

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 27, 2006, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-05021 for Fairfield at Greenbelt Metro Park, Lot 1, Block A the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan is for a portion of the South Core of the overall development called Greenbelt Station. The proposed development consists of 302 multi-family residential units located in three separate buildings, connected by a parking structure.
2. **Site Data:**

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	MXT and DDO	MXT and DDO
Use	Vacant	Multi-family Residential
Acreage	6.0046	6.0046
Lots	One	One
Parcels	None	None
Dwelling Units	0	302

	REQUIRED	PROVIDED
Parking Required		
One Bedroom at 1.33 spaces per unit.	208	See total below
Two Bedroom at 1.66 spaces per unit.	216	See total below
Three Bedroom at 1.99 spaces per unit.	32	See total below
2,279-square foot leasing office at 1 per 250 square feet	10	See total below

Total Parking Required/Provided	466	506 (11 exterior; 495 interior)
Handicapped Spaces	10 (included above)	10 (included above)
Loading Required	1	2

Please note that a 36 spaces more than are required have been provided. Justification for the additional spaces is because of the size of the parking garage. Leaving excess, unstriped space in the garage would be an inefficient use of space.

3. **Location:** The site is located in Planning Area 67, Council District 1. More specifically, it is located on the northern side of Branchville Road, just east of the Metro tracks and its intersection with 55th Avenue a.k.a. Ballew Avenue in the southwestern portion of the Greenbelt Metro Park Project. The project is also located west of the North-South Connector Road that will extend from Greenbelt Road into the proposed project.
4. **Surroundings and Uses:** Fairfield at Greenbelt Metro Park is bounded to the north by other future development parcels in the South Core; to the west by the Greenbelt Metrorail and MARC rail tracks; to the east by vacant land; and to the south by a fence contractor business known as “Hercules Fence.”
5. **Previous Approvals:** The Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008/01 was approved by the District Council on June 20, 2006. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026 was approved by the Planning Board on September 6, 2001, reconsidered on September 15, 2005, and February 2, 2006. The final resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution 01-130(A)/2 was adopted on February 16, 2006. The preliminary plan remains valid until February 16, 2012, or until a final record plat is approved. The site is also the subject of Stormwater Management Concept Approval 2657-2001-01 approved on April 13, 2007, with such approval being effective for three years or until April 13, 2007.
6. **Design Features:** The 302 multi-family units involved in the subject project are contained in three separate buildings on the site that are oriented toward the North South Connector. Of the mix, 156 units are planned to be one-bedroom apartments, 122 are two-bedroom apartments and 24 are three-bedroom apartments. A parking garage runs along the western/rear boundary of the site, adjacent to the CSX/Wmata tracks, connecting them one to another. Three separate access points are provided to the North South Connector. A median is included in the design of the North South Connector, so only the most central access point provides for the option of travel in either the northern or southern direction. That central access point is located between buildings 2 and 3, on a traffic circle, that allows vehicles to either turn right or travel around the circle to then travel north on the North South Connector. The other two access points, located at the extreme northern and southern boundary of the property, respectively, offer only “right-in/right-out” access and lead to a drive that skirts the periphery of the property, along its southern boundary, around back of the parking garage and then along the northern boundary of the property. Two loading areas are located to the rear of the parking garage and a limited number (11 spaces) of surface parking is provided along the drive that leads between building 2 and 3 from the most central access point. Buildings 1 and 2 are designed around central courtyards, and a third

courtyard provides room for the swimming pool and clubhouse. Interior elevations for the courtyard are well articulated, balanced and fenestrated, and provide visual interest.

Recreational amenities for the development include a trail, a swimming pool, a 1,200 square foot fitness room and a 1,600 square foot clubroom, in addition to the offered outdoor passive recreational areas.

The eastern elevation is attractively designed with a variety of forms breaking up and defining its mass. The façade recedes as it provides room for the two interior courtyards and protrudes in a rhythmic fashion, articulating the various bays of the façade. Use of a variety of materials on this well-balanced facade provides further visual interest. The predominant building material specified is brick, though cast iron, painted metal, stone, pre-cast stone, stone with brick inlay and painted Exterior Insulation and Finish Systems (EIFS) architectural cornice and dentil details are also used. Fenestration along the façade, like the articulation of the façade and its roofline, is also varied.

