformance to the exhibits in the CSP prior to approval of future DSP's for the site.

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 plan proposes three phases of development. Each detailed site plan must demonstrate conformance to the M-X-T Zone, which restricts single-use projects through the implementation of Section 27-597(d). If the project is built out in accordance with the applicant's phasing plan and the proposed staff condition for phasing, then each building phase will be self sufficient and will allow for future integration of subsequent phases.

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

Comment: Where frontage improvements have been made along Addison Road, a standard sidewalk has been provided. The *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and Vicinity (Planning Area 72)* recommends a sidewalk/bikeway along Addison Road (Master Plan, page 84). This can be implemented through the completion of the sidewalks along both sides of Addison Road, the provision of bikeway signage, and bicycle compatible road striping. The subject site has an existing sidewalk along its frontage which will not be sufficient for an enhanced streetscape along Addison Road. At the time of detailed site plan, the streetscape improvements will be required to be detailed and specified.

Sidewalk connections around and within the site will be an especially important component to make the subject site a walkable community. If constructed, the possible future extension of Minnesota Avenue will provide direct vehicular and pedestrian access to the Cheverly Metro Station. Staff also recommends the striping of designated bike lanes in conformance with the

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials' (AASHTO) Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, unless modified by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). An enhanced streetscape may also be appropriate along the subject site's portion of Addison Road, including landscaping and street trees, wide sidewalks, pedestrian scale lighting and other pedestrian amenities. This appears to be indicated on some of the illustrative drawings. Standard or wide sidewalks should be provided along both sides of all internal roads, and internal trail connections may be appropriate at some locations. The internal sidewalk network will be further evaluated at the time of preliminary plan and detailed site plan.

- 8. On the Detailed Site Plan, 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, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting;**

Comment: These issues have been addressed through the conditions of approval and will also be addressed at the time of the detailed site plan for the property.

8. **Section 27-548:** M-X-T Zone regulations establish additional standards for the development in this zone. The CSP's conformance with the applicable provisions is discussed as follows:

(a) Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):

- (1) Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR**
- (2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR**

Comment: The applicant has proposed to use the optional method of development. Under the optional method of development, greater densities can be granted up to a maximum floor area ratio of eight. The density bonus amenities proposed in this CSP include:

Outdoor Plaza—Outdoor plazas have been provided on the site which will potentially add eight square feet for every one-square-foot of plaza area provided, if the plaza measures a minimum of 8,000 square feet and is designed with an appropriately high degree of design quality which encourages a variety of human activities in accordance with Section 27-545(b)(6).

Residential—This will potentially increase FAR by 1.0 if more than 20 dwelling units are provided with the application. This CSP includes 940–2,000 dwelling units and is eligible for this bonus.

The proposed FAR in this CSP is 1.40 and is an allowable FAR in Scenario One of the development proposals. In Scenario Two, the applicant must demonstrate, to the satisfaction of the Planning Board, that an outdoor plaza or other qualifying amenity supports the increase in density at the time of detailed site plan.

9. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9981-C:** The District Council adopted the recommendations of the Zoning Hearing Examiner as its findings and conclusions in this case. The zoning case was approved by the District Council on December 26, 2007, with the following conditions applicable to the review of the proposed conceptual site plan:

1. **The final location of dwelling types shall be determined at the time of Conceptual Site Plan review, due to the extensive environmental constraints on site.**

Comment: The plan clearly indicates the location of dwelling units on the site; none of the structures appear to conflict with the environmental features of the site.

2. **During Conceptual Site Plan review, the Planning Board or its designee shall ensure there is adequate open space at the perimeter to serve as a buffer between the project and adjacent residential development of lower density.**

Comment: This condition assures compatibility between the proposed development and the surrounding existing land uses in the area. The most concerning relationship of the proposed development to surrounding uses is that located on the east side of the development where single-family detached development is directly adjacent to the subject site. The conceptual site plan does not dimension the proposed setback and the illustrative landscape plan appears to attempt to address the setbacks from adjacent uses, but in this case, the setback required by the *Landscape Manual*, in staff's opinion, is insufficient to provide an effective buffer. Further, where existing woodland is present on the site, the staff recommended that the trees be preserved. The Type I tree conservation plan does not show the preservation of woodland along that edge but could be revised to preserve the woodland. Staff recommended that the bufferyard be a minimum of 50 feet in width and that the preservation of woodland be required where woodland exists.

The eastern boundary of the subject site, which is currently wooded, is adjacent to several single-family lots. A significant portion of the woodland in this area is within the Regulated Area of the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan* network. The CSP and TCPI propose to clear the existing woodland in this area for the construction of multifamily dwellings, office/residential buildings, structured parking, and a recreation center. In order to provide effective and permanent screening of the site for the adjacent lots, the existing woodlands along the eastern boundary of the site should be placed in a buffer and maintained as woodland preservation. Any necessary afforestation/reforestation for the enhancement of the buffer should also be implemented.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CSP, and at least 35 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCPI shall be revised to provide a wooded buffer along the eastern boundary. The buffer shall be a minimum of 50 feet in width and shall be used to fulfill the woodland conservation requirements with woodland preservation and woodland afforestation/reforestation.

- 3. Multi-family development shall have direct access to arterial or collector roads and shall not have primary access through single-family residential streets.**

Comment: This condition requires that all multi-family development would have access to arterial or collector roadways, and would not gain access through single-family residential neighborhoods. All internal streets within the development would connect only to Addison Road, a master plan collector, or to Minnesota Avenue Extended, which has no status on the master plan. No development within this site, as currently proposed, connects to existing streets serving single-family communities.

