

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed 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 20, 2000, regarding Detailed Site Plan CSP-99050 for MANOKEEK, the Planning Board finds:

1. Location: The subject property is located on both the east and west sides of Berry Road (MD 228) south of the intersection of Berry Road and Indianhead Highway (MD 210). The portion of the property located west of MD 228 is bounded to the south and west by Manning Road; to the north by the MD 210 right-of-way and vacant property Zoned R-R; and to the east the MD 228 right-of-way. The portion of the property located east of MD 228 is bounded to the south by Manning Road; to the east by developed and vacant single-family residential lots Zoned R-R; to the north by the MD 210 right-of-way and a vacant property Zoned R-R; and to the west by the MD 228 right-of-way.
2. The Proposed Development: The purpose of the subject application is approval of a Conceptual Site Plan for a site of approximately 97 acres in the M-X-T Zone. The applicant's three proposed uses for the property are residential (senior/age restricted dwellings), commercial, and office. In its entirety, the proposed development will allow for 1,427,500 to 1,686,461 square feet of gross floor area. The proposed uses will be sited on Pods 1, 2, and 3. Commercial/retail and office space will occupy Pods 1 and 3, while Pod 2 will be occupied by the senior/age restricted dwellings with a small allowance for service-oriented commercial/retail and office. Pods 1 and 2 are bisected by an existing electric utility easement. The application consists of a Conceptual Site Plan, Tree Conservation Plan-Type I, and an Illustrative Site Plan for the entire site. Access from MD 210 and MD 228 was denied for the subject property; therefore ingress/egress to all three pods will be via Manning Road.
3. Background: The *Subregion V Master Plan and SMA* (1993) rezoned the subject property from E-I-A to the M-X-T Zone. Mixed Use development was specifically recommended for the subject property. In a memorandum (Rovelstad to Jordan) dated July 7, 2000 master plan issues pertaining to the subject application and the proposed development are raised. See Findings No.7 and 10 for a detailed discussion of the noted issues.

On September 14, 1993, the District Council approved *The Subregion V Master Plan and SMA* and adopted Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993 which rezoned the property to M-X-T. Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993 does not contain any conditions or considerations with respect to the subject property. The proposed plan is in full conformance with Zoning Ordinance No. 60-1993.

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

Zone	M-X-T	
Gross/Net Tract Area		96.79 acres
Pod 1	26.04 acres	
Pod 2	57.47 acres	
Pod 3	13.27 acres	
Proposed Uses		
Senior/Age Restricted Dwellings		1,238,961 square feet
Commercial/Retail		337,500 feet
Office/Retail	110,000 feet	

5. Conformance with the Requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance: The subject application was referred to the Environmental Planning Section, and in a memorandum (Markovich to Jordan) dated July 11 , 2000, the following comments were provided:

“Wetlands, streams and the associated buffers have been found to occur on this property and have been reflected with the appropriate buffers on the Conceptual Site Plan. The proposal will result in impacts to the 25-foot wetland buffer and will require the approval variation to the Subdivision Ordinance during the review of the Preliminary Plat of Subdivision. Some of the wetland and wetland buffer impacts are questionable in that some slight adjustments to the development area could significantly reduce the number of impacts proposed. A copy of the Wetland Delineation Report for this application shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section for review in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision. At that time the applicant shall clarify if streams associated with the wetlands found on this site.

“There are no Scenic or Historic Roads on or adjacent to this phase of the development. There are no Marlboro clays in the vicinity of this site. Based on information available to this office there are no species of special State concern in the immediate vicinity of this property. The Sewer and Water Service Categories for this property are 4 and 4 respectively. Approximately 90% of this property has soils classified as Beltsville silt loams with the balance of the soils being classified as Othello silt loam. The primary limitations with these soils are seasonally high water tables and impeded drainage, which would typically require the applicant to address subsurface drainage issues associated for any basement areas.

“During the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-97091) the areas included in this Conceptual Site Plan application were approved as Outlots 1, 2 and 3. Since de-

velopment of the Outlots is not permitted without a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the applicant was not required to provide a Detailed Noise Study. The applicant submitted a Noise Study dated June 20, 2000 which has been reviewed and found to be acceptable with respect to the noise predictions resulting from the traffic on MD Route 210. However, the study did not address the noise generated by the traffic on MD Route 228 which is located to the south of the residential living areas. Based on the study it will be necessary for the applicant to address noise attenuation measures for several of the residential buildings. Therefore, the Noise Study is found to be acceptable with respect to this Conceptual Site Plan subject to the conditions outlined later in this memorandum.