The western elevation, the other longitudinal façade, which is immediately adjacent to the train tracks, is comprised primarily of a linear pre-cast concrete garage structure. The structure has brick detailing in its elevator stairway core and a painted metal security grill on its ground floor. At either end of the garage structure is architecture similar, but more understated than, the architecture of the eastern elevation. Though some brick is utilized on the first floor of these end appendages, siding is the predominant material. The roof is finished in asphalt shingles. The variety of forms is simpler than the eastern elevation, but the massing is still pleasing and the fenestration varied.

The southern and northern elevations are similar to the eastern elevation in its rhythmically protruding bays; however, the scale is proportional to the diminished length of this façade. The bays are smaller and generally only carry a single window design whereas on the eastern elevation the windows are generally paired. Also, there is less variety on the southern and northern facades, though enough to create an attractive visage. A combination of siding, brick, brick with inlay, and painted EIFS provide an attractive mix of materials for these facades.

Landscaping is provided in between the buildings, in the courtyards and along all peripheries of the site. The applicant has specified the following items in the landscape details to the plans:

- Bike rack;
- Plaza pedestrian paver section with gravel base;
- Victor Stanley bench;
- Victor Stanley receptacle;
- Victor Stanley custom curve backless bench;
- Raised planters; and
- Ornamental pool fence.

7. **Compliance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance:**

Staff has listed each relevant requirement of the Zoning Ordinance in bold-faced type below and

provided comment:

Required Findings for detailed site plans in metro planned communities:

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

Staff Comment: The project offers a multi-family residential development close to a metro stop offering good pedestrian and vehicular circulation. The project meets the goals of efficiency and conservation of land and buildings by concentrating relatively dense development proximate to easily accessible mass transit facilities. The project, together with the adjacent development, will provide a balance of mixed land use offering a twenty four (24) hour environment to facilitate and encourage a twenty-four (24) hour environment.

The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of Section 27-475.06.03.

Comment: The subject project is in general conformance with the purposes and other provisions of Section 27-475.06.03 as more particularly described below.

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

Comment: Although the subject project only involves multi-family residential land use, it is part of a larger project in which a variety of land uses will be physically and visually integrated in order to encourage interaction between and among the uses within the development and with those who live, work in, or visit the area. In addition, site design of the subject project, incorporating two sizable, attractively landscaped courtyards offering passive recreational opportunities along the front façade, will assist the project in fulfilling this requirement.

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

Comment: The subject project is a multi-family residential component of a larger project that will fulfill the above requirement.

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

Comment: Since the proposed development is not staged, the above finding is inapplicable to the subject project.

The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development and appropriate linkages to the surrounding community:

Comment: The site plan will meet this requirement if some minor revisions to the plan are implemented as described in the recommendation of this report.

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

Comment: The site plan meets this requirement by providing benches, extensive landscaping, specialized paving, and recreational amenities, and by enhanced treatment of the architectural elevations.

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

Comment: The proposed multi-family residential development has been made compatible with existing development through buffering and acoustical considerations. Future projects to be developed on currently vacant land to the north and east will be made compatible with the subject development, though their respective approval processes.

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

Comment: This finding was made at the time of approval of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026. In addition, in response to the subject case, in referral comments, public facilities and transportation facilities were deemed adequate to support the proposed development.

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

Comment: The proposed development does not include a hotel use.

For approval of the detailed site plan only in a Metro Planned Community, there is evidence of an executed letter of intent from at least one anchor department store with fashion sophistication at a level designed to attract the upscale customer, commonly viewed as being well educated, sophisticated in his/her tastes, and earning in excess of \$50,000 per year. Department operating under the trade names Bloomingdale's, Lord & Taylor, Macy's,

Neiman Marcus, Nordstrom, and Saks 5th Avenue, or the equivalent (or with trade names then being used by any of the named department stores, aforesaid) will automatically be deemed to meet the criteria set forth in the preceding sentence. In no event shall any of the anchor department store tenants initially operate under a trade name generally associated with, and characterized as, a discount department store such as Wal-Mart, KMart, or Target. Notwithstanding the foregoing, in no event shall traditional, high-quality, main-street retail shopping and entertainment complex stores operating under trade names such as Bloomingdale's, Macy's, Hecht's, Lord & Taylor, Sears, Dillards, JC Penney, Nordstrom, Neiman Marcus, or Saks 5th Avenue be deemed a discount department store.
Comment: The subject project is a multi-family component of a larger development that will include at least one anchor department store as described above

In addition, the proposed project is in accordance with the purposes for a Metro Planned Community contained in the Zoning Ordinance.