- 4. Wherever possible, living areas shall be linked to community facilities, transportation facilities, employment areas, and other living areas by a continuous system of pedestrian walkways and bike trails utilizing the open space network.**

Comment: The submitted CSP reflects the construction of a road within a “paper street” right-of-way labeled as Minnesota Avenue. The extension of Minnesota Avenue is not included in the Approved Landover and Vicinity Master Plan. Discussions within the Transportation Planning Section have indicated that this road cannot be required at this time as the road was not addressed at the time of basic plan.

Since road construction has been determined to not be feasible, staff recommends the construction of a trail or walkway along the subject driveway with the portion of Minnesota Avenue Extended. Details regarding surface type, ownership, and maintenance can be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

- 5. Buffering in the form of landscaping, open space, berming, attractive fencing, and/or other creative site planning techniques shall be utilized to protect residential areas from commercial, industrial and other incompatible uses.**

Comment: The application is subject to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual* which must be conceptually demonstrated on the plans prior to signature approval.

- 6. The Conceptual Site Plan shall show right-of-way along Addison Road consistent with Master Plan recommendations. This right-of-way shall be shown for dedication at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision. At the time of Conceptual Site Plan review Applicant shall address access to Addison Road for this site in detail. Consideration shall be given to consolidation of access points to the extent feasible as well as the alignment of access points opposite existing streets.**

Comment: This condition requires that adequate right-of-way be shown along Addison Road, and that attention be given to the placement of access along Addison Road. Adequate right-of-way is shown along Addison Road. However, the plan is erroneous, as Addison Road should not be labeled as a 70-foot right-of-way. Plat WWW 57@16 for Beaver Heights clearly indicates the width of this right-of-way as 80 feet, and the existing 80 feet is consistent with

current master plan recommendations for Addison Road. Access from the site has been concentrated in three locations, one opposite existing Doewood Lane, one opposite existing Elkwood Lane, and a third opposite the existing Board of Education property. This is acceptable.

- 7. At time of Conceptual Site Plan review a geotechnical report shall be submitted that evaluates the existing soil conditions on the site and their suitability for the redevelopment proposed.**

Comment: This condition has been addressed. A report titled, "Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration Report, Addison Row at Cheverly Metro," dated August 4, 2006, describes 13 soil borings that were sampled in various areas of the site at depths ranging between 25 and 51 feet below the existing ground surface. According to the report, uncontrolled fill, ranging from two to 20 feet were discovered in ten of soil borings. This fill was considered to be not suitable for the proposed development and the report recommends the removal of all fill where building structures are proposed.

A copy of the report will be required for review at the time of grading permit by the Prince Georges County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) prior to any disturbance of the site. DPW&T may require additional information prior to issuance any grading permits for this site.

Recommended Condition: Development of the site shall follow the recommendations of "Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration, Addison Road at Cheverly Metro" dated August 4, 2006 or any subsequent report approved by the Prince Georges County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

- 8. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan will be required at the time of Conceptual Site Plan review. The TCPI should propose the preservation of as much of the existing vegetation as possible (as deemed appropriate by the Planning Board or its designee) and should provide some areas of afforestation adjacent to the expanded buffer.**

Comment: A Type I tree conservation plan has been submitted. Woodland conservation is discussed in the Environmental Review Section of this memo.

- 9. A determination regarding stream valley dedication and/or trail construction along Beaverdam Creek will be made at the time of CSP.**

Comment: The subject property includes a small portion of the Beaverdam Creek Stream Valley along the northern property line. Jesse Warr Neighborhood Recreational Center Park is adjacent to this property on the east. Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) staff believed that trail construction along Beaverdam Creek is inappropriate because of severe slopes. DPR staff also believes that a trail connector to the park may be provided via Woodhill Drive and recommends preserving a portion of Beaverdam Creek Stream Valley as homeowners open space.

10. At time of Conceptual Site Plan review, Applicant and staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation shall develop a mutually acceptable package of parkland, outdoor recreational facilities, fees or donations to meet the future needs of the residents of the planned community.

Comment: The staff of the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) has reviewed the conceptual site plan application for conformance with the requirements of approved Basic Plan A-9981-C, with conditions as described in County Council Zoning Ordinance No. 9-2007; M-X-T Zone requirements; the requirements and recommendations of the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*; the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and Vicinity (Planning Area 72)*; current zoning and subdivision regulations; and existing conditions in the vicinity of the proposed development as they pertain to public parks and recreation facilities.

The applicant proposes to develop the property as a high-quality, high-density mixed use residential and commercial development, which will include a hotel, office, retail and residential uses. The applicant proposes 2,000 residential dwelling units in the project area. Using current projections of household type and size by Planning Area, DPR has concluded that the residential component of this development will bring approximately 6,000 new residents to the area.

The applicant proposes the construction of a 25,000-square-foot recreational center that may be operated by the YMCA or another entity. The applicant considers this 25,000-square-foot recreational facility as part of a recreational facilities package. The applicant has not provided commitment letters from the YMCA or any other entity stating that it will operate this facility at this location, or that a 25,000-square-foot building will meet YMCA requirements. The applicant indicated that this YMCA-like recreational center will be available to the residents for a fee.

The Department of Parks and Recreation staff has reviewed this application and recommended conditions addressing Condition 10 of approved Basic Plan A-9981-C.

Prince George's County General Plan establishes objectives related to the provision of **public parkland**. It states that a minimum of 15 acres of Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) local parkland should be provided per 1,000 population and 20 acres of regional, countywide and special M-NCPPC parkland per 1,000 residents. By applying the General Plan standards for the projected population in the new community (6,000 residents), staff has determined that **112 acres** of local and **150 acres** of regional public parkland, suitable for active recreation, may be needed to serve the proposed community. Current needs for parkland and recreational facilities are not being met within the existing community. The addition of 6,000 new residents to the community will substantially increase the community's recreational needs.

