

R E S O L U T I O N

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board has reviewed Departure from Design Standards Application No. DDS-642, Matapeake Parcels 1, 2 (previously Parcels 8 & 9) and A, requesting a departure from Section 27-558(a) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance in accordance with Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, after consideration of the evidence presented at the public hearing on March 1, 2018, the Prince George's County Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application requests a departure from design standards from Section 27-558(a) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance to allow parking spaces with varied depths from 18 feet to 21 feet by 9 feet in width.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use*	Vacant	Multifamily Residential
Gross Acreage	12.38	12.38
Floodplain	0.07	0.07
Net Acreage	12.31	12.31
Total Gross Floor Area (GFA)	0	356,160 sq. ft.
Total Dwelling Units	0	312
One-bedroom Units	0	120
Two-bedroom Units	0	144
Three-bedroom Units	0	48

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the M-X-T Zone

Base Density Allowed	0.40 FAR
Residential	1.00 FAR
Total FAR Permitted:	1.40 FAR
Total FAR Proposed:	0.67 FAR

Note: *This DSP covers the residential part of a mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial uses that was approved under Conceptual Site Plan CSP-16003.

Parking and Loading Data

	Provided
Total Number of Parking Spaces	569 (includes 24 garage spaces)
Handicapped Spaces	12
Standard parking space size*	18' x 9'
Total Number of Loading Space	2
Loading space size	12' x 33'

Note: *A Departure from Design Standards DDS-642 has been requested. See Finding 7 below for discussion.

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the east side of Matapeake Business Drive, one-quarter mile east of the intersection of Timothy Branch Drive and US 301 (Robert Crain Highway), in Planning Area 85A, Council District 9. More specifically, the property is located at 7651 Matapeake Business Drive in Brandywine, Maryland.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject property is bounded to the north by the vacant Parcel 12, within the Brandywine 301 Industrial Park, in the Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone; to the east by Outlot C, within the Brandywine 301 Industrial Park, in the M-X-T Zone; to the south by Parcel 7, also within the Brandywine 301 Industrial Park, that is developed with a commercial office building in the M-X-T Zone; and to the west by the public right-of-way of Matapeake Business Drive and a commercial establishment, known as the Brandywine Crossing shopping center, in the Commercial Shopping Center (C-S-C) Zone.
5. **Previous Approvals:** In 1978, the Brandywine-Mattawoman Sectional Map Amendment rezoned (CR-106-1978) the entire Brandywine 301 Industrial Park property from the R-R (Rural Residential) Zone to the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone. The property was later rezoned in 1985 through Zoning Map Amendment A-9502-C from the E-I-A Zone to the Light Industrial (I-1) and Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zones. On July 18, 1991, the Planning Board approved a Conceptual Site Plan CSP-91012 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (PPS) 4-91030, which included the subject property, for 19 lots and 3 parcels (170.5 acres) for 1,638,920 square feet of industrial development.

The 1993 *Approved Subregion V Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* retained (CR-61-2006) the property in the I-1 and I-3 zoning categories. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 was approved by the Planning Board on March 26, 1998, for 19 parcels (166.18 acres) and 1,638,920 square feet of industrial development. The subject property was platted in accordance with PPS 4-97124 and recorded in the Land Records of Prince George's County in Plat Books 203-50 and 198-51 for Parcels 8 and 9, respectively.

On July 24, 2013, the District Council adopted County Council Resolutions CR-80-2013 and CR-81-2013 approving the 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (SMA), which included the rezoning of the subject parcels (SMA Nos 12, 14) from the I-1 Zone to the M-X-T Zone.

A new Conceptual Site Plan CSP-16003 was approved on July 13, 2017 by the Planning Board (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-109), with three conditions, for a mixed-used development consisting of an existing commercial flex building located on adjacent Parcel 7 and 300–325 multifamily units located on existing Parcels 8 and 9.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16013, which governs the subject property, was approved by the Planning Board on July 20, 2017 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-113) for residential development on two parcels, subject to 20 conditions.

The site also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (12704-2017-00) dated October 13, 2017, which is valid through October 13, 2020.