Staff has listed the relevant purposes included in the Zoning Ordinance for a Metro Planned Community in boldface type below, followed by staff's comments with respect to the subject application.

To promote the optimum use of the transit facilities by assuring the orderly development of land in transit station development areas and access, both vehicular and pedestrian, to metro stations;

Comment: The proposed development proposes the optimum use of transit facilities by assuring the development of land in the transit station area and access, both vehicular and pedestrian, to the Metro station and other major transportation systems. In addition, the proposed project promotes the orderly development of land by organizing the site in a rational manner for the ingress and egress of vehicles and for easy movement of pedestrians on and off the site. The proposed North South Connector, running along the eastern periphery of the site will provide logical in/out turn movements at the planned traffic circle along the project's frontage and two additional right in/right-out only access points. An extensive network of sidewalks will provide for pedestrian mobility along the site's North-South Connector's frontage and throughout the site.

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

Comment: The subject project will provide a housing component of a larger development that will include a variety of uses. It will be that combination of uses that creates activity on the street in a round-the-clock manner creating a safer and more vital neighborhood fabric.

To encourage diverse land uses which blend together harmoniously;

Comment: As stated above, the subject project is a multi-family housing component of a larger

development that will include a diversity of land uses. In order to encourage the development as a whole to mesh, a conceptual site plan and a detailed site plan for infrastructure were completed for the entire site that established common requirements. As we can see from the subject detailed site plan, transportation improvements on the site will provide easy vehicular and pedestrian access between the subject project and its surrounding area.

To create dynamic, functional relationships among individual uses within a distinctive visual character and identity;

Comment: The exterior architectural treatment of the facades of the building helps the project create a distinctive visual character and identity to the project. Architectural treatment on the project's eastern façade is most pronounced from the eastern direction, where the building's longest façade also provides glimpses into the two recessed courtyards, with landscaping and recreational facilities. Architectural design of the north and south facades that will not be as visible is still attractive, but not ornate. The building's western façade, facing the rail tracks is de-emphasized, comprising mainly the garage structure. The subject project creates a distinctive character and identity especially along the peripheries of the project that will be most visible to passersby.

To permit a flexible response to the market;

Comment: The project provides a variety of apartment sizes in response to the market. Such design program could be modified by a future application should it become necessary to have the project conform to vagaries in market demand.

To provide the maximum amount of freedom possible in the architectural design of buildings and their grouping and layout within the area classified in this zone in order to provide an opportunity and incentive to the developer to achieve excellence in physical, social and economic planning; to stimulate the coordinated, harmonious, and systematic development of the area within the zone, the area surrounding the zone, and the regional district as a whole; to prevent detrimental effects to the use or development of adjacent properties or the surrounding neighborhoods; and to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the present and future inhabitants of the regional district and county as a whole;

Comment: The layout of the building utilizes the frontage along the railroad tracks for the service use of the parking of cars. Recreational facilities, landscaping and the most enhanced architecture in the project (the eastern façade) are located where most visible and enhance quality of life for the community.

To promote the application of, and to be in conformance with, the planning recommendations, strategies, and/or guidelines for Metro Station areas included in existing community or area Master Plans and Sectional Map Amendments;

Comment: As per comments dated November 3, 2005, received from the Community Planning Division, the project is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies

for the Developed Tier and conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2001 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area*.

To preserve and/or mitigate environmentally sensitive areas and significant natural features.

Comment: As per comments received from the Environmental Planning Section dated July 12, 2006, the Environmental Planning Section found the proposed project acceptable subject to conditions. Implicit in that recommendation is support of this purpose of Metro Planned Communities.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008/01**—The detailed site plan is generally in conformance with CSP-01008/01. The following conditions of the CSP warrant discussion. Staff has included each relevant condition in bold face type followed by staff comment:

1. **Total development within the subject property shall be limited to 2,250 residences; 1,215,000 square feet of retail space; 1,600,000 square feet of general office space; and 300 hotel rooms, or different uses generating no more than the number of peak-hour trips (4,030 AM peak-hour vehicle trips and 6,879 PM peak-hour vehicle trips) generated by the above development.**
 - (a) **South Core—Development in the south core shall not exceed 983 housing units and 115,000 square feet gross floor area of neighborhood-serving retail and/or office. Up to 1,022 dwelling units may be permitted subject to verification by the Transportation Planning Section that the additional dwelling units do not exceed the overall trip caps for the development. Neighborhood-serving retail and/or office shall include, at a minimum, 80,000 square feet which may be reduced as noted below. Development in the south core shall contain at least two of the following three land use types: residential, neighborhood commercial, and office.**

Staff Comment: The proposed development involves the creation of 466 multi-family housing units. This is well below the threshold for development of residences on the Fairfield property (2,250) and well below the maximum permissible housing units in the south core (963).