The approved Master Plan for Landover and Vicinity Planning Area 72 recognizes the need for additional parkland and additional recreational facilities to satisfy the projected population. In addition, the approved 1993 *Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and*

Vicinity (Planning Area 72) did not take into account that this property will be rezoned from industrial to M-X-T with a residential component; therefore, it does not account for a 6,000 person population increase on the subject site.

Subdivision Ordinance, Section 24-134 requires the mandatory dedication of parkland in all residential subdivisions. This development includes mixed uses on the same parcel and in the same buildings. It is difficult to determine which portion of the parcel will include the planned residential development. Clearly, a mechanism or technique is needed to achieve the goals of the Subdivision Ordinance regarding the provision of parks and recreational facilities to respond to the needs of the residents and employees of the planned community.

Section 24-135 of the Subdivision Regulations states that the recreational facilities may be provided instead of land or fees in any residential zone, provided that a plan for such recreational facilities is approved by the Planning Board after determining that:

- (1) Such facilities will be superior, or equivalent, to those that would have been provided under the provisions of mandatory dedication;
- (2) The facilities will be properly developed and maintained to the benefit of future residents through covenants, a recreational facilities agreement, or other appropriate means, that such instrument is legally binding upon the subdivider and his heirs, successors, and assigns, and that such instrument is enforceable, including enforcement by the Planning Board; and
- (3) No permit for construction or occupancy of dwellings will be issued unless the Planning Board is satisfied that the facilities have been, or will be, provided at the appropriate state of development.

The applicant indicated that each apartment building will contain its own community room and that recreational facilities for each building will be determined at the time of the detailed site plan. In addition, the applicant provides various open space areas that may be used for passive recreation. The applicant proposes construction of up to a 25,000-square-foot YMCA-like recreational center and seeks a private operator to take it over. There is no information as to what type of recreational facilities will be provided in this recreational center. In addition, this recreational center will be privately operated and available to the residents for a fee and limited to members only. While staff has no objection to the construction of the YMCA-like recreational center on this property, we believe that this recreational center cannot be counted toward mandatory dedication requirements as described in Section 24-135 of the Subdivision Ordinance because such a facility will not be superior or equivalent to those that would be provided under provision of mandatory dedication and there are no covenants that this facility will be operated for the residents of this development.

The subject property is located 1,200 feet east of the Jesse Warr Neighborhood Recreation Center Park. The park is 11.5 acres in size and includes an older recreation building built in 1970, a play

area, a basketball court and a playground. The Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) is currently in the process of rebuilding the recreation building in the park. DPR staff anticipates that a new 2,100-square-foot recreational building will be under construction starting in 2010 and will be available to the public in 2012. This project is funded in CIP FY10. Considering the close proximity of the proposed development, staff believes that this recreational building will also serve the residents of the planned community. In addition, the DPR operates seven Community Centers within a 3-mile radius of the project area.

CONCLUSION

DPR staff recommended development of a recreational facilities package, including on-site private recreational facilities available to the residents at no charge and the contribution of a fee to the M-NCPPC for the construction and reconstruction of the existing public recreational facilities in the vicinity of the project area.

As has been the case with other developments zoned M-X-T, DPR staff recommended establishing a formula for calculation of fees-in-lieu of parkland dedication in this mixed-use development. The amount of the fee required should be based on the cost of the recreational facilities that would be required if private recreational facilities were deemed a desirable option for meeting the requirements for mandatory dedication of parkland. The Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines provide a formula for determining the value of recreation facilities to be provided. Staff proposed using the formula to determine the value of a recreation facilities package required from the subject planned development:

$$\begin{array}{ll}\text{Step 1:} & (N \times P) / 500 = M \\ \text{Step 2:} & M \times S = \text{Value of facilities}\end{array}$$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

P = Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500

Number of units in project: Includes all dwelling units proposed for future development within the project area.

Population per dwelling unit by Planning Area: The Research Section of the Planning Department publishes projections of household type and size by Planning Area each year.

Multiplier: The ratio of the projected total population of the proposed community to a standard population increment of 500 persons.

Standard value of facilities for population of 500: The cost of providing and installing

adequate recreation facilities for a population of 500. This monetary amount is determined by the Department of Parks and Recreation on a biennial basis and is based on the cost of a representative selection of recreation facilities, which, according to generally accepted standards in the recreation industry, will satisfy the needs of the typical group of 500 citizens.

Value of facilities to be provided: This dollar amount reflects the minimum cost of recreation facilities that should be provided for the residents in the project area.

In order to demonstrate conformance with Basic Plan A-9981-C, Condition 10 above, at the time of detailed site plan review for the residential development, the Development Review Division (DRD) and the Department of Parks and Recreation staff should employ the formula above as a basis for recommending to the Planning Board a fee amount to be contributed to the M-NCPPC for the construction or reconstruction of recreational facilities on public parkland in the surrounding neighborhood. DPR staff further recommends to the Planning Board that a YMCA-like recreational center should not be considered part of a recreational facilities package provided to meet mandatory dedication requirements in accordance with Section 24-135 of the Subdivision Regulations.

11. **The Landover and Vicinity Master Plan recommends that Addison Road be designated as a sidewalk/bikeway with appropriate signage. Because Addison Road is a County right-of-way, the Applicant and its heirs, successors, and/or assigns shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the DPWT for the placement of this signage. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.**

Comment: This condition will be carried over to the approval of this plan.