“This site is not exempt from the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance. A Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) and a Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/52/97) was submitted and approved in conjunction with the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97091. TCPI/52/97 addressed the development activities for the R-R and R-A portions of that Preliminary Plan and proposed no woodland clearing on the M-X-T portion of the property that is the subject of this application. Furthermore, the 91.47 acres of woodland located on the M-X-T portion of the property were identified as Tree Save Areas until such time as a specific development proposal for the Outlots was initiated. The applicant has submitted a revision to TCPI/52/97 which addresses the changes to the M-X-T zone only. The TCP has been reviewed and found to satisfy the requirements of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance. The M-X-T portion of the property totals 95.87 acres and has a Woodland Conservation Threshold of 15% or 14.40 acres. There is an additional 18.23 acres of replacement requirements for a total of 32.63 acres requirement on the M-X-T portion of the property. That requirement is being satisfied by 18.60 acres of on-site preservation in priority retention areas, 3.51 acres of on-site reforestation and 10.52 acres of off-site mitigation. TCPI/52/97 is recommended for approval in conjunction with SP-99050 subject to conditions.”

The said conditions can be found in the Recommendation Section of this staff report.

6. Transportation: The subject application was referred to the Transportation Planning Section and in a memorandum (Masog to Jordan) dated July 11, 2000, the following comments were provided:

“The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated May 2000, and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. The study has been referred to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation and the State Highway Administration, and comments from both agencies are attached. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the application and the study, and the findings and recommendations outlined below are based

upon a review of these materials and analyses conducted by the staff which are consistent with the *Guidelines*.

“Summary of Traffic Impact Study

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

MD 210/MD 228 - signalized now and in the future
MD 228 WB left/MD 210 SB left - under construction now; signalized in the future
MD 228/Manning Road - unsignalized now; signalized in the future
Manning Road/Sr. Living Ent. - future; unsignalized
Manning Road/Retail North Ent. - future; unsignalized
Manning Road/Retail South Ent. - future; unsignalized

“With the development of the subject property, the traffic consultant has determined that adequate transportation facilities in the area can be attained with four improvements in place:

- “1. The widening of MD 228 to four lanes, which is currently under construction.
- “2. The reconfiguration of the MD 210/MD 228 intersection, which is currently under construction.
- “3. The signalization of the MD 228/Manning Road intersection, along with need upgrades to the Manning Road approaches to the intersection.
- “4. The installation of a roundabout along Manning Road just north of MD 228 to serve the uses planned for the site on the north side of MD 228.

“The applicant would construct the improvements proposed above which are not currently under construction.

“Staff Analysis of Traffic Study

“Existing conditions in the vicinity of the subject property are summarized as follows:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)	Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)

MD 210/MD 228	992	1335	A	D
MD 228 WB left/MD 210 SB left	planned			
MD 228/Manning Road	39.9*	51.2*	--	--
Manning Road/Senior Living Entrance	planned			
Manning Road/Retail North Entrance	planned			
Manning Road/Retail South Entrance	planned			
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

“A review of background development in the area was conducted by the applicant. The traffic study also includes a growth rate of 1.5 percent per year along MD 210 and MD 228 to account for growth in through traffic. The widening of MD 228 to a four-lane divided highway between MD 210 and the Mattawoman Creek is currently funded for construction in the State Consolidated Transportation Program (CTP). This project, which includes a major reconfiguration of the MD 210/MD 228 intersection, is under construction and is considered to be a part of the background traffic situation. Background traffic conditions (existing plus growth in through traffic plus traffic generated by background developments) are summarized below:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 210/MD 228	928	1001	A	B
MD 228 WB left/MD 210 SB left	341	912	A	A
MD 228/Manning Road	46.4*	70.0*	--	--
Manning Road/Senior Living Entrance	planned			
Manning Road/Retail North Entrance	planned			
Manning Road/Retail South Entrance	planned			

*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the *Guidelines*, an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.