- (d)(iv) **Show the proposed location of the proposed College Park Overpass.**

Staff Comment: Condition 1A ensures that the proposed location of the College Park Overpass will be shown on the plans.

15. **Emphasis shall be placed on a mixed-use development that is pedestrian-and bicycle-friendly, a grid street pattern with buildings close to the sidewalk, and civic**

areas with plazas and parks at regular intervals. Buildings may be set back from a street to provide for outdoor uses such as cafes.

Staff Comment: The detailed site plan is in conformance with this condition. The overall development is mixed use, and this site provides a multifamily component of the mixed-use development. The building is proposed close to the road, providing easy pedestrian access and an urban environment.

The building has three wings, with private courtyards, providing additional urban-scaled recreational opportunities on the west side of the north/south connector road. Connections to the overall pedestrian system are provided. Bicycle racks are provided in the garage. Private recreational facilities are provided within the proposed project. Other recreational opportunities are provided on the east side of the north/south connector road and more will be provided on subsequent development sites.

16. All detailed site plans shall consider the development district standards of the Greenbelt area sector plan.

Staff Comment: The detailed site plan is generally consistent with all applicable development district standards.

17. The design specifications and materials for site-wide amenities, signage, lighting, street furniture and recreational facilities shall be approved by the Planning Board with the first detailed site plan for the north core and the first detailed site plan for the south core, which plans may be submitted separately. Also, at the time of the first detailed site plan for the north or south core, specific amenities that are considered site-wide will be identified, and those amenities that may be different between the north and south core will be identified. In addition, the first detailed site plan shall provide a refined layout that shows the locations and general dimensions of all civic components, including parks, plazas, recreational areas and green areas/open spaces. Special attention shall be paid to address size, lighting, design and scale of any signage facing the Hollywood neighborhood.

Staff Comment: This requirement was met at the time the detailed site plan for the property on the east side of the connector road was approved (DSP-04081). Street sections have been provided for the north-south connector road and all other public and private street types within the development. Public streets that are to be dedicated to the City of Greenbelt have been designed to standards acceptable to the city. Private streets and alleys have also been designed to be acceptable to the city and are recommended for approval by the Planning Board. There is no signage in the subject project facing the Hollywood neighborhood.

19. In general, the building height in the north core shall be 4-10 stories with a maximum height of 140 feet from finished grade, except landmark buildings, which may rise to 12 stories, with a maximum height of 165 feet from finished grade.

Taller buildings shall be located in the maximum height zone as defined in the Greenbelt Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. In the south core, building heights shall generally range from 2 to 5 stories, with a maximum height of 70 feet from finished grade. Additional building height may be granted as outlined in the Greenbelt Metro Area approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment. Any height analysis submitted shall reflect the height review guidelines delineated in the Greenbelt sector plan.

Staff Comment: The proposed structure is generally four stories with a five-story parking garage. It is no more than 70 feet in height. Therefore, this requirement is satisfied.

- 25. The applicant, his successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private and/or public recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. A complete recreational package shall be provided at the time of the first detailed site plan for each core and shall include facilities in the amount of \$1.750,000 at a minimum.**

Staff Comment: As mentioned above, site-wide recreational facilities have been provided for the south core and site-specific recreational facilities have been provided for the townhouse section. The following private recreational facilities and amenities are proposed in this phase:

An outdoor pool with deck
2 courtyard areas with sitting areas
Indoor club room/amenity area
Business center

The overall South Core recreational facilities were found to be adequate in the first detailed site plan (DSP-04081).

- 26. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of the Development Review Division (DRD) for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of a detailed site plan by the Planning Board.**

Staff Comment: The recreational facilities included in the proposed development are adequate for the number of dwelling units proposed and are properly sited. The courtyards created by the wings of the building provide a secure, attractive outdoor environment for the residents.

- 32. At the time of each Detailed Site Plan review, the developer shall submit plans to the Maryland Department of the Environment for review and comment and shall notify the City of College Park of each plan submittal. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review for any area that includes 100-year floodplain impacts, modeling data generated in conjunction with the Maryland Department of the Environment permitting process for floodplain fill shall be provided to the City of College Park. The City shall also be notified of any proposed changes to floodplain elevations. Floodplain mitigation shall fully compensate for all floodplain impacts in the project**

area including upstream and downstream.