12. **Prior to issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (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:**

Addison Road at Eastern Avenue

- a. **Restriping the eastbound Eastern Avenue approach to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.**
- b. **Provisions of a dual right-turn lane along the southbound Addison Road approach.**

Sheriff Road at Addison Road

- a. **Provision of two (2) through and exclusive right-turn and left-turn lanes**

along the westbound Sheriff Road approach.

- b. Provision of an exclusive left-turn lane along the eastbound Sheriff Road approach.**

Comment: The off-site transportation improvements identified in this condition will be re-reviewed during review of a preliminary plan of subdivision, and required at the time of building permit.

- 13. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision a revised traffic study shall be submitted. The improvements set forth above shall be reviewed and revised if deemed necessary. The review shall include an analysis of queuing within the left-turn lane along eastbound Eastern Avenue. The traffic study shall also review each proposed access point along Addison Road to determine the appropriate land configuration at each location and to determine if signalization merits further study. Such further study of traffic signal warrants shall be conducted at the time of Detailed Site Plan. This revised study shall also consider traffic calming measures along Doewood Lane, if an access point is aligned opposite to it, and Elkwood/Nast Street, if an access point is aligned opposite to Elkwood Lane.**

Comment: This condition identifies several transportation issues to be studied at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision review. This will be done in accordance with the condition at that time.

- 14. Prior to Detailed Site Plan approval the Applicant shall submit a noise study and shall use the appropriate noise and vibration mitigation measures in developing the property.**

Comment: A noise study has been submitted; however, it did not include a vibration analysis for the proposed buildings and the submitted plans do not show the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour associated with the adjacent Washington Metro Area Transit Authority (WMATA) Metrorail tracks, as well as railroad tracks owned by the Consolidated Rail Corporation. These railroad tracks are significant noise and vibration generators.

Although the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour is not shown on any of the plans, the study notes that some outdoor activity areas and residential units will be impacted by noise levels exceeding the state standard. The TCPI must be revised to show the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Because this site will require a preliminary plan, noise mitigation measures for the impacted areas shall be addressed at that time.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CSP, and prior to the acceptance of the preliminary plan application, a vibration analysis of the adjacent Metrorail and railway tracks shall be submitted.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CSP, the TCPI shall be revised to show conceptually the location of all proposed outdoor activity areas and the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour based on the "Phase I Railway Noise Analysis, Cheverly Row," dated April 20, 2006.

Recommended Condition: At the time of preliminary plan, the preliminary plan application shall include a Phase II noise study addresses how noise has been mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn for outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA Ldn for interior levels and the preliminary plan and TCPI shall be revised to conceptually show the proposed mitigation and the mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour.

- 15. All future submission packages shall contain a signed natural resources inventory (NRI). The NRI shall be used to prepare a site layout that results in non-essential impact to the regulated features of the site.**

Comment: This condition is intended to mean that the NRI should be used to prepare a site layout that results in impacts to the regulated areas that are limited to those that are essential to the development proposed. The plan submitted shows one impact to the regulated for a storm drain outfall.

A signed Natural Resource Inventory (NRI), dated November 28, 2006, has been submitted. The site contains 100-year floodplain associated with the adjacent stream system within the Beaverdam Creek Watershed. The site also contains areas of steep and severe slopes; however, most of the site is developed and contains uncontrolled fill.

The gross acreage and 100-year floodplain acreage on the NRI is not consistent with the acreages on the TCPI and CSP. The NRI, or the TCPI and CSP will need to be revised as necessary to reflect the correct acreages.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CSP, and prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan, the NRI and all associated documents shall be revised as necessary to show the correct acreages for the site. The acreages shall be correctly reflected on the CSP and TCPI.

- 16. Any proposed route for the shuttle service through the Town of Cheverly shall be reviewed at the time of subdivision review, and must be submitted to the Town for its review and approval.**

Comment: This condition requires that any proposed routing for shuttle service be reviewed at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision. This will be done in accordance with the condition at that time. The applicant is reminded that they must coordinate submittal of this information to the Town of Cheverly, and receipt and documentation of the Town's comments for submittal to the transportation planning staff is required at the time of subdivision review. Transportation planning will not finalize comments regarding this condition until it is clear that needed coordination with the Town has occurred to the satisfaction of all parties.

- 17. The residential development of the project shall be limited to a maximum of 2,000 dwelling units and the total development on the property shall be limited to uses that generate no more than 1,683 AM and 2,323 PM peak vehicle hour trips.**

Comment: The trip cap condition above governs the development of the property. Each plan of development that is submitted is required to be found in conformance with the underlying zoning conditions on the site. The Transportation Planning Section reviewed each development scenario proposed for conformance to the Basic Plan from a traffic perspective and provided the following trip analysis:

<i>Scenario One</i>	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<i>Retail</i>	<i>121,900</i>	<i>square feet</i>				
Total Trips	108	69	177	390	390	780
Pass-By	-54	-35	-89	-195	-195	-390
Internal	-4	-3	-7	-20	-29	-49
New Trips	50	31	81	175	166	341
<i>Comm. Ctr.</i>	<i>25,000</i>	<i>square feet</i>				
Total Trips	25	15	40	12	29	41
Pass-By	-8	-6	-14	-4	-10	-14
New Trips	17	9	26	8	19	27
<i>Office</i>	<i>650,000</i>	<i>square feet</i>				
	1,170	130	1,300	228	975	1,203
<i>Residential</i>	<i>940</i>	<i>residences</i>				
Townhouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Condominiums	94	395	489	367	197	564
Internal	-3	-4	-7	-29	-20	-49
New Trips	91	391	482	338	177	515
<i>TOTAL SITE</i>	1,328	561	1,889	749	1,337	2,086
<i>Scenario Two</i>	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<i>Retail</i>	<i>121,900</i>	<i>square feet</i>				
Total Trips	108	69	177	390	390	780
Pass-By	-54	-35	-89	-195	-195	-390
Internal	-9	-6	-15	-43	-62	-105
New Trips	45	28	73	152	133	285