“This mixed use application varies slightly from the traffic impact study assumptions, as described below:

1. “Pod 1, the portion south of MD 228, is proposed to contain up to 220,000 square feet of commercial space, with a minimum of 15,000 square feet of office space. The traffic study assumes 220,000 square feet of retail space. In the staff’s analysis, we will utilize 205,000 square feet of retail space and 15,000 square feet of office space, and consider the numbers in the traffic study as a maximum. Also, the staff’s analysis will consider retail uses which generate AM peak hour traffic.
1. “Pod 2, the portion north of MD 228 and west of Manning Road, is proposed to contain up to 1,239,000 square feet in senior housing and community/care facility space, and also up to 70,000 square feet of commercial space. The traffic study assumes 800 senior housing units. The staff’s analysis will consider:
 - “1. 800 units of senior housing, with the assumption that the community/care facility space is incidental to the senior housing community project.
 - “2. Because the conceptual plan does not integrate Pads A and B with Pads C and D within Pod 2, we must assume that the commercial uses may be open to the public rather than open to residents of the senior housing community only. Therefore, staff will assume up to 70,000 square feet of retail or office space, whichever has the highest trip generation.
1. “Pod 3, the portion north of MD 228 and east of Manning Road, is proposed to contain up to 157,500 square feet of commercial space, with a minimum of 10,000 square feet of office space. The traffic study assumes 157,500 square feet of retail space. In the staff’s analysis, we will utilize 147,500 square feet of retail space and 10,000 square feet of office space, and consider the numbers in the traffic study as a maximum. Also, the staff’s analysis will consider retail uses which generate AM peak hour traffic.

1. “The Guidelines allow a percentage of retail trips to be considered as pass-by trips, i.e., trips which are already on the road-way. With a potential for as much as 422,500 square feet of retail space on the site, the Guidelines would suggest a 40 percent pass-by rate. Given that the property straddles a major highway, however, we do not believe that the property will function as a single large retail center but rather as two smaller centers, suggesting that a slightly higher pass-by rate would apply. The traffic study assumed pass-by rates of 46 percent and 48 percent for the south and north sides of MD 228. The staff agrees with the assumption, but prefers to use a single rate of 47% for both sides of the highway.

“The table below shows the site trip generation, as assumed by the transportation staff and incorporated in the transportation staff’s recommendations:

SITE TRIP GENERATION - MANOKEEK —X-T				
Area/Use	Pass-By Trips - in/out (AM & PM)		Net New Trips (AM & PM)	
Pod 1 - Retail - 205,000 square feet	45/45	308/308	104/51	348/348
Pod 1 - Office - 15,000 square feet	0/0	0/0	27/3	5/23
Pod 1 - Total Net Trips	----	----	131/54	380/380
Pod 2 - Sr. Housing - 800 units plus community/care	0/0	0/0	72/32	40/88
Pod 2 - Commercial - 70,000 square feet	0/0	105/105	126/14	119/119
Pod 2 - Total Net Trips	----	----	198/46	159/207
Pod 3 - Retail - 147,500 square feet	37/37	222/222	86/41	250/250
Pod 3 - Office - 10,000 square feet	0/0	0/0	18/2	4/15
Pod 3 - Total Net Trips	----	----	104/43	262/262
Entire Site - Total Net Trips	----	----	433/143	801/849

“Total traffic under future conditions without improvements, as analyzed by the transportation staff, is summarized below:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS W/O IMPROVEMENTS		
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)	Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)

MD 210/MD 228	958	1053	A	B
MD 228 WB left/MD 210 SB left	412	1110	A	B
MD 228/Manning Road	172.1*	+999*	--	--
Manning Road/Senior Living Entrance	10.2*	38.1*	--	--
Manning Road/Retail North Entrance	9.7*	34.1*	--	--
Manning Road/Retail South Entrance	9.6*	12.4*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

“The applicant has proffered the construction of a roundabout at the Manning Road/Senior Living Entrance, and has also proffered signalization at the MD 228/Manning Road intersection. With these traffic control modifications in place, total traffic would be as summarized below:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS WITH IMPROVEMENTS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 210/MD 228	958	1053	A	B
MD 228 WB left/MD 210 SB left	412	1110	A	B
MD 228/Manning Road	1066	1278	B	C
Manning Road/Senior Living Entrance	10.2*	38.1*	--	--
Manning Road/Retail North Entrance	9.7*	34.1*	--	--
Manning Road/Retail South Entrance	9.6*	12.4*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average delay exceeding 45.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

“The transportation staff received the following comments from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T):

1. “DPW&T believes that the traffic study should have considered three access points into the retail center south of Manning Road, but the study only considered two. Transportation planning staff believes that while the observation is valid, neither of the two access points showed delays so high that there was reason to consider signalization at any. This finding is not likely to change if three access are analyzed.