Staff Comment: These plans were submitted with the application.

- 48. Design consideration shall be given to mixing unit types to avoid monocultures of housing, and to avoid continuous groupings of similar unit types, scale and massing. Where appropriate, buildings shall provide for a vertical mix of uses to create a mix of uses on a site-specific and neighborhood basis.**

Staff Comment: The proposed overall development provides a mix of housing types of various scales and massing. The multifamily building architecture proposed provides varying scale and massing, creating an upscale urban feel. The architectural style of the buildings includes facades that give the appearance of both townhomes and multifamily structures.

- 55. Street blocks shall be limited to lengths no greater than 400 feet in length, unless the curb line and/or building frontage is interrupted by an offset sufficient in size and design to create a functional public space.**

Staff Comment: Though traditional street blocks are not involved in the subject multi-family residential development, the longest stretch along the North-South connector measures only 305 feet.

- 58. Concurrent with the submission of the first detailed site plan for each core, a common sign plan for the subject property shall be submitted. The height of freestanding/monument exterior signs shall generally not exceed six feet in height for the area encompassing the main signage area. Combined with other architectural features (architectural bases, structures, planters, mounds), the height of freestanding/monument signs may be allowed to exceed six feet in height, as reviewed and approved by the City of Greenbelt. With the exception of 4, page 179 (Freestanding or Monument Signs), the design guidelines set forth in the Greenbelt Metro Area Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment shall be considered the basis for development and review of the common sign plan for the project.**

Staff Comment: A common sign plan has been approved with DSP-04081. The proposed signage meets the above requirements and is consistent with the criteria set forth in the Greenbelt Metro Area Sector Plan. Therefore, this condition has been satisfied.

- 61. At the time of the review of the first detailed site plan for each core area, the applicant shall provide a plan showing all proposed private and public trails, including the identification of public access points to the proposed stream valley trail system.**

Staff Comment: The comprehensive private and public trail system was approved with DSP-04081.

66. The following considerations shall be addressed at the time of Detailed Site Plan:

- (a) The applicant shall make all reasonable efforts to include a “senior housing” (age-restricted) component in the South Core. The applicant shall demonstrate its efforts as part of the Detailed Site Plan process. The District Council may require one multifamily building to contain “senior housing.”**
- (b) The applicant shall design all retail office, hotel or multifamily buildings or public buildings to satisfy the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Silver standard.**

Staff Comment: With regard to the senior housing, there are other multifamily structures that will be proposed in the south core that will be appropriate for senior housing.

Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the applicant shall submit an analysis that demonstrates that the proposed development is designed to satisfy at least the LEED silver standard.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026**—The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-01026 and its requirements.

10. **The Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance**—In a memorandum dated July 12, 2006, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has approved tree conservation plans. Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/147/04 was approved by staff as part of the permit for reclamation of the former mining site. A revision to Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/147/04-01 was approved by the Planning Board on June 22, 2006.

The revised plan, TCPII/147/04-01, contains the entire 168.54 acres of the Greenbelt Metro project. The overall project has a woodland conservation threshold of 18.12 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The plan proposes clearing 1.47 acres of the existing 1.87 acres of upland woodland. The plan also proposes clearing 3.00 acres of the existing 29.53 acres of wooded floodplain. The minimum woodland conservation requirement for the Greenbelt Station site is 21.49 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 8.61 acres of on-site planting within the 100-year floodplain, where woodland does not currently exist, and planting 16.51 acres on the adjacent State of Maryland property, for a total of 25.12 acres.

The design of the proposed woodland conservation areas is in conformance with the Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/27/00-01. The plan shows extensive restoration of woodland in areas that have been significantly impacted by past mining activities on-site. Preparation for planting will require removal of large quantities of concrete debris, reconfiguration of abandoned wash ponds into forested stormwater management water quality ponds and placement of thousands of cubic yards of new topsoil. The timing of the planting areas on the land owned by the State of Maryland is tied into the wetland permit required for the development of the property. The

planting of all 16.51 acres will commence with the issuance of the first permit.

In conclusion, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/147/04-01 that was approved with DSP-04081, meets the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance and is in conformance with previous approvals.