Comm. Ctr.	25,000	square feet				
Total Trips	25	15	40	12	29	41
Pass-By	-8	-6	-14	-4	-10	-14
New Trips	17	9	26	8	19	27
Office	14,300	square feet				
	26	3	29	5	21	26
Hotel	340	rooms				
	119	102	221	153	119	272
Residential	2,000	residences				
Townhouse	0	0	0	0	0	0
Condominiums	200	840	1040	780	420	1,200
Internal	-6	-9	-15	-62	-43	-105
New Trips	194	831	1,025	718	377	1,095
TOTAL SITE	401	973	1,374	1,036	669	1,705

In CSP Scenario One, the application generates 1,889 AM peak-hour trips and 2,086 PM peak-hour trips, 206 trips over the AM peak trip limitation allowed for the project. The staff recommends that Scenario One be adjusted to conform to the trip cap by reducing an appropriate amount of office space. In Scenario Two, the application generates 1,374 AM peak-hour trips and 1,705 PM peak-hour trips. These numbers conform to the trip caps of the Basic Plan. The trip cap will be further analyzed at the time of the preliminary plan and the detailed site plan in order to assure conformance.

14. **Conformance to the *Landscape Manual*:** The CSP is not in conformance to the *Landscape Manual*. The plan does not provide sufficient land area for the required bufferyards, based on the schedules and the illustrative plan submitted. Prior to signature approval, the plan should be revised to correct the schedules and conceptually demonstrate conformance to Section 4.7 of the *Landscape Manual*.

REFERRALS

15. The **Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section** stated the following:
A Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the above-referenced 34.40-acre property located at 4800 Addison Road in Capitol Heights, Maryland. A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Aerial

photographs from 1965 show that the entire property was extensively graded prior to construction of the warehouse building and parking lots that currently occupy the tract. The grading and construction of the warehouse have likely adversely impacted any archeological site that may have previously existed on the property. However, the applicant should be aware that one previously recorded archeological site, 18PR126 an Archaic base camp, is located within a one-mile radius of the subject property. In addition, there are four National Register of Historic Places sites, four County Historic Sites, and four County Historic Resources located within a one-mile radius of the subject property.

Moreover, Section 106 review may require archeological survey for state or federal agencies. Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, to include archeological sites. This review is required when state or federal monies, or federal permits are required for a project.

16. **The Transportation Planning Section** provided the following comments on the CSP:

Access and circulation is acceptable.

The most significant transportation issue concerns Minnesota Avenue Extended. While the conceptual site plan shows this facility within the site and extending beyond the site toward the Cheverly Metrorail Station, it is not constructed in this area and has not been proffered for off-site construction by this applicant to date. It has no status on the master plan, and is not on property that is owned or controlled by the applicant. It is possible that it could be constructed in the future, and it is even possible that development on this site could be made conditional on its construction with a future adequacy finding. For purposes of this application, however, the portion of Minnesota Avenue Extended to the north and east of the area of this application should be displayed in a dashed or crosshatched fashion and labeled "Possible Future Roadway Connection."

In consideration of these findings, the Transportation Planning Section determines that the plan conforms to the required findings for approval of the conceptual site plan from the standpoint of transportation. This finding is conditional upon the following:

1. The approved conceptual site plan shall include the following modifications:
 - a. The right-of-way for Addison Road shall be reflected as 80 feet, consistent with the master plan and information shown on prior approved record plats.
 - b. The portion of Minnesota Avenue Extended to the north and east of the area of this application should be displayed in a dashed or crosshatched fashion and labeled "Possible Future Roadway Connection."
17. **The Environmental Planning Section** – The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06003, stamped as received on July 11, 2008.

Previous comments were provided in a memorandum dated February 28, 2008. Not all of the comments in that memorandum were addressed and the revised plans have resulted in additional comments because of new technical issues raised by the revisions. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CSP-06003 and TCPI/041/07 subject to the conditions noted at the end of this memorandum.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed this site as part of a Natural Resources Inventory review (NRI/125/06) and a rezoning application (A-9981). The zoning application to rezone the site from the I-1 (Light Industrial), I-2 (Heavy Industrial) and C-O (Commercial Office) to the M-X-T (Mixed Use Transportation oriented) Zone was approved by the Planning Board on December, 14, 2006. Currently, the site is developed. This conceptual site plan proposes a mixed-use community consisting of residential units, office, commercial, and hotel accommodations, and a community center. The subject property is located within the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and Vicinity (Planning Area 72)*, and is adjacent to, but not within, the Tuxedo Road/ Arbor Street Sector Plan.

The 34.40-acre property is located in the northeast quadrant of Addison Road and Minnesota Avenue and is currently developed with an old warehouse building previously used as a food distribution center. A review of available information indicates that streams, wetlands and 100-year floodplains, and associated areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils and areas of severe slopes, are found to occur on the extreme northern portion of the site. There are nearby noise sources associated with the subject property. According to PGATLAS, these sources include, rail lines operated by the Washington Metro Area Transit Authority (WMATA) and the Consolidated Rail Corporation. The proposed development could require noise and vibration mitigation measures if residential uses are located in proximity to the railroad. The predominant soil type found to occur on the site according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey* is recorded as Gravel Pit, indicating that the site was previously mined. According to GIS information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, rare, threatened, or endangered species are not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. No designated scenic or historic roads are affected by this proposal. This property is located in the Beaverdam Creek watershed in the Anacostia River basin. The site is in the Developed Tier according to the adopted 2002 General Plan.