6. **Design Features:** This DSP covers the residential portion of a mixed-use development approved under CSP-16003. The site consists of three parcels and is in a generally rectangular shape with the long sides fronting on Matapeake Business Drive to the west and environmental features to the east. The DSP proposes one vehicular access off Matapeake Business Drive with entry features and a primary identification sign on both sides of the entrance. The entrance driveway is a divided roadway with a median and a 24-foot-wide driving lane for each direction.

Architecture: There are eight multifamily buildings shown on the site plan with three fronting on Matapeake Business Drive, three in the middle of the site, perpendicular to Matapeake Business Drive, and another two in the rear of the site located parallel to Matapeake Business Drive. Of the three buildings in the middle of the site, two buildings surround a proposed clubhouse building, which terminates the entrance driveway creating a place with a unique identity. An outdoor swimming pool is located behind the clubhouse with a centrally located village green in a formal composition further behind the swimming pool. Surface parking lots are proposed on four sides of the clubhouse compound and along the internal drives. Sidewalks are proposed on both sides of all roadways. In addition, three small garages, with square footage varying from 1,936 to 2,420, are also shown on the site plans. The entire site will be fenced with wrought-iron and aluminum fences with a guardhouse at the main entrance gate.

The eight buildings are three-story walk-ups and are designed in three distinctive floor plan modules with different combinations in each building stick. Each module is connected with a recessed section that creates an attractive elevation with clear vertical divisions. The building has a gable roof with cross-gables for each entrance tower that creates a landmark feature for the module. Each building elevation shows a clear three-part composition with a split-face masonry base, a combination of brick and vinyl middle section and an asphalt-shingled gable roof. Various architectural articulation, such as trim, brick arches, wide soffits, paneled windows, and balconies, is employed throughout the elevations. Some of the cross-gables are also pedimented with faux

widows and louvers. The clubhouse is designed in a similar way, but with a multiple-layer hip roof and topped, in the middle of the elevation, with a metal cupola. The front clubhouse elevation becomes the foci of the view from the main entrance off Matapeake Business Drive. The three garages are designed in a similar way to the other buildings, but with only vinyl siding. At a minimum, a masonry water table should be provided on each garage to create some visual connection between the garages and the residential buildings. A condition has been included in this resolution.

Signage and Lighting: An entrance sign has been included with this DSP that is designed to be part of the entrance feature with logo and text of “Union Park at Brandywine” on both sides of the entrance off Matapeake Business Drive. The entrance feature is composed of a brick base and brick columns that is consistent with the main building in terms of design, material and color. The entrance signage is also integrated with the fencing system that surrounds the entire property. The entrance features, including the signage, are attractive. The sign face area is about 40 square feet for each panel, for a total of 80 square feet for both panels. Wall lights and pole lights are included with this DSP. The lighting fixtures are Dark Sky- compliance products and are acceptable.

Recreational Facilities: A comprehensive recreational facility and amenity package has been included with this application. The facilities and amenities proposed include the following:

- a. Fitness and Cardio Center (1,150 square feet (SF))
 - (1) Professional Quality Cardio Equipment with Individual TV Monitors
 - (2) Dumbbell Free Weight Area
 - (3) Machine Weight Training Area
 - (4) Personal Training and Yoga Area
- b. Kids Activity Center (200 SF)
 - (1) Highly Visible, safe for Entertainment and Learning
- c. Clubhouse and Entertainment Area (740 SF)
 - (1) Lounge Area
 - (2) Beverage Kitchen
- d. Internet Café and Espresso Bar (303 SF)
 - (1) Wi-Fi Multi-Station Work Area
 - (2) Relaxed Meeting Setting
 - (3) Serve Yourself Commercial Coffee and Espresso

- e. Resort Style Pool
 - (1) Entertaining Cabana
 - (2) Grilling Area
 - (3) Pool Fountain
 - (4) Furnished Pool Deck
- f. Pet Salon
 - (1) Professional Washing and Drying Area
- g. Central Union Park
 - (1) Lawn Areas with Park Benches
 - (2) Outdoor Seating areas in a Wi-Fi Plaza, with Grills

In accordance with the current formula for calculating the dollar amount of the recreational facility obligation of the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), for a 312-dwelling unit multifamily development, a total of \$354,380 worth of facilities is required. The applicant estimates the dollar amount of the above facilities and amenities, including the clubhouse building around \$984,880, which is much more than the amount required.