11. ***Prince George's County Landscape Manual***—Section 4.1 Residential Requirements, Section 4.3 Parking Lot Requirements, apply to the subject project. Staff has reviewed the subject plans and found them to be generally in conformance with the requirements of those sections. The schedules from the *Landscape Manual*, however, were missing. Therefore, staff has included a recommended condition below that requires their inclusion prior to signature approval.
12. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Archeological Review—In a memorandum dated November 10, 2005, the staff archeologist stated that while she would not require any archeological investigations on the site, Section 106 review may be required by state or federal agencies.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated November 3, 2005, the Community Planning Division stated that the proposal is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier and that the application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 2001 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Greenbelt Metro Area*.

Transportation—In a revised memorandum dated July 11, 2006, the Transportation Planning Section reviewed the transportation-related conditions of approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008 and Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026. With respect to the conceptual site plan, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the applicant is in compliance with transportation-related conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 37 and 38. Similarly, the Transportation Planning Section noted that the applicant is in compliance with transportation-related conditions 1, 2, 3, 4, 17 and 18. In addition, they noted that the vehicular and pedestrian access within the site is acceptable, that the 2001 traffic study that was revised in 2005 in consideration of CB-36-2005 is still valid. Finally, they noted that the evidence of bonding with the State Highway Administration and the City of Greenbelt—required by condition 37 of the conceptual site plan and condition 17 of the preliminary plan of subdivision—has been properly made, but that future development moving into Phase II would trigger the need for further bonding and presentation of evidence of said bonding.

Subdivision—In a memorandum dated July 12, 2006, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026, approved by the Planning Board on September 6, 2001, for two outlots and 14 parcels. On August 30, 2004, the Court of Special Appeals of Maryland reversed the judgment of the Circuit Court and remanded the case back to the Circuit Court for further proceedings in accordance with their opinion. Additionally,

they stated that on February 2, 2005, the Circuit Court ordered that the Planning Board's approval of the Preliminary Plan of subdivision be reversed. On March 17, 2005, the Planning Board approved a request to reconsider Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01026 based on the fact that the Planning Board erred in the original approval of the conceptual site plan for the site (CSP-01008) by not requiring the applicant to guarantee funding for the transportation facilities. Further, with respect to the chronology of the subdivision actions on the site, they stated that on September 15, 2005, the Planning Board reconsidered the preliminary plan of subdivision and approved the subject application with modifications to the original conditions and findings, consistent with the decision of the court. The stated basis for the modifications was that the original number of parcels was too restrictive with regard to a Metro Planned Community. On February 2, 2006, the Planning Board once again approved the subject application with modifications to the original conditions and findings, consistent with the ability to provide future flexibility in the number of lots and parcels that are permitted. Resolution of Approval PGCPB Resolution 01-130(A)/2 was adopted on February 16, 2006. The preliminary plan remains valid until February 16, 2012, or until a final record plat is approved. In their referral comments, the Subdivision Section commented on conditions of that approval relevant to the subject detailed site plan and concluded that the subject detailed site plan was in conformance with the requirements of that approval.

Trails—In a memorandum dated April 17, 2006, the Senior Trails Planner reviewed the trails requirements of the Greenbelt Metro Area sector plan and Condition 24 of approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01008. The Senior Trails Planner's recommendations are contained in the conditions below.

Permits—In a memorandum dated December 15, 2005, the Permit Review Section noted an inconsistency in the number of exterior parking spaces between the general notes and the architectural elevations, a deficit in the number of required parking spaces and a lack of plans for all levels of the proposed parking garage. These deficiencies will be eliminated through compliance with the recommended conditions below.

Public Facilities—In a memorandum dated December 6, 2005, the Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the proposed development is within the required travel time guideline for fire engine, ambulance, paramedic and ladder truck service, and that existing police facilities would be adequate to serve the proposed development.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated July 12, 2006, the Environmental Planning Section evaluated the project's conformance to the Greenbelt Metro Area sector plan. Specifically, they stated:

Environmental Review

1. This site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the site has approved tree conservation plans. Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/147/04 was approved by staff as part of the permit for reclamation of the former mining site. A revision to Type II Tree Conservation Plan

TCPII/147/04-01, was approved by the Planning Board on June 22,2006.

The revised plan, TCPII/147/04-01, contains the entire 168.54 acres of the Greenbelt Metro project. The overall project has a woodland conservation threshold of 18.12 acres (15 percent of the net tract). The plan proposes clearing of 1.47 acres of the existing 1.87 acres of upland woodland. The plan also proposes clearing 3.00 acres of the existing 29.53 acres of wooded floodplain. The minimum woodland conservation requirement for the Greenbelt Station site is 21.49 acres. The plan proposes to meet the requirement by providing 8.61 acres of on-site planting within the 100-year floodplain where woodland does not currently exist and planting 16.51 acres on the adjacent State of Maryland property, for a total of 25.12 acres.

The design of the proposed woodland conservation areas is in conformance with approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/27/00-01. The plan shows extensive restoration of woodland in areas that have been significantly impacted by the past mining activities on-site. Preparation for planting will require removal of large quantities of concrete debris, reconfiguration of abandoned wash ponds into forested stormwater management water quality ponds and placement of thousands of cubic yards of new topsoil. The timing of the planting areas on the land owned by the State of Maryland is tied into the wetland permit required for the development of the property. The planting of all 16.51 acres will commence with issuance of the first permit.

Comment: Revised Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/147/04-01, which was approved with DSP-04081, meets the requirements of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance and is in conformance with previous approvals.

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

Recommended Condition: At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all the elements of the expanded buffer: all 100-year floodplain, all 50-foot floodplain buffers, stream buffers, wetlands and wetland buffers except for approved variation requests, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The conservation easement shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and the City of College Park for review prior to signature. The following note shall be placed on the plat:

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

3. The plan proposes impacts to stream buffers and wetland buffers. Impacts to these buffers are

prohibited by Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations unless the Planning Board grants a variation to the Subdivision Regulation in accordance with Section 24-113. The approval of a conceptual impact as part of CSP-01008 by the Planning Board or District Council does not relieve the applicant of the need to obtain a variation from the Subdivision Regulations. Some impacts were reviewed and approved with Preliminary Plan 4-01026; however, any new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision will require re-evaluation of all proposed impacts. The impacts shown on the Type II TCP are consistent with those approved with Preliminary Plan 4-01026

Recommended Condition: Prior to the issuance of any permit which proposes impacts to wetlands or wetland buffers or Water of the United States, the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans, to the Environmental Planning Section, the City of College Park and the City of Greenbelt and provide evidence in the permit package to M-NCPPC that copies have been delivered to all parties.

4. A state endangered wildflower, Trailing Stichwort (*Stellaria alsine*) is known to occur on the site. Habitats of rare/threatened/endangered species should be evaluated as part of the TCP. The location of the population is not known to staff of the Environmental Planning Section.

Discussion: The Maryland Endangered Species Act requires review of all state permits by the Maryland Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). As stipulated by Maryland law, MDNR must issue a finding of no significant impact before the permit may be released by any state agency. As in prior cases, the Environmental Planning Section will coordinate with the applicant and MDNR during the state permit review process. The condition proposed above ensures that copies of approved permits will be provided prior to permit issuance.

Summary of Recommendations

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-05021 subject to the proposed conditions 2–5 below.

Department of Environmental Resources (DER)—In an email dated June 22, 2006, DER stated that the proposed project is consistent with the relevant Stormwater Management Approval Concept 8851-2006.

Prince George's County Fire Department—In a memorandum dated April 12, 2006, the Prince George's County Fire Department offered information on required access for fire apparatuses, design of private roads, fire lanes and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—In a letter dated February 15, 2006, DPW&T stated that:

- Full frontage improvements and right-of-way dedication in accordance with DPW&T's commercial and industrial roadway standards are required;

- The entire frontage along Branchville Road must be improved to include concrete curb and gutter, pavement widening, sidewalks and a closed storm drainage system;
- Resurfacing and any required base repair for the full width of Branchville Road along the property frontage is required;
- All improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county are to be in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T's Specifications and Standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act;
- Conformance with street tree and street lighting standards is required.

Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—In a letter dated November 2, 2005, SHA stated that they had no objection to Detailed Site Plan DSP-05021 approval.

Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority—At the time of this writing, staff has not received comment from the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

City of College Park—In a letter dated July 13, 2006, the mayor and council of the City of College Park recommended approval of the detailed site plan for Fairfield at Greenbelt Metro Park subject to conditions. Those conditions have been included in the recommendation section of this report.

City of Greenbelt—In a letter dated June 21, 2006, the mayor of the City of Greenbelt stated that on April 24, 2006, the Greenbelt City Council reviewed and endorsed with conditions the detailed site plan for the Fairfield section of the south core of the Greenbelt Station project. Further, they stated that they had been working actively with the applicant, Greenbelt Metropark, LLC, and representatives from Fairfield Residential, LLC, to address our concerns surrounding a number of issues, including architecture, recreational amenities, handicap accessibility, and noise attenuation.

In closing, they suggested four conditions be placed on the approval. Such conditions have been included below in the recommendation section of this report.

Town of Berwyn Heights—In a resolution dated May 10, 2006, the Town of Berwyn Heights expressed concern regarding stormwater runoff and school overcrowding as a result of the subject project. Please note that the adequacy of schools is not an issue at time of detailed site plan review and that in an email dated June 22, 2006 DER stated that the subject project conformed to the relevant stormwater management concept approval.

13. The detailed 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 costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Detailed Site Plan DSP-05021, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the plan, the plans shall be revised as follows and/or the following documentation provided to staff:
 - a. Provide an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject site's frontage of Metroland Parkway unless modified by the City of Greenbelt at the time of storm drain and paving plan approval;
 - b. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of the internal road leading to the parking garage between building 2 and building 3;
 - c. Mark and label designated bike lanes along the subject site's frontage of Metroland Parkway, consistent with approved DSP-04081 and the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities;
 - d. The discrepancy between the general notes and the architectural elevations regarding the number of exterior parking spaces shall be reconciled;
 - e. All required parking shall be indicated on the plans and a floor plan shall be provided for all levels of the proposed parking garage;
 - f. The detailed site plan notes shall be revised to address all requirements of a Metro Planned Community per Section 27-475.06.03(b)(1)(A)(i)-(iv);
 - g. Buffering and screening the industrial land use to the south and the CSX/WMATA tracks to the west shall be redesigned. Such redesign shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt for review and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board;
 - h. It shall be indicated on the plans that pavers referred to as "typical plaza pedestrian" shall be made of concrete.
 - i. Detailed drawings of proposed signage shall be provided. In no case, shall there be more than one sign for the project and the dimensions of that sign shall not exceed twelve feet in length or six feet in height.
 - j. The architecture of the parking garage shall be revised to:
 - (i) Incorporate quadratic diffusers in the horizontal spandrels in an attempt to reduce reflective noise from the project;
 - (ii) Add color to the walls of the ground floor level along the entire length of the

structure to match the color found in the end residential units;

- (iii) Utilize different colors to provide visual interest and break up the horizontal massing of the structure;
 - k. Applicant shall consult with the City of Greenbelt in order to provide an attractive alternative to the board-on-board fence shown in the site plan adjacent to the Metro chain-link fence, and shall present an agreed upon alternative to the Urban Design section for approval as designee of the Planning Board.
 - l. Applicant shall add the Schedule for Section 4.1 of the *Landscape Manual* to the plans and demonstrate compliance with that section.
 - m. The applicant shall submit an analysis prepared by a LEED Accredited Professional demonstrating that the proposed development is designed to satisfy at least the LEED Silver Standard. If the Certified Standard, but not the Silver Standard is achieved at time of building permit, the permit application shall be referred to the Planning Board for a determination that the Silver Standard is unreasonable to accomplish.
 - n. The applicant shall indicate the proposed College Park Overpass on the plans if it is proposed in this section of the South Core.
2. Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of residential structures have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA or less.
3. The following note shall be placed on the final plat:
- “Properties within this subdivision have been identified as possibly having noise levels that exceed 65 dBA Ldn due to rail traffic. This level of noise is above the Maryland designated acceptable noise levels for residential uses.”
4. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain all the elements of the expanded buffer: all 100-year floodplain, all 50-foot floodplain buffers, stream buffers, wetlands, and wetland buffers, except for approved variation requests, and be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certificate approval. The conservation easement shall be referred to the City of Greenbelt and the City of College Park for review prior to signature. The following note shall be placed on the plat:
- "Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation is prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is permitted."
5. Prior to the issuance of any permit which proposes impacts to wetlands or wetland buffers or Water of the United States, the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence

that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans, to the Environmental Planning Section, the City of College Park, and the City of Greenbelt and provide evidence in the permit package to M-NCPPC that copies have been delivered to all parties.

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

* * * * *

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Eley, seconded by Commissioner Vaughns, with Commissioners Eley, Vaughns, Clark and Parker voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioner Squire abstaining at its regular meeting held on Thursday, July 27, 2006, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of September 2006.

Trudye Morgan Johnson
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin
Planning Board Administrator

TMJ:FJG:RG:bjs