Environmental Issues Addressed in the Landover and Vicinity Approved Master Plan (February 1993) and Approved Sectional Map Amendment (July 1993).

There are no specific environmental requirements or design standards in the Landover and Vicinity Approved Master Plan Sectional Map Amendment that require review for conformance. The environmental requirements for woodland preservation, stormwater management and noise are addressed in the Environmental Review section below.

Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan Conformance

This site contains Regulated Areas and Network Gaps within the designated network of the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan. Because of the sensitive environmental features and existing woodland associated with this area, every effort should be made to preserve and/or restore the regulated features and focus woodland conservation on this portion of the site.

The site is also within a designated Special Conservation Area of the Green Infrastructure Plan: the Anacostia River. This river has very poor water quality and is the focus of many efforts to restore water quality. This provides even more reason to protect the existing wooded areas and restore any areas that are within the Regulated Area that are not current wooded.

The TCPI proposes preservation along the northern portion of the site, within and adjacent to the on-site expanded buffer. The proposed preservation is within most of the Regulated Area and some of the Network Gap on-site. The plan is in conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan.

Tree Conservation

This site is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet and there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site.

On May 10, 2001, the Environmental Planning Section originally issued a Numbered Exemption Letter (E-34-01) for a specific activity on the site, resulting in less than 5,000 square feet of disturbance. A Letter of Exemption is valid for a period of two years from the date of issuance so this letter has expired. A new Numbered Exemption Letter (E-34-01-01) was re-issued resulting in 3,332 square feet of cumulative woodland disturbances, dated April 19, 2004 and it too has expired.

A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/041/07), stamped as received on July 11, 2006 has been submitted. The plan could not receive a complete review for conformance to the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the worksheet is incorrect. In a previous memo dated February 21, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section noted that the worksheet needed to be revised to show the correct gross tract area of the site. This required revision was based on the differences in acreages on the TCPI and NRI that were submitted with the application. To date, the gross tract areas of the site on the NRI and revised TCPI are still inconsistent. Additionally, the plan showed a woodland conservation requirement (4.58) that is lower than the required threshold for the site (4.97). The acreage of the 100-year floodplain on the site is also incorrect. The TCPI worksheet shows it as 1.06 acres; however, the NRI shows it at 1.40 acres, and the worksheet shows it as 1.24 acres. The woodland conservation threshold cannot be correctly calculated until the acreages are correct.

It appears as though clearing within the 100-year floodplain is proposed. Revise the TCPI worksheet to show the acreage of clearing within the floodplain. The worksheet proposes 0.81 acres of reforestation; however, it is not shown on the plan.

The TCPI proposes to meet 5.47 acres of the requirement using fee-in-lieu. Fee-in-lieu is the last option of the available woodland conservation methods and it is typically used in cases when the remaining requirement is less than one acre. The plan must be revised to show any remaining requirement being met with off-site mitigation.

The plan shows a symbol representing the “adjacent Green Infrastructure from PG Atlas.” The Green Infrastructure Plan is a conceptual plan that should be used as a guide to land development decisions and should not be shown on plans. This information must be removed.

The plan proposes a road extension along the northwest boundary of the site and ending at the northeast corner of the site continuing north onto the adjacent property. The TCPI and CSP show this road as a “Possible Location of Future Road.” It appears as though the extension is to provide a road connection with the nearby WMATA Metro station through an existing 100-year floodplain. The road as shown is not realistically reflected on the plan because the associated grading and the conceptual limits of disturbance are not shown to construct the road. The TCPI also shows woodland preservation in this area. The submitted CSP proposal does not include text regarding this particular road. It is not clear at this time whether or not the road is required and because its construction would cause non-essential impacts to sensitive environmental features, it should be removed from the plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the certification of the conceptual site plan, the TCPI shall be revised as follows:

- Revise the worksheet to show the correct acreages associated with this site. This shall include but not be limited to the gross tract area, 100-year floodplain area, existing woodland on the net tract, and existing woodland in the 100-year floodplain.
- Revise the TCPI so that the worksheet correctly reflects the woodland conservation requirement for the site.
- Revise the plan to reflect any clearing within the 100-year floodplain.
- Show the area of proposed reforestation as indicated in the worksheet.
- Eliminate the proposed road designated as the “Possible Location of Future Road” from the CSP and TCPI.
- Remove the information shown as “adjacent Green Infrastructure from PG Atlas” and any other information that relates to the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan.

- Show the 10-foot public utility easement.
- Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

Stormwater Management

The site has a Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter dated August 30, 2006. The associated plan was not included in the package and the TCPI does not show any stormwater management infrastructure.

The approval letter states the following: “This is a redevelopment project. Applicant will provide water quality volume for 20 percent of the impervious area by reducing the impervious coverage using hydrodynamic separators.” It does not appear that the amounts of impervious surfaces on the site are going to be reduced.

The CSP proposal does not discuss or show how stormwater runoff from this site will be addressed and no information is provided on the TCPI. Given the close proximity of this site to Lower Beaver Dam Creek, the quality of stormwater runoff from the site is a top priority. The Tuxedo Road/Arbor Street/Cheverly Metro Sector Plan designates Lower Beaver Dam Creek as a green corridor within the Anacostia Watershed, which is one of the most degraded systems in the county due to a variety of impacts as a result of urbanization.