1. “DPW&T indicated that each exit onto Manning Road should have two lanes exiting, along with needed acceleration and deceleration lanes along Manning Road. The exits should be checked at the time of Detailed Site Plan; improvements along Manning Road will be determined at the time of road dedication by DPW&T.

“We also received comments from the State Highway Administration (SHA):

- “1. Signalization at MD 228 and Manning Road will need to be coordinated with the SHA’s Office of Traffic and Safety.
- “2. The applicant should provide a roundabout along Manning Road north of MD 228 to serve the entrances to the senior living community and the retail center.
- “3. The SHA has determined that they would not support split phasing of the signal at MD 228/Manning Road, as proposed in the traffic study. Therefore, the SHA requests that the applicant provide exclusive dual left-turn lanes and an exclusive through lane on both Manning Road approaches to MD 228. Also, the SHA requests that both exclusive right-turn lanes along Manning Road at MD 228 be designed as free-flow channelized right-turn lanes. The transportation staff supports these recommendations, and has incorporated the SHA recommendation into the intersection results presented above.

“With the planned development and the improvements which have been proffered by the applicant (and with SHA’s suggested changes), all intersections within the study area for this application operate acceptably in both weekday peak hours. The applicant will be required to construct all improvements needed to relieve any inadequacies identified under the Total Traffic condition.

“Plan Comments

“MD 210 is a Master Plan freeway (F-11 in the *Subregion V Master Plan*) and MD 228 is a planned expressway facility (E-7 in the same plan). The conceptual plan makes provi-

sion for these facilities. The *Subregion V Master Plan* also recommends future grade-separated interchanges at the MD 210/MD 228 and the MD 228/Manning Road intersections. It is not clear that the plan, as submitted, makes adequate provision for these future interchanges. The eastern and western portions of Pod 2 as identified on the submitted have areas of parking and even buildings which may extend into areas which would eventually become the footprint of planned interchanges. Right-of-way issues for the subject property should be completely resolved prior to preliminary plat approval.

“Manning Road is a master plan collector (C-526 in the *Subregion V Master Plan*). The alignment shown on the submitted plan generally conforms to the Master Plan concept. It is important to keep in mind that C-526 would eventually extend north of the traffic circle to serve the properties within Employment Area E. Therefore, the traffic circle within the subject property should be designed to enable usage by vehicles which would serve a light industrial area.”

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 conditions found in the Recommendation Section of this staff report.

7. 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 a major interchange, MD 210 and MD 228. The proposed 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. In general, the proposed development creates a dynamic, functional relationship among individual uses with the potential for a distinctive visual character and identity.

- a. **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 : Adjacent development relevant to the subject property is sparse. The only development adjacent to the subject property is a few single-family detached residential lots on the northwest side of proposed development Pod 2. A subdivision of existing single-family detached homes is east of, and in proximity to proposed development Pods 2 and 3. 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 a quality commercial/retail component in this area will ultimately improve the quality of life and present a positive image for the community as a whole.

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

Comment : Given that the surrounding community is comprised of residential, parkland, and small scale commercial development, staff believes that the proposed development is compatible with, and complementary to, existing and proposed development in the vicinity.

- a. **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, which will include an area specifically designated for use by the general public as a gathering place, will reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

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

Comment : In general, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases. Staged development, or phases, have not been proposed by the applicant. In order to insure that the retail and office component are constructed in a timely fashion, it is recommended that use and occupancy permits for the commercial/retail and of-

office components in Pod 1 should be issued by the issuance of 50 percent of the residential building permits for Pod 2. Furthermore, it is recommended that use and occupancy permits for the commercial/retail and office components in Pod 3 should be issued by the issuance of 90 percent of the residential building permits for Pod 2.

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

Comment : In general, the pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development. Since the development pods are separated by MD 228 and Manning Road, it is difficult to provide a comprehensive pedestrian network that will foster circulation between all pods without vehicular conflicts. Although separated by Manning Road, development Pods 2 and 3 will have pedestrian linkages between them, given the nature of local traffic anticipated to use the thoroughfare. Proposed pedestrian circulation within the individual pods does promote and encourage pedestrian activity.

- a. **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; and**

Comment : Within development Pod 2, and between Pods 2 and 3 there are a total of five (5) designated "focal points". The applicant has stated that some, if not all of, these focal points will be areas within the development which will be used for passive/active socially-oriented pedestrian activities, or as gathering places for people. Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan review specific attention be given to the designated focal points with respect to human scale, urban design, and other amenities, such as materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.

- a. **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. 6 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.

Sections 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip Requirements, 4.3(b)(c), Parking Lot Requirements, Perimeter Landscape Strip Requirements, Interior Planting, and 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, apply to the subject site. The concept plans appear to generally be in conformance with the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*.

8. 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:

“Site 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:

“On-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. The subject

property should set the standards for streetscape treatment and redevelopment of adjacent properties in the future. 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 special, decorative paving in proposed sidewalks, extensive perimeter landscape planting along all roadway frontages where parking lots and building rears are exposed, substantial interior landscape planting at building frontages and all surface parking areas, and amenities throughout the site. Building materials should be of high quality, and should be coordinated 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 shall be established at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

9. Trails: The subject plan was referred to the Transportation Planning Section for review and in a memorandum (Shaffer to Jordan) dated July 10, 2000 it was found that no trails for the subject property are required by either the Countywide Trails Plan or the 1993 Subregion V Master Plan. It was noted that the approved Preliminary Plat, 4-97091, for the single-family detached Manokeek Subdivision does have trail requirements, and conditions pursuant to those requirements are reflected in the Recommendation Section of this staff report.
10. Urban Design: The Urban Design staff has reviewed the subject application and provides the following comments:
 - a. Section 27-548(d) of the Zoning Ordinance states the following:

Landscaping, 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.

Development Pod 1 is located between MD 228 and Manning Road on the east side of Manning Road, directly across from the approved Manokeek subdivision of 106 single-family detached dwellings. Pod 1 is proposed to provide a mix of commercial/retail and office uses. Based on the plan layout and the proposed areas of landscaping/screening indicated at the perimeter of Pod 1, specifically the area of frontage on Manning Road across from the approved subdivision, staff is concerned that there will be a negative visual impact upon future residents of the Manokeek subdivision given that commercial/retail and office are proposed directly across from, and fronting onto, the residential properties. Given the orientation of the proposed building pads in relation to where the proposed parking will be located it appears to staff that it is very likely that the rears of the

commercial/retail and office components in Pod 1 will face the residential Manokeek subdivision. The applicant has stated that the landscaping indicated along the frontage of Manning Road for Pod 1 would meet the minimum requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. Staff does not believe that this treatment will be adequate.

All three of the proposed development pods will have significant and extensive frontage on either MD 210, MD 228, Manning Road, or a combination of the thoroughfares. Although the plan indicates perimeter landscape screening at all three pods where they abut the said vehicular rights-of-way, staff is concerned that the landscaping indicated may be minimal with respect to the requirements of the *Landscape Manual*. Furthermore, staff believes that for a development proposal of this magnitude it is appropriate to provide perimeter landscaping above that required by the *Landscape Manual* to lessen the visual impact to the surrounding community and vehicular traffic, while protecting the character of the M-X-T Zone and the adjoining land uses.

Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan specific attention be given to the proposed landscaping/screening at the perimeter of all development pods with respect to the abutting rights-of-way and adjoining land uses, and furthermore that all perimeter landscaping/screening proposed for the development pods shall exceed the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.

- a. Development Pods 1 and 3 provide for the majority of commercial/retail and office uses. The plan proposes a generally linear layout for both development pods with expansive areas of surface parking provided to accommodate the proposed uses. Although the applicant is required to provide adequate area for parking to serve the proposed square footage of each respective use, staff is concerned that given the large continuous areas of surface parking proposed the minimum requirements of the *Landscape Manual* pertaining to parking lot interior green will not be sufficient to mitigate the visual and environmental impact of the asphalt parking area. Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan specific attention be given to the proposed parking lot interior green specifically at development Pods 1 and 3, and furthermore that the parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of the *Landscape Manual* by no less than 25 percent.
- a. The subject plan has designated four “focal points” within the residential development area of Pod 2. Although not specifically defined at this stage of the review process as to what the focal points will consist of, the applicant has stated

that the focal points will be used for passive/active socially-oriented pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people. Staff believes that for a development proposal of this size, given its potential impact on the existing community, provision of an amenity for the general public use and benefit is appropriate. Staff believes that the results of a proffer by the applicant to provide such an amenity will be positive in that the surrounding community is acknowledged in the development proposal, the applicant demonstrates an intent to become an active stakeholder in the community, and the provision of a twenty-four hour environment is more likely. Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan the plan provide for a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2. See the letter from the Accokeek Development Review District Commission (Thompson to Hewlett) dated June 12, 2000 for specific suggestions and recommendations with respect to the public amenity.

- a. The subject development pods are generally separated from the surrounding community by MD 210, MD 228, and Manning Road. Generally, the proposed development pods are bounded by undeveloped properties and the provision of pedestrian linkages to the surrounding community at-large is impractical, given the property location and the potential pedestrian/vehicular conflicts and constraints.
- a. Scale of the proposed structures is a component to be considered when evaluating a development of this size proposed in a generally residential community with large expanses of open space. Although the proposed development will be a landmark in the community, staff is concerned that the proposed structures not be of a height/scale that diminishes the rural/open space quality of the existing community, nor should they introduce an inappropriate urban/metropolitan context into the community. Therefore, it is recommended that the maximum height of the office and residential structures be limited to 3-4 stories.
- a. Development Pods 1 and 2 are bisected by an existing Southern Maryland Electric Company public utilities easement. Although burying the electrical line would provide for a more aesthetically pleasing development, the development review process does not afford the Planning Board the authority to mandate any activity within a public utilities easement controlled by another agency. Neither the applicant nor the respective public utility can be forced to remove the existing utility line through this process. It is recommended that the applicant investigate burying the line.

- a. 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. 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.
 - a. Concerns have been noted in the referral from the Community Planning Section that the commercial/retail components located at the corner of Manning Road and MD 228 are prospective locations for gas stations. Staff concurs in this concern, and given the applicants stated intent to provide a development of high architectural quality, staff believes that the prominent and most visible pad sites located at the said corners should project the highest of architectural quality. Furthermore, whether located at a development pod corner or its periphery, a gas station should be compatible in terms of articulation and materials with the surrounding commercial/retail components. Therefore, it is recommended that at the time of Detailed Site Plan review specific attention be given to any gas station proposed within the development, and furthermore that the proposed architecture shall be of high quality compatible with that of the surrounding commercial/retail components.
10. Subdivision: The applicant included the subject property as part of an application for approval of a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, 4-97091, which was approved by the Planning Board on March 5, 1998 (PGCPB No. 98-22). At that time the portion of Manokeek which is currently under consideration for Conceptual Site Plan approval was designated as Outlots 1, 2, and 3, and it was noted that at that time the said outlots were identified as tree save areas which would require a new TCP when the outlots were developed. Therefore, it is recommended that prior to approval of an application for Detailed Site Plan review the applicant shall obtain Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for Outlots 1, 2, and 3 as designated on approved Preliminary Plat 4-97091 to create legal lots of subdivision.
10. The subject application was referred to the Accokeek Development Review District Commission, and in a letter (Thompson to Hewlett) dated June 12, 2000 several concerns were raised with respect to the proposed development. See Finding No. 10 for a detailed discussion of the noted issues.
13. The subject application was referred to all applicable agencies and divisions; no significant issues were identified. The Department of Public Works & Transportation provided comments for designated roadway improvements within the right-of-way. The plans should address these comments at the time of the review of permits.

14. 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 (TCP 52/97) and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan CSP-99050 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, special attention shall be given, but shall not be limited to, the following:
 - a. The streetscape treatment of the subject property to include sidewalks, special pavers, interior landscaping at building frontages, lighting, furnishings, and sitting areas.
 - b. The designated focal point areas of the subject property to include human scale, urban design, materials, landscaping/screening, furnishings, and lighting.
 - c. The building materials and architecture.
 - d. Perimeter landscaping/screening of all development pods shall exceed the requirements of Sections 4.3a and 4.2a, of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of width and plant quantities by no less than 100 percent.
 - e. Parking lot interior green proposed for development Pods 1 and 3 shall exceed the requirements of Section 4.3c of the *Landscape Manual* in terms of plant quantities by no less than 25 percent.
 - f. Provision of a public amenity to be used by the surrounding community in development Pod 2.
 - g. The maximum height of office structures shall be limited to a maximum of 3-4 stories. The maximum height of residential structures shall be limited to 5-6 stories.
 - h. The proposed signage for the commercial/retail components. A comprehensive design approach is recommended.

- i. The provision of a gasoline station use on any pad site within the development. The proposed architecture shall be of a high quality and shall be compatible with the surrounding commercial/retail components with respect to materials and articulation.
2. Prior to Detailed Site Plan approval, a Preliminary Plat of Subdivision for the subject property shall be approved by the Planning Board.
2. Certificates of occupancy shall be issued for 75,000 square feet of commercial/retail and office components in development Pod 1 by the issuance of 50 percent, or 400 units, of the residential permits in development Pod 2. Furthermore, certificates of occupancy shall be issued for 125,000 square feet of commercial/retail and office components in the entire development by the issuance of 75 percent, or 600 units, of the residential permits in development Pod 2.
2. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan shall be further refined during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision to address reforestation in the Stormwater Management facilities, additional on-site preservation and/or reforestation and to address intrusions into the wetlands and wetland buffers.
5. The applicant shall submit a detailed Noise Study for review and approval in conjunction with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for development Pod 2 which clearly reflects the limits of the 65 dBA noise contours for MD. Routes 210 and 228 at the residential areas of Pod 2. The study shall propose noise attenuation measures for all residential areas which are located within the 65 dBA noise contours.
6. Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan the applicant shall clearly reflect on all appropriate plans the noise attenuation measures which will be utilized to address the adverse noise impacts on this site. If attenuation measures are to include structural components the applicant will be required to submit architectural plans to the Environmental Planning Section which reflect those components.
7. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to an 800-unit senior housing community, and approximately 447,500 square feet of mixed retail and office space; or different uses generating no more than the number of peak hour trips (576 AM peak hour trips and 1,650 PM peak hour trips) generated by the above development. Community facilities, skilled care facilities, and incidental office and retail space which are not public but are developed within the senior housing community shall be considered ancillary and additional to the permitted 800-unit community.

8. The following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for construction through the SHA access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the SHA or the DPW&T. Staging of these improvements will be determined at Preliminary Plat of Subdivision:

A. MD 228 at Manning Road:

- (1) Prior to the approval of the Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the intersection of MD 228 and Manning Road. If deemed warranted by the SHA and the DPW&T, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of the initial building permit, and install the signal if directed prior to the release of the bonding for the signal.
- (2) Provide the following lane configuration at MD 228 and Manning Road:
 - a. Along the eastbound and westbound MD 228 approaches, two through lanes, an exclusive right-turn lane and an exclusive left-turn lane.
 - b. Along the northbound and southbound Manning Road approaches, an exclusive through lane, dual left-turn lanes and an exclusive right-turn lane. Per direction of the SHA, both right-turn lanes should be designed as free-flow channelized lanes.

B. Manning Road at Senior Living/Retail entrance (north of MD 228):

- (2) Provide a roundabout, or a similar intersection design that provides sufficient capacity and safety, with design details to be coordinated with the SHA and the DPW&T. A consideration in the design should be the potential continuation of Manning Road as C-526 to the north to serve the properties which make up Employment Area E.

9. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the transportation staff will ensure that each exit from Pod 1 onto Manning Road allows for at least a two-lane exit. The transportation staff will also ensure that appropriate acceleration and deceleration lanes are provided to serve Pod 1 as a part of frontage improvements along Manning Road.

10. At the time of Preliminary Plat of Subdivision, provision must be made for adequate right-of-way along MD 210, MD 228 and Manning Road to support Master Plan recommendations. These recommendations include future interchanges at MD 210/MD 228 and MD 228/Manning Road. Appropriate right-of-way lines and setbacks will be determined at that time.
11. Parcels C and other small parcels for trail connections shall be dedicated to the M-NCPPC, in accordance with Condition 7 of 4-97091.
12. Parcels G and H shall be dedicated to M-NCPPC and a six-foot wide asphalt trail connection shall be constructed by the applicant to join Manning Road with the stream valley, in accordance with 4-97091.
13. All internal paths/trails indicated on the site plan shall be a minimum of six-feet wide and asphalt. All internal paths/trails within Pod 2 shall be six-feet-wide and an impervious surface unless otherwise restricted in width or material by environmental regulations or agencies.
14. Appropriate signage and pavement markings should be provided in order to ensure safe pedestrian crossings at the Berry Road and Manning Road intersection.

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.

PGCPB No. 00-142
File No. CSP-99050
Page 22

* * * * *

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 Brown, seconded by Commissioner Boone, with Commissioners Hewlett, Boone and Brown voting in favor of the motion, at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 20, 2000, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 27th day of July 2000.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:JJ:leb