Green Building and Sustainable Site Development Techniques: This DSP also includes a green building package that will be employed in order to achieve effective usage of energy, water and other resources, protection of occupant health and reduction of waste, pollution and environmental degradation. Specifically, the proposed green building and sustainable site development techniques include the following:

Building-Level

- a. Energy Performance—Compliance with energy performance standards of the International Building Code.
- b. Energy Efficient Equipment—Installation of energy efficient HVAC units, Energy-Star appliances.
- c. Energy Efficient Lighting—LED lighting generally provided.
- d. Energy Efficient Windows—Double glazed insulated windows (low E) provided.
- e. Energy Education—Information on renewable energy sources and energy saving practices available to residents through programs provided by utility company.
- f. Alternative Transportation—Bicycle racks provided adjacent to residential buildings.

- g. Recycling—Household recycling available to residents, promoted through management.
- h. Resource Efficiency—Structural design and framing techniques reduce material use and construction waste.
- i. Heat Island Mitigation—Landscaping provided for partial shading of hardscaping.
- j. Light Pollution Reduction—Outdoor fixture selection, quantity and placement reduce overall outdoor illumination.

Site-Level

- a. Stormwater Design Quantity and Quality Control—The plan includes stormwater management systems compliant with County regulations that meet or exceed recognized sustainable design criteria.
- b. Water Efficient Landscaping—The project includes native species for landscaping, and uses drought tolerant plantings.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

- 7. **Departure from Design Standards (DDS-642):** The applicant requires a departure from Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance which requires nonparallel standard parking spaces to be 19 by 9.5 feet; but allows up to one-third of the required spaces to be compact measuring 16.5 by 8 feet. The applicant is providing a total of 569 parking spaces with varied depths from 18 feet to 21 feet by 9 feet in width, except for the required parking spaces for the physically handicapped. No compact parking spaces are proposed with this DSP. Specifically, the parking space sizes proposed are included in the following table:

PARKING SPACE SIZES PER PARCEL				
PARCEL 1				
WIDTH	DEPTH	DRIVE AISLE	TYPE	NUMBER
9FT	18FT	22FT	SURFACE	86
9FT	18FT	24FT+	SURFACE	10
9FT	19FT	22FT	SURFACE	154
9FT+	21FT	23FT	GARAGE	8
SUBTOTAL				258
PARCEL 2				
WIDTH	DEPTH	DRIVE AISLE	TYPE	NUMBER
9FT	18FT	22FT	SURFACE	112
9FT	18FT	23FT	SURFACE	18
9FT	18FT	24FT+	SURFACE	11
9FT	19FT	22FT	SURFACE	154
9FT+	21FT	23FT	GARAGE	16
SUBTOTAL				311
GRAND TOTAL				569

Section 27-239.01(b)(7) of the Zoning Ordinance contains the following required findings in order for the Planning Board to grant the departure:

(A) In order for the Planning Board to grant the departure, it shall make the following findings:

(i) The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant's proposal;

The purposes of the Subtitle are found in Section 27-550 as follows:

The purposes of this Part are:

- (1) To require (regarding each building constructed and each new use established) off-street automobile parking lots and loading areas sufficient to and uses;**
- (2) To aid in relieving traffic congestion on streets by reducing the use of public streets for parking and loading and reducing the number of access points;**
- (3) To protect the residential character of residential areas; and**
- (4) To provide parking and loading areas which are convenient and increase the amenities in the Regional District.**

Applicant's Justification:

“For parking, the primary purpose is to ensure that all buildings and uses provide off- street parking which is “...sufficient to serve the parking and loading needs of all persons associated with the buildings and uses.” The applicant submits that the purposes of the parking and loading regulations will be equally well or better served by the proposed site plan.

“The applicant is proposing that all parking spaces, apart from the spaces provided for the physically handicapped, be 9 feet by 18 feet. Section 27-558(a) requires that standard nonparallel parking spaces measure 9.5 feet by 19 feet while nonparallel compact car spaces must be 16.5 feet by 8 feet. The difference between the required standard car space measurement and the 9 feet by 18 feet space the applicant is proposing is insignificant in light of the fact that there will be no compact car spaces. Moreover, the off-street parking proposed by the applicant is adequate to serve the needs of all persons associated with the building or use. The use of a universal sized parking space has become the more common standard in modern zoning ordinances. In the proposed zoning ordinance rewrite, the standard parking space size will be 9 feet by 18 feet. This creates a more efficient and functional parking layout and will serve the purposes of the subtitle equally well.”

The Planning Board is in general agreement with the applicant's reasoning. The reduced parking dimensions will not significantly impact the function of the proposed parking lot, given that the site would normally be allowed up to 30 percent as compact spaces. The proposed spaces with a width of 9 feet and a depth of 18–21 feet, with drive aisle widths ranging from a minimum 22 feet to 24 feet, will provide more space than a regular compact space to allow future residents to comfortably maneuver their vehicles.

- (ii) The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request;**

Applicant's Justification:

“The departure from Section 27-558(a) sought by the applicant for its proposed 9 feet x 18-21 feet parking spaces is the minimum necessary given the specific circumstances of this request. In order to forego compact parking spaces, the departure from the required standard car size is necessary to provide the requisite number of parking spaces determined to be necessary for the proposed residential rental community for the type of extended stay motel proposed at this location.”

The site has been restrained on the front by possible additional frontage dedication, which is a separate parcel outside of the public utility easement (PUE) along Matapeake Business Drive, and at the rear by a preserved floodplain buffer. As a result, the buildable envelope on this site has been reduced significantly. In order to provide sufficient parking for a successful project, the departure for spaces smaller than regular surface parking spaces, but larger than compact spaces, is the minimum necessary in this case.

- (iii) The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are special to the subject use, given its nature at this location, or alleviate circumstances which are prevalent in older areas of the County which were predominantly developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

This finding is not applicable to this DSP.

- (iv) The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

Applicant's Justification:

“The applicant submits that the requested departure will not impair the visual, functional or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood. Currently, the Prince George’s County Zoning Ordinance permits two parking space sizes, one for compact cars (8 feet by 16.5 feet) and one for standard cars (9.5 feet by 19 feet). The Urban Land Institute (ULI) has evaluated the efficiency of providing parking stalls of different sizes and concluded that a single parking space works better in practice. ULI offers the following reasons why parking stalls of differing dimensions do not work in practice:

- “• At the time the small-vehicle-only parking space was introduced, the mix of automobiles consisted of very large and very small vehicles; therefore, the small-vehicle space was largely self-enforcing.
- “• Vehicle manufacturers have since down-sized many large passenger cars; light trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles have become more popular; and, more recently, certain models have been up-sized, which leads to confusion as to what is and what is not a small vehicle.
- “• If a small-vehicle space is available in a convenient location in a parking facility, many drivers of intermediate or even larger vehicles will park in the small vehicle spaces, thus impeding traffic flow and compromising safety within the facility.

- “• When large vehicles park in small vehicle spaces, they frequently encroach into the adjacent parking space such that a domino effect occurs down the row and eventually renders a parking space unusable.
- “• If small vehicle spaces are placed at inconvenient locations, small-vehicle drivers may park in standard sized spaces, forcing later-arriving large vehicles into inadequate and inconvenient small-vehicle spaces.”

“As a result of the above factors, ULI concludes:

“Due to the convergence of vehicle sizes, small-vehicle-only parking spaces are no longer a rational parking design alternative. In addition, light trucks, vans, and sport utility vehicles are an increasingly important factor in parking design geometrics. Sales of small vehicles dropped significantly in the 1980’s as the American passenger vehicle underwent a general, slow upsizing. Therefore, a rational approach to parking space and module sizing can and does support moderate module dimensions for one-size-fits-all designs.”

The Planning Board agrees with the applicant that the departure from Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance will allow the site to provide adequately sized spaces to accommodate all types of vehicles owned by future residents and conform to modern guidelines, which discourage compact parking spaces and are in favor of universal size spaces. Eliminating the smaller compact car spaces improves the functional integrity of the site and adequately serves the purpose of the parking regulations and the parking needs of the residents.

Based on the analysis above, the Planning Board approved the departure request for the dimensions of the proposed parking spaces.

8. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board found the following:

General Plan: This application is located within the Plan 2035 designated Brandywine Local Town Center. The vision for this type of Local Center is to “typically have a walkable ‘core’ or town center. Often the mix of uses is horizontal ... rather than vertical... While master plans may call for future heavy or light rail extensions or bus rapid transit, no transit alternatives have been approved for construction.” (Plan 2035, Chart 16)

Master Plan: The 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan* (CR-80-2013) recommends mixed-use as the future land use for the subject property, located in the Core Area of Brandywine Community Center, and recommends the following:

Vision

“Brandywine develops into the center envisioned in the 2002 *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*. It is a large, mixed-use community within the MD 5/US 301 corridor with transit-oriented neighborhoods designed so residents and employees can walk to nearby bus or light rail commuter stations. A variety of housing choices are available to residents, from apartments to single-family dwellings, and there are many opportunities to shop, dine, and be entertained. A well-planned road network allows local traffic to circulate throughout the community without relying on MD 5/US 301, and the regional highway network. A key feature in Brandywine is the network of pedestrian trails and bike paths that connect living areas to schools, shops, and parks.” (page 28)

Land Use

“The core is envisioned as a mixed-use area containing moderate to high density residential (15 to 30 dwelling units per acre), commercial, and employment uses that would generate approximately 25 employees per acre. Public uses, such as schools, parks, and the transit station, would comprise 10 to 20 percent of the total area. This area would abut existing and planned major retail land uses to the south, such as Costco and Target. Big box retail is inappropriate within the community center core.” (page 46)

Recreation and Trails

“... Timothy Branch would be accessible from the Brandywine Community Center and the surrounding area. Part of the Timothy Branch trail system would follow the tributary along the west side of US 301/MD 5 to the open space near the A-55 interchange. On-road bicycle lanes or sidepaths are envisioned for major roads in the vicinity (Chapter VI: Transportation). Additional trails and small parks should be built as a part of new development. Trails and parks should be linked together and designed to protect sensitive natural resources.” (page 47)

Environmental Considerations

“Wetlands, streams, and their buffers should be protected to the greatest degree possible. Including these features as ‘green’ or open space amenities can add value to development in and around the community center, while providing necessary open space, park, and recreation land for residents. New development should incorporate best management practices and environmental site design (ESD) consistent with the revisions to the Maryland Stormwater Design Manual to manage stormwater runoff.” (page 48)

Sidewalks, Trails (pages 120-121):

- Timothy Branch Steam Valley Trail: This trail will stretch along Timothy Branch between Dyson Road and Mattawoman Creek. It will provide access to the Brandywine Community Center.
- Encourage developers at employment destinations to provide new sidewalks, bicycle trails, lockers, bike friendly.
- Intersection improvements, and trail connections as part of their development proposals.
- Provide bicycle parking at all major transit locations and within all new employment-related developments.
- Construct pedestrian and bicycle facilities as part of new development in the Brandywine Community Center.

Aviation/MIOZ: This application is not located within an Aviation Policy Area or the Military Installation Overlay Zone (MIOZ).

SMA/Zoning: The 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Sectional Map Amendment* (CR-81-2013) rezoned the subject property from the I-1 (Light Industrial) Zone to the M-X-T (Mixed Use–Transportation Oriented) Zone. The site is not located in a Transit District Overlay (TDO) Zone.

The functional relationship between the two uses can be enhanced by physically and visually integrating the proposed residential with the adjacent commercial development. By removing impediments to connectivity, the development could be designed to have an outward orientation and integration of uses that better reflects the purposes of the M-X-T Zone.

The applicant should show a pedestrian or vehicular connection between the residential and commercial uses that does not involve a public right-of-way. For example, the applicant could design a walkable connection around the abutting SWM pond so residents can circulate between the apartments and the commercial development on Parcel 7. Providing a pass-protected gate for pedestrian circulation between the two uses is one method of connecting these uses.

Interconnectivity between different uses is greatly encouraged in the M-X-T Zone. Since the proposed residential community will be gated, a pedestrian gate should be provided at the southern boundary area between the subject site and Parcel 7.

b. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board found the following:

Pursuant to PGCPB Resolution No. 17-113, the subject property was the subject of an approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, 4-16013, that was approved on July 20, 2017. The property was approved with multiple conditions, including the following pertaining to transportation:

13. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more 162 AM peak trips and 187 PM peak trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein-above shall require a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

The PPS was approved for 312 dwelling units. The subject application proposes 312 units, and consequently, the trip cap will not be exceeded.

14. **Prior to issuance of any building permit, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall, pursuant to the provisions of County Council Resolution CR-9-2017, pay to Prince George's County (or its designee) a fee of \$999 per dwelling unit (given in first quarter 1993 dollars), to be indexed by the appropriate cost indices to be determined by the Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.**

This condition will be addressed at building permit.

Site Circulation

The site plan proposes a single point of access from Matapeake Business Drive. The access proposed will be dualized with a 22-foot lane ingress and a 22-foot lane egress, separated by a raised median up to the first cross drive aisle. Given the fact this 312-unit development will be served by a single point of access, by proposing 22-foot (ingress/egress) lanes, in the event of an emergency where one side of the access is temporarily blocked, the remaining side will have 22 feet of pavement, enough to support two lanes of travel. Consequently, the Planning Board supported the need for two 22-foot access lanes.

Regarding the general overview of the site plan, the Planning Board is satisfied that various vehicle types will be adequately accommodated from a circulation perspective.

Departure from Design Standards DDS-642

The applicant has filed a Departure from Design Standards (DDS) in order to construct parking spaces that are smaller than the standard sizes. Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance governs the size of parking spaces. The County Code allows spaces of different sizes in order that compact cars can be accommodated. Specifically, it requires a standard

space to be 19 feet by 9.5 feet, while allowing a compact space to be 16.5 feet by 8 feet. The applicant is proposing that all of the spaces being provided be of a common dimension of 18 feet by 9 feet. While the proposed dimensions will be smaller than the code requirement, that deficiency will be outweighed by the fact that all of the spaces will be of the same size, and will provide less of a challenge to the residents in trying to find a suitable spot for their vehicles of varying dimensions.

The latest revision of the site plan proposes a total of 569 spaces. Typically, a residential development of 312 multifamily units would require 744 spaces. However, pursuant to the provisions of Section 27-574(a) of the Zoning Ordinance, the number of parking spaces required in the M-X-T Zone are to be calculated by the applicant and submitted for Planning Board approval at the time of DSP approval. Further, it requires the applicant to submit the methodology, assumptions, and data used in performing the calculations. To that end, the Planning Board received a memorandum dated January 18, 2018 from the applicant, outlining a parking analysis replete with methodologies and assumptions for the proposed development. The analyses were based on information contained in the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) *Parking Generation Manual, 4th Edition*. The analyses, which considered peak demand for parking, concluded that 447 spaces will be sufficient to meet parking needs of the proposed development.

Additionally, the location of the proposed development in proximity to other developments with available parking is an important element in considering the adequacy of the parking needs of the subject application. Specifically, the applicant will be upgrading the existing sidewalk network by converting the existing four-foot sidewalk to an eight-foot-wide sidepath in front of the subject property and the adjacent Lot 7, as well as provide a cross walk to allow residents to safely cross Matapeake Business Drive to the shopping center. This property is in a developing center with ample parking conveniently located to the proposed residents. Thus, the availability of parking is in keeping with the requirements of Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance. Consequently, the 569 spaces being proposed will be well within the “adequacy” threshold. In review of the applicant’s parking analysis, the Planning Board concurred with its conclusions.

In looking at the overall site circulation, the Planning Board found no negative impact that would be created by constructing slightly smaller spaces with a common dimension. In review of the applicant’s parking analysis, the Planning Board concurred with its conclusions.

Overall from the standpoint of transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable and meets the finding required for a DSP, as well as a Departure of Design Standards, described in the Zoning Ordinance.

- c. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board analyzed the conditions attached to the approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16013 that are applicable to review of this DSP as discussed in Finding 9 above. Since Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16013 has

not obtained signature approval, a condition has been included in this resolution to require the applicant to complete the approval prior to certification of the DSP.

- d. **Trails**—The Planning Board reviewed the DSP for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the 2013 *Approved Subregion 5 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (area master plan and SMA), in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements. Because the site is located in the Branch Avenue Corridor and Brandywine Town Center, it was subject to the requirements of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations and the “Transportation Review Guidelines – Part 2, 2013” at the time of PPS.

One master plan trail/bikeway issue impacts the application, with a stream valley trail recommended along Timothy Branch (see MPOT map). The text from the MPOT regarding the Timothy Branch Trail is copied below:

“**Timothy Branch Stream Valley Trail:** Provide a stream valley trail along Timothy Branch between Dyson Road and Mattawoman Creek. This trail will provide access to the developing employment center in Brandywine. Public use trail easements have been acquired as commercial development has occurred (MPOT, page 32).”

A 65-foot-wide public use trail easement was previously established for the Timothy Branch Trail for the parcels within the Matapeake Business Park, including the subject property. Staff initially recommended construction of the trail within this easement for the subject site. However, after discussions with the M-NCPPC Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR), it was determined that DPR had no plans to take over the operation and maintenance of this trail or to acquire land within this stream valley as a park trail corridor. To the north of the site, the stream valley trail has been implemented as a homeowner association (HOA) trail only, with the majority of the public trail located along parallel roadways to avoid impacts to the stream valley. Because there is no public entity willing to take over the operation of a trail within the stream valley, the Planning Board did not recommend construction on the subject site and supports the removal of the easement for a public trail connection at this location. It has consistently been the M-NCPPC Planning Department’s policy to not burden a Homeowners Association (HOA) with a public trail connection on private HOA land. This trail easement can be eliminated at the time the record plats are revised.

The Complete Streets element of the MPOT reinforces the need for these recommendations and includes the following policies regarding sidewalk construction and the accommodation of pedestrians.

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

Sidewalks are recommended along all road frontages and along both sides of all internal roads consistent with these policies. An additional segment of sidewalk is recommended in the vicinity of Building 2. There is an existing sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Matapeake Business Drive. However, the sidewalk does not appear to meet current County or Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards or specifications and is proposed to be replaced by the applicant with a shared use path or wide sidewalk.

Review of the Proposed Off-Site Improvements and BPIS Exhibit:

At the time of PPS, the applicant proffered off-site sidewalk reconstruction along Matapeake Business Drive in order to make the route ADA accessible.

Our client is proffering the replacement of existing 4-foot sidewalks along Matapeake Business Drive. The walks will be replaced with 5-foot wide sidewalks. The scope and nexus of the sidewalk replacement will be determined at the time of Detailed Site Plan.

Per the guidance of Section 24-124.01 of the Subdivision Regulations and the "Transportation Review Guidelines – Part 2, 2013," only the portion of the sidewalk off the immediate frontage of the subject site will count towards the off-site cost cap. Using the DPW&T Construction Price List at the time of PPS, staff developed a cost estimate for the proposed sidewalk work. The costs covered in the estimate include (1) four-foot sidewalk removal, (2) five-foot sidewalk construction, and (3) ADA ramp installation. The limits of the work include the frontages of Parcels 4, 5, 6 and 7 on the east side of Matapeake Business Drive and Parcels 3 and 11 on the south side of Matapeake Business Drive.

On- and off-site pedestrian improvements were addressed at the time of PPS 4-16013. These facilities are indicated on the submitted DSP. The sidepath along Matapeake Business Drive should be labeled on the DSP. A detail for the bike racks is included in the plan sheets.

The off-site sidewalk construction and ADA improvements will directly benefit the future residents and guests to the subject site by providing pedestrian and ADA access to the existing shopping center, the adjacent office space, and several existing bus stops in compliance with County specifications and standards. The revised limits proposed by the applicant comply with the cost cap specified in Section 24-124.01(c) of the Subdivision Regulations.

- e. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—In a memorandum dated January 10, 2018, the Department of Parks and Recreation provided no comments on the subject application.
- f. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board provided the following:

Portions of this site were previously evaluated by the Environmental Planning Section in conjunction with previous applications, including review and approval of: Zoning Map Amendment ZMA-9502-C; Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-91030 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-026-91; and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-97124 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI-026-91-02. A Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan, TCP2-133-91, for the entire Brandywine 301 Industrial Park was first approved on July 13, 1998, which has had numerous revisions, and expansions to reflect the development of Brandywine Crossing, and includes the subject property. Natural Resources Inventory NRI-158-06 and a '-01' revision for the Brandywine 301 Industrial Park was approved in 2008, but it has since expired.

Parcel 9 was previously subject to the approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-05073 and Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-133-91-04 for a 17, 992-square-foot office/warehouse under I-1 zoning standards. Grading was completed, but no structure was constructed, and the DSP has since expired.

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area

Impacts to the regulated environmental features should be limited to those that are necessary for the development of the property. Necessary impacts are those that are directly attributable to infrastructure required for the reasonable use and orderly and efficient development of the subject property or are those that are required by County Code for reasons of health, safety, or welfare. Necessary impacts include but are not limited to, adequate sanitary sewerage lines and water lines, road crossings for required street connections, and outfalls for SWM facilities. Road crossings of streams and/or wetlands may be appropriate if placed at the location of an existing crossing or at the point of least impact to the regulated environmental features. Stormwater management outfalls may also be considered necessary impacts if the site has been designed to place the outfall at a point of least impact. The types of impacts that can be avoided include those for site grading, building placement, parking, SWM facilities (not including outfalls), and road crossings where reasonable alternatives exist. The cumulative impacts for the development of a property should be the fewest necessary and sufficient to reasonably develop the site in conformance with County Code.

The floodplain evaluation shows that the site contains floodplain on the property. According to the TCP2, there will be no impacts to the PMA with this application.

At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the delineated PMA, except for any approved impacts, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat.

Soils

The predominant soils found to occur according to the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey (WSS) include: Grosstown gravelly silt loam; and Udorthents, evidence of previous gravel mining on the site. According to available mapping information, Marlboro clay and Christiana clay does not occur on or in the vicinity of this property.

Stormwater Management

An approved SWM concept approval letter was submitted with the subject application. Stormwater Management Concept Plan 12704-2017 was approved on October 13, 2017, with conditions of approval, requiring a SWM pond, five micro-bioretenention facilities, and two sand filters. The concept approval expires October 13, 2020.

- g. **Prince George's County Fire/EMS Department**—The Fire/EMS Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
- h. **Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated December 26, 2017, DPIE provided a standard memorandum that includes comments regarding improvements within the public right-of-way, existing 100-year floodplain, street tree, street lighting, existing utilities, soil investigation, sidewalks, ADA ramps, storm drainage system, etc. that will be enforced through its separate permitting process. DPIE specifically noted that it has no objection to approval of DDS-642 and that the proposed DSP is consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 12704-2017.
- i. **Prince George's County Police Department**—The Police Department did not offer comments on the subject application.
- j. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated June 30, 2017, the Environmental Engineering Program of the Prince George's County Health Department provided comments on Conceptual Site Plan CSP-16003 and the applicable comments were included in the resolution of the approval. At time of writing of this report, no additional comments were provided.
- k. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In a memorandum dated December 27, 2017, WSSC provided standard comments on the DSP regarding existing water and sewer systems in the area, along with requirements for service and connections, requirements for easements, spacing, work within easements, meters, etc. These comments will be enforced through WSSC separate permitting process.

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 above-noted application to allow parking spaces in the following dimensions:

PARKING SPACE SIZES PER PARCEL				
PARCEL 1				
WIDTH	DEPTH	DRIVE AISLE	TYPE	NUMBER
9FT	18FT	22FT	SURFACE	86
9FT	18FT	24FT+	SURFACE	10
9FT	19FT	22FT	SURFACE	154
9FT+	21FT	23FT	GARAGE	8
SUBTOTAL				258
PARCEL 2				
WIDTH	DEPTH	DRIVE AISLE	TYPE	NUMBER
9FT	18FT	22FT	SURFACE	112
9FT	18FT	23FT	SURFACE	18
9FT	18FT	24FT+	SURFACE	11
9FT	19FT	22FT	SURFACE	154
9FT+	21FT	23FT	GARAGE	16
SUBTOTAL				311
GRAND TOTAL				569

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board's action must be filed with the District Council for Prince George's County, Maryland within thirty (30) days of 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 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Doerner, with Commissioners Washington, Doerner, Bailey, Geraldo, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, March 1, 2018, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 12th day of April 2018.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:HZ:rpg