In August 2006, the Prince George’s Department of Environmental Resources released the results of its Stream Corridor Assessment Survey as a “response plan to restore the health of water bodies that do not meet the Clean Water Act (CWA) regulations or other natural resource goals.” The study includes information from a Stream Corridor Assessment that was completed for Lower Beaver Dam Creek and provides recommendations to restore and enhance severely degraded areas within the Anacostia Watershed. The development of the subject site with its high percentage of impervious surfaces, which is located in the Anacostia Watershed, will serve to increase runoff and pollutants that enter the water system. Water quality and restoration will need to be addressed during the review of the preliminary plan and any requests for impacts to the existing regulated features.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan, and prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan, copies of the approved stormwater management concept plan shall be submitted.

Recommended Condition: Prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan application, a statement addressing how the application is addressing the recommendations of the Anacostia Stream Corridor Assessment Survey shall be included.

18. The **Transportation Planning Section** also provided the following comments on the CSP:

Three master plan trails impact the subject site. The Approved Landover and Vicinity Master Plan designated Addison Road as a pedestrian/bicycle corridor. The *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Tuxedo Road/Arbor Street/Cheverly Metro Area* also makes recommendations regarding Beaverdam Creek and the future provision of a stream valley trail in this corridor, as well as a trail connection from Beaverdam Creek to Addison Road.

The Sector Plan includes a recommendation specifically regarding the stream valley trail and future studies along the stream valley. Recommendation 5 of the Sidewalks, Trails, and Bikeways Element of the Master Plan states:

Conduct a feasibility study for a stream valley trail along Beaverdam Creek. The feasibility study for the trail should be part of a larger comprehensive study for the restoration of the Beaverdam Creek stream valley. Issues such as pollution, erosion, water quality, and incompatible land uses may need to be addressed as part of this study. A trail along Beaverdam Creek would ultimately link the Cheverly Metro area with the Anacostia Tributary Trails Network and the planned Anacostia River Trail in the District of Columbia.

This recommendation indicates the desire of the community to ultimately have a stream valley trail along the corridor. This trail will provide access to a local urban greenway, allow a connection to the regional trail system, and provide additional opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian movement for some transportation trips. However, the recommendation also indicates that significant issues need to be explored and resolved before the trail is completed over its entire length. These issues include environmental constraints, stream restoration, conflicting land uses, and the need for additional stream valley park acquisition.

The appropriateness of trail construction along the subject site's relatively short segment of Beaverdam Creek will have to be evaluated in more detail by the Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR). It should be noted that the M-NCPPC, Department of Parks and Recreation, currently owns land along the stream valley immediately to the east of the subject site, thus making a trail connection to the existing Jesse J. Warr Neighborhood Park and community center feasible. However, there are significant steep slopes in the stream valley in the vicinity of the subject site. Therefore, in accordance with the DPR recommendation, staff does not recommend trail construction at this time.

19. WMATA provided the following comments on the plan in a letter dated April 16, 2008, from Joel Washington to Chairman Parker:

“Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the *Addison Row Conceptual Site Plan CSP 06003*. In general, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (“WMATA”) supports the establishment of vibrant, mixed-use, transit oriented communities at and around our Metrorail stations. The Addison Row Conceptual Site Plan is consistent with WMATA’s transit oriented development goals.

“WMATA would like to see as many steps taken as possible to improve the accessibility of this project to Metro at Cheverly and Deanwood stations by foot, bicycle, or shuttle bus, including wide, safe, well-lit paths. However, the proposed conceptual site plan illustrates a proposed vehicular connection to the southern border of the Park and Ride lot that might constrain future development and could potentially impact rail ridership. Further, if land were consumed that would otherwise have been available for private development or for a transit purpose, we would generally expect to be compensated for the taking of our land. If any changes to our facilities were necessitated by a public road as proposed - for example, reduction in parking spaces available, relocation of bus bays or parking spaces, etc. - then a compact public hearing would be required. Given the environmental constraints in the area surrounding the Cheverly station Park and Ride lot, it may make more sense to aim to connect this project to the Deanwood station, which is also in close proximity to the proposed development.

“Connectivity to the Metro stations is extremely important in this area to encourage the use of Metro. When reviewing projects in the vicinity of Metrorail, we prefer not to see projects that create a large new source of demand for parking, but rather would like to see more cost-effective methods of access to our stations from projects in the neighborhood. That said, we would expect any facility providing public access for a private developer to be paid for and maintained by either the developer or the County.”

“Finally, I would like to point out that Metro’s current planning work program includes a station access study at the Cheverly Metro Station that will make recommendations for: improved transit patron access; future transit links; and new development opportunities. During these studies, alternative station area plans will be developed and evaluated to ensure that Metro operational and access needs are met within the context of future joint development. Metro is working with M-NCPPC planning staff, other agency and elected stakeholders, potentially affected communities, the Maryland Department of Transportation, and others as these projects move forward.”

“In conclusion, with the conditions noted above, WMATA supports approval of the ***Addison Row Conceptual Site Plan CSP 06003.***”

20. The CSP represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs 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/041/07), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06003 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan for the subject application, a new preliminary plan of subdivision shall be approved. Upon issuance of building permits for residential units, the applicant shall pay the applicable public safety surcharge and schools facilities surcharge.
2. At the time of review of each detailed site plan including residential development, the applicant shall specify the total number of proposed dwelling units in the residential portion of the subject DSP. Development Review Division and Department of Parks and Recreation staff shall employ the formula below to determine the minimum value of the private recreational facilities package to be provided on-site for the benefit of the residents:

Step 1: $(N \times P) / 500 = M$

Step 2: $M \times S = \text{Value of facilities}$

Where:

N = Number of units in project

M = Multiplier

S = Standard value of facilities for population of 500. A list of the quantity and respective value of the recreation facilities to be provided for a typical population of 500 is updated regularly.

P = Population per dwelling unit will be based on estimates of average household type and size by Planning Area, generated by the Research Section of the Department of Planning each year.

3. At the time of review of each detailed site plan including residential development, the formula above shall be employed to determine the amount of the applicant's fee to the M-NCPPC in fulfillment of Basic Plan A-9981-C, Condition 10. The fee shall be the difference between the minimum value of private facilities established by Condition 2 above, and the dollar value of private facilities actually provided by the developer on the subject site. The recreational center owned by the condominium association or the developer and operated by the condominium association, the developer or their agent or lessee located on the frontage of Addison Road may be considered as a supplement to the recreational facilities package to satisfy mandatory dedication requirements in accordance with Section 24-135 of the Subdivision Ordinance, if the applicant provides covenants as satisfactory to the Planning Board that guarantee non-profit recreation/community/cultural use of the building in perpetuity.

Reduced fees for residents of the Addison Row development may be included in the covenants depending on the type of facilities proposed in the building. This agreement shall be documented in a Declaration of Covenants recorded with the Final Plats of Subdivision.

4. Prior to approval of the final plat of subdivision, the applicant shall provide evidence of the payment of a fee to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the construction and reconstruction of the public recreational facilities in the surrounding neighborhood.
5. The applicant, the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees, shall provide private

recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.

6. The applicant shall allocate appropriate and developable areas for the private recreational facilities on the subject property. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting, prior to approval of the detailed site plan by the Planning Board.
7. The applicant shall submit three original, executed, private recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to the DRD for their approval three weeks prior to the submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.
8. The applicant shall submit to DRD 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. The developer, his successor and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.
9. At the time of the detailed site plan review, the applicant shall demonstrate to the Planning Board that the on-site private recreational facilities will be properly developed and maintained to the benefit of future residents through covenants, a recreational facilities agreement, or other appropriate means and that such instrument is legally binding upon the applicant, the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees.
10. The conceptual site plan and all subsequent plans of development shall include the following modifications:
 - a. The right-of-way for Addison Road shall be reflected as 80 feet, consistent with the master plan and information shown on prior approved record plats.
 - b. The portion of Minnesota Avenue Extended to the north and east of the area of this application should be displayed in a dashed or crosshatched fashion and labeled "Possible Future Roadway Connection."
11. The applicant, the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a financial contribution of \$210 to the DPW&T for the placement of bicycle signage. A note shall be placed on the final record plat for payment to be received prior to the issuance of the first building permit.
12. Prior to approval of the applicable DSP, a 50-foot-wide tree preservation/landscape buffer shall be provided along the entire eastern property line. Where quality woodland exists along the eastern property line, it shall be preserved in its entirety to a maximum of 50 feet in width.

Based on engineering necessity, a reduction from the 50-foot-wide preservation/landscape buffer may be considered in conjunction with enhanced buffering techniques or architecture on the structured parking garages.

13. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the CSP shall be revised to conceptually demonstrate conformance to the *Landscape Manual*, Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses.
14. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan, the plans shall demonstrate conformance to CSP-06003. An enhanced streetscape shall be provided along Addison Road as contemplated by the CSP.
15. Prior to certification of the CSP, and at least 35 days prior to any hearing on the preliminary plan, the CSP and TCPI shall be revised to provide a wooded buffer along the eastern boundary. The buffer shall be used to fulfill the woodland conservation requirements with woodland preservation and woodland afforestation/reforestation.
16. Development of the site shall follow the recommendations of "Report of Preliminary Geotechnical Exploration, Addison Road at Cheverly Metro" dated August 4, 2006 or any subsequent report approved by the Prince Georges County Department of Public Works and Transportation.
17. Prior to Detailed Site Plan submittal, a vibration analysis of the adjacent Metrorail and railway tracks shall be submitted. If mitigation is required, that will be approved with the Detailed Site Plan.
18. Prior to certification of the CSP, the TCPI shall be revised to show conceptually the location of all proposed outdoor activity areas and the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour based on the "Phase I Railway Noise Analysis, Cheverly Row," dated April 20, 2006.
19. At the time of preliminary plan, the preliminary plan application shall include a Phase II noise study addressing how noise has been mitigated to 65 dBA Ldn for outdoor activity areas and 45 dBA Ldn for interior levels and the preliminary plan and TCPI shall be revised to conceptually show the proposed mitigation and the mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour.
20. Prior to certification of the CSP, and prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan, the NRI and all associated documents shall be revised as necessary to show the correct acreages for the site. The acreages shall be correctly reflected on the CSP and TCPI.
21. Prior to the certification of the conceptual site plan, the TCPI shall be revised as follows:
 - a. Revise the worksheet to show the correct acreages associated with this site. This shall include, but not be limited to the gross tract area, 100-year floodplain area, existing woodland on the net tract, and existing woodland in the 100-year floodplain.
22. The residential development of the project shall be limited to a maximum of 2,000 dwelling units,

and the total development on the property shall be limited to uses that generate no more than 1,683 AM and 2,323 PM peak hour vehicle trips. This may require a reduction in the amount of office, retail, and/or residential development to conform to the trip cap.

23. Prior to the issuance of any building permits for exclusively residential buildings within Phase II or III, building permits shall be issued and construction shall be substantially complete for two of the following Buildings: A, B and C.
24. Prior to the issuance of the 501st use and occupancy permit for residential uses, the recreation building shall be constructed and open for use.

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 Squire, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Cavitt absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 31, 2008, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 11th day of September 2008.

Oscar S. Rodriguez
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs