

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 April 7, 2016 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07074-01 for Town Center at Camp Springs, Aspire Apollo (formerly known as Archstone), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The detailed site plan (DSP) includes revisions to the site plan, landscape plan, and architectural elevations previously approved and Planning Board Conditions 2, 4, 5, 13(c), 13(e), 15 and 16, as stated in Prince George's County Planning Board (PGCPB) Resolution No. 08-102. Minor revisions to the site plan encompass slightly different architectural design and building materials, revised recreational amenities and common courtyard spaces, changes to the bedroom counts, and a relocation of one dwelling unit from Phase II to Phase I of the project. The requested amendments to the conditions and the plans do not include changes in the proposed building footprint, building height, setbacks, and overall site design.
2. **Development Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-X-T/D-D-O-Z	M-X-T/ D-D-O-Z
Use	Multifamily Residential	Multifamily Residential and Retail
Acreage	19.37	19.37
Square footage	0	Phase II, West Building—537,536 Phase I, East Building—582,766 Retail buildings: #100—11,080 #200—8,300 #300—10,535 #400—6,055 #500—19,030 #600—10,359 Total: 1,185,661

Other Development Data

Residential Parking Required – East Building(s) Phase I	417 units
1 bedroom—197 units @ 1.33 spaces/unit	262 spaces
2 bedroom—165 units @ 1.66 spaces/unit	274 spaces
3 bedroom—55 units @ 1.99 spaces/unit	109 spaces
Leasing Office(s) Parking Required	
Phase I – East Building(s) 4,104	14 spaces
Required Spaces	659 spaces
Spaces Proposed	685 spaces
Residential Parking Required – West Building(s) Phase II	384 units
1 bedroom—162 units @ 1.33 spaces/unit	215 spaces
2 bedroom—142 units @ 1.66 spaces/unit	236 spaces
3 bedroom—80 units @ 1.99 spaces/unit	159 spaces
Leasing Office(s) Parking Required	
Phase II – West Building(s) 3,874	10 spaces
Required Spaces	620 spaces
Spaces Proposed	650 spaces
Retail Parking Required – Building(s) 1–6 Phase III	
Retail Buildings: Integrated Shopping Center rate – 1 space per 250 sq. ft. of retail	*262 spaces
Spaces Proposed	291 spaces

*The number of parking spaces is subject to change based upon the final retail square footage.

PHASE I BEDROOM TABULATION

BEDROOM COUNT PER APPROVED DSP			
UNIT TYPE	NO. OF BED	NO. OF D.U.	TOTAL NO. OF BED
1 - Bed	1	180	180
2 - Bed	2	155	310
3 - Bed	3	81	243
TOTAL		416	733

BEDROOM COUNT PER DSP REVISION (Phase I)			
UNIT TYPE	NO. OF BED	NO. OF D.U.	TOTAL NO. OF BED
1 - Bed	1	197	197
2 - Bed	2	165	330
3 - Bed	3	55	165
TOTAL		417	692

PHASE II BEDROOM TABULATION

BEDROOM COUNT PER APPROVED DSP			
UNIT TYPE	NO. OF BED	NO. OF D.U.	TOTAL NO. OF BED
1 - Bed	1	162	162
2 - Bed	2	143	286
3 - Bed	3	80	240
SUB-TOTAL		385	688

BEDROOM COUNT PER DSP REVISION (Phase II)			
UNIT TYPE	NO. OF BED	NO. OF D.U.	TOTAL NO. OF BED
1 - Bed	1	162	162
2 - Bed	2	142	284
3 - Bed	3	80	240
TOTAL		384	686

3. **Location:** The subject site is located directly north of the Branch Avenue Metro Station on the west side of Auth Way, near the intersection of Telfair Boulevard. The site is located within Planning Area 76A, Council District 8.
4. **Surroundings and Use:** The property is configured on two sides by Auth Way, which forms a semicircle around the Alta Branch Development (also known as Chelsea West) property to the north. The site has approximately 585 linear feet of frontage on the east side of Auth Way and approximately 631 linear feet of frontage on the west side of Auth Way. The entire south side of the property, approximately 1,300 linear feet, is adjacent to the Branch Avenue Metro Station.

The property is bounded on the north by a multifamily project, Alta Branch (also known as Chelsea West), Phase I. To the west, across Auth Way, is a multifamily project and 329 townhouses comprising a development known as Metropolitan and previously known as the Town Center at Camp Springs, Phases 1A and 1B. The majority of that project, approximately 90 percent, is built-out and units are being rented (multifamily) and sold (townhouses). The property is bounded on the east by the right-of-way of Auth Way. Across the street to the northeast is industrially-zoned land in the Light Industrial (I-1) Zone currently the location of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) yard facilities. The land directly to the east of the subject property is zoned Mixed Use Transportation-Oriented (M-X-T), is part of the land area included in the conceptual site plan (CSP), and is part of the Town Center at Camp Springs known as Pod C, as identified on the approved CSP and was approved with a four-story office building. The property to the south is the Branch Avenue Metro Station.

5. **Previous Approvals:** The subject property was previously zoned I-1 and was known as Capital Gateway Office Park. The property was the subject of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-90037) in 1990 and, subsequently, the property was approved as final plats of subdivision. The property was rough graded and infrastructure was placed on the site including stormwater management and

the main loop road (Auth Way) with street trees and sidewalks. Subsequently, WMATA acquired a portion of the land for the terminus of the Green Line, which is the Branch Avenue Metro Station and rail yard.

In October 2000, the Prince George's County District Council rezoned the property from the I-1 and Rural Residential (R-R) Zones to the M-X-T Zone. The Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-01015) was reviewed and approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on June 28, 2001. The CSP indicated office/residential as the primary use of Pod B and also allowed for a retail component (Pod B is the area of the subject site). Access points were also approved on the CSP. A central green area was shown on the CSP within Pod B, which was conceptually shown as a possible connection to the Metro station.

On June 27, 2002, the Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-02023 for Town Center at Camp Springs, Phase 1A, as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 02-146, and Detailed Site Plan DSP-02024 for Town Center at Camp Springs, Phase 1B, as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 02-147. These residential projects completed the development of Pod A as identified on the CSP-01015.

On September 9, 2004, the Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-03075 for Alta Branch, located directly north of the subject property. On March 14, 2005, the District Council disapproved DSP-03075. Subsequently, Detailed Site Plan DSP-05051 for development of the same property, Alta Branch, was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board and Phase I of the project is currently under construction.

On June 19, 2008, the Planning Board approved the current DSP-07074 for the subject parcels in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-102. That approval allowed 801 multifamily units (one to three bedrooms) and 65,359 square feet of retail space. Phase I (East Building) comprises 582,766 square feet of residential use and Phase II (West Building) comprises 537,536 square feet of residential use. Commercial retail space is approved for 65,359 square feet and will be developed as Phase III. Total development accounts for 1,185,661 square feet. Permits were issued in 2013 and Phase I (East Building) is nearing completion.

6. **Design Features:** The subject property is divided among three parts, two of which encompass the multifamily component with the remaining portion proposed as the retail component of the site. As originally approved, the application proposes the following subdivision:

Parcel D	5.84 acres (multifamily)	Phase II	West Building
Parcel E	7.37 acres (multifamily)	Phase I	East Building
Parcel F	6.16 acres (retail)	Phase III	Six Buildings

The multifamily units are located in two four- to six-story buildings, which are designed around two six- to seven-level parking garages located centrally to each of the buildings.

The third parcel for development proposes six retail buildings designed around a central parking compound on the east side of the development. The retail development is oriented toward the street, which will be enhanced with wide sidewalks with street tree plantings. At the corner of Telfair Boulevard and Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Road is a proposed 57-foot-tall clock tower and a plaza, which will provide a landmark structure at that intersection. No revisions to the plans are proposed at this time to Phase III under the subject revision to DSP-07074-01.

Proposed Revisions

The proposed revisions to the application include revisions to the previously approved Planning Board Conditions 2, 4, 5, 13(c), 13(e), 15 and 16, as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-102. Minor revisions to the site plan encompass slightly different architectural design and building materials, revised recreational amenities and common courtyard spaces, changes to the bedroom counts, and shifting one unit from Phase II to Phase I of the project. The requested amendments do not include changes in the proposed building footprint, building height, setbacks, and overall site design. The amendments to the conditions are provided below in Finding 7.

The following general categories of changes are proposed on the plans for both Phases I and II of the development, as described in the applicant's statement of justification:

PHASE I — EAST BUILDING

Item 1.1 – Brick and Cementitious Siding at Courtyards

The design per approved DSP-07074: Building elevations at the courtyards show mostly fiber cement panels with fiber cement trims. Brick is provided at certain locations on the first level.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“The Applicant proposes the Fiber cement panels and fiber cement trims are replaced with 3” and 6-1/2” architectural lap siding.

“There is a precedent for the use of this material based on its use on other similar projects in the area. For this project, the material used is a heavier gauge, architectural lap siding in order to prevent deformation and waviness, while maintaining straight edges. The architect has used this material recently on other projects in Arlington, Virginia and Baltimore, Maryland and found the results essentially indistinguishable from fiber cement siding.

“Regarding maintenance, fiber cement siding requires repainting approximately every 4 years. For a four story project, this would require the use of a lift system or scaffolding, both of which may be difficult to stage/accommodate in an enclosed courtyards with restricted entrances. By comparison, the requirements for maintaining architectural lap siding are minimal, requiring washing with water and a mild cleaner to restore to a clean appearance.

“The architect has evaluated the use of architectural lap siding in lieu of fiber cement. In their opinion, the use of architectural lap is the more practical option and superior than fiber cement siding. While the cost to furnish and install is not significantly less than fiber cement siding, the long term operating and maintenance cost are strongly in favor on architectural lap siding without any change to the overall aesthetics of the project.”

It should be noted that the building is constructed at this point and the siding substitution is in place. The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.2 – Loft Units at the Courtyards

The design per approved DSP-07074: Building elevations at the courtyards show some loft units with a taller window and a hip dormer above.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Loft units at the Courtyard are being eliminated, therefore, also eliminating the taller window and hip dormer.

“This change is proposed for the courtyards only and is driven by a recent reevaluation by the Applicant/Owner to better understand market demands. Since there is less demand for larger units, which drive rent rates higher, the decision to reduce the total number of loft units helps with reducing the average size of units provided throughout the project.

“Architecturally, there is no impact to the appearance of the main facades since the change is localized to the courtyards. The architect has worked to maintain a balance in the building’s architecture by maintaining variety in the roof form and articulating the facades. This change still provided for an equally appealing project.

“Loft units are maintained along the exterior facades to keep the original design concept intact.”

It should be noted that the building is constructed at this point and the interior floor plans are in place, eliminating the lofts and adjusting the exterior accordingly. The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.3 – Number of Units

The design per approved DSP-07074: Phase I was intended to have 416 units.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Proposed change is to have 417 units in Phase I. Phase II will be reduced by one (1) unit to show 384 units.

“There were no issues found to have 417 units in the Project. Between Phase I and Phase II, total number of units remains the same with 801 units.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.4 – Pavement (General)

The design per approved DSP-07074: Concrete pavers shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Certain areas of pavers were changed to concrete (both colored and plain), and a few colors/patterns were changed in areas that remained pavers.

“The additional concrete pavement provides a greater variety of surfaces and blends with the concrete pavement that was previously shown. Colors and patterns were rethought in greater detail and changed accordingly. In the opinion of the project architects, the multifamily market as related to hardscape is moving in a more contemporary direction. Concrete (be it colored or plain) is a more fitting surface than the previously specified concrete pavers, that provides the added benefit of being a more stable and safer walking surface over traditional pavers.”

The courtyards are already built and appear attractive as designed. The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.5 – Grand Entry

The design per approved DSP-07074: Ten benches were shown in the grand entry area.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Eliminated two (2) benches and added a concrete landing.

“To reduce the appearance of a cluttered look created by the grouping of the original ten (10) benches, two (2) of said benches were relocated to facilitate a

more pleasing visual environment to the seating area. The concrete landing creates a condition that allows users to exit the building without traversing landscape. The project architects believe this provides for better landscaping and functionality in the area.”

These revisions facilitate the movement through the space and the Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.6 – Furnishings

The design per approved DSP-07074: No furnishings were shown in the courtyards.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Furnishings and specifications were added.

“For improved design considerations, the addition furnishings create a more comfortable environment for residents. This provides for better layout and functionality as residents look for more outdoor areas, thus meeting what the current market trend dictates.”

The added furnishings consist primarily of tables and chairs. The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.7 – Pool Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: A fountain, pavilion, and raised planter were shown. A complicated pool shape was shown at 2,300 square feet.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with a greater amount of open space. One BBQ grill was added and one was removed. The pool shape was simplified and made 1,777 square feet. A courtyard entry was reconfigured.

“In the opinion of the project architects, multifamily swimming pools are increasingly being desired to be used as social gathering areas, and are becoming smaller. The revised square footage is a better option as it also created additional deck area conducive to socializing. In tight, mid-density style courtyards, shade is already plentiful and pavilions are not considered a marketable amenity. Instead, as is typical of larger pool facilities, folding umbrellas that are easily adjustable and movable to suit the needs of residents/bathers using the pool facility are provided.

“Likewise with fountains, in the opinion of the project design team, as well as from the experience of other projects in this region, fountains are long-term maintenance problems, and with most of them ultimately ending up being changed to planters once they cease to function as designed. The immediate localized climate restricts the number of months that fountains are seasonably operable.”

The facilities above have been built. The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.8 – Blossom Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: A greenhouse, shade structure, fountain, and piers/pots were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with a greater amount of open space. The greenhouse was changed to an herb garden.

“The changes created a simpler, dignified look and provided greater amounts of open space for an apartment community with a large number of residents. Herb gardens are more in vogue and popular with today’s residents than greenhouses (greenhouses were a ‘fad’ item that are no longer marketable as being desired by residents). Shade structures and fountains were removed for reasons listed in ‘Pool Courtyard’ discussion above.”

The substitution of the herb garden for the greenhouse, as well as the substitution of umbrella in place of a permanent shade structure, is reasonable and the Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.9 – Water Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: A fire pit and large “hanging pot” feature were shown. Three barbeque grills were also shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with a greater amount of open space, and a BBQ grill was added.

“The ‘hanging pot’ feature was a shade/fountain structure removed for reasons listed in ‘Pool Courtyard’ discussion above in Item 1.7. BBQ’s grills are currently one of the most popular hardscape features, explaining why one was added.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 1.10 – Building East Entry Plaza

The design per approved DSP-07074: A guardrail was not shown on the leasing entry. Two fountains were shown. No trellis details were provided for the east trellis.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“A guardrail was added, two fountains removed, and trellis details added.

“After a reassessment of the plaza design, it was determined that a guardrail creates a safer condition for pedestrians; that is design to meet all County and State code requirements. Trellis details were added showing information that will be beneficial to the contractor during construction phase. The fountains were removed for reasons listed in the ‘Pool Courtyard’ discussion in Item 1.7 above, and created additional room for more impressive landscaping. In opinion of the project design team, attractive landscaping is a more marketable feature than fountains as it continues to grow and mature over time, increasing the marketability over time.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to remove the fountains because they are only functional for a portion of the year and sit barren for many months and, as such, are rather unattractive features.

Item 1.11 – Masonry Walls

The design per approved DSP-07074: Courtyard planter and seat walls were detailed with concrete masonry unit construction.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Courtyard planter and seat walls were changed to architectural block.

“After revisiting this proposed site feature in a more subjective manner, the project design team determined that architectural block to be a more suitable material that would architecturally blend more pleasantly with the courtyard building elevations. The walls create a more attractive (and contemporary) condition while providing needed seating area.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans and notes that these features have been constructed.

Item 1.12 – Landscaping

The design per approved DSP-07074: A number of trees have been shown; no shrubs or groundcover were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“A smaller number of trees were provided and shrubs and groundcover added.

“The original DSP plans only included trees, and did not include shrubs or groundcover, which was not helpful from an aesthetic and marketability standpoint. In reevaluating the plan, the project design team has prepared a plan with landscaping that creates a visual a ‘layering effect’ in the plantings, as well as proposing plant stock with variations in color. The original plans were designed with trees that were spaced far too closely together, which would have resulted in maintenance problems and a shorter life span.

“Adherence to the County 2010 Landscape Manual (based on 57,704 square feet of green space) requires a total of 58 shade trees (with allowance to substitute ornamental/evergreen trees at a 2:1 rate up to 25%); the revised plan provides 52 shade trees and 70 ornamental/evergreen ($70 \times .25 \times .5 = 7.25$) for a total of 59.25 trees.

“Overall, the design team believes that the mix of trees, shrubs, and groundcover provide for better aesthetics.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans; however, the plans must be revised to demonstrate conformance to the *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* (1990 Landscape Manual) in accordance with the requirements of the original approval.

Item 1.13 – Stairs

The design per approved DSP-07074: A specific number of risers were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Number of risers altered. Stair layouts were altered to reflect updated site grading and accessibility, ensuring code-compliant, accessible building entries.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

PHASE II – WEST BUILDING

Item 2.1 – Brick and Cementitious Siding at Courtyards

The design per approved DSP-07074: Building elevations at the courtyards show mostly fiber cement panels with fiber cement trims. Brick is provided at certain locations on the first level.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“The Applicant proposes the Fiber cement panels and fiber cement trims are replaced with 3” and 6-1/2” architectural lap siding.

“There is a precedent for the use of this material based on its use on other similar projects in the area. For this project, the material used is a heavier gauge, architectural lap siding in order to prevent deformation and waviness, while maintaining straight edges. The architect has used this material recently on other projects in Arlington, Virginia and Baltimore, Maryland and found the results essentially indistinguishable from fiber cement siding.

“Regarding maintenance, fiber cement siding requires repainting approximately every 4 years. For a four story project, this would require the use of a lift system or scaffolding, both of which may be difficult to stage/accommodate in an enclosed courtyard. By comparison, the requirements for maintaining architectural lap siding are minimal, requiring washing with water and a mild cleaner to restore to a clean appearance.

“The architect has evaluated the use of architectural lap siding in lieu of fiber cement. In their opinion, the use of architectural lap a more practical option. While the cost to furnish and install is not significantly less than fiber cement siding, the long term and operating cost of maintenance are strongly in favor on architectural lap siding without any change to the overall aesthetics of the project.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.2 – Loft Units at the Courtyards

The design per approved DSP-07074: Building elevations at the courtyards show some loft units with a taller window and a hip dormer above.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Loft units at the Courtyard are being eliminated, therefore, also eliminating the taller window and hip dormer.

“This change is proposed for the courtyards only and is driven by a recent reevaluation by the Applicant to better understand market demands. Since there is less demand for larger units, which drive rent rates higher, the decision to reduce

the total number of loft units helps with reducing the average size of units provided across the project.

“Architecturally, there is no impact to the appearance of the main facades since the change is localized to the courtyards. The architect has worked to maintain a balance in the architecture by maintaining variety in the roof form and articulating the facades. This change still provided for an equally appealing project.

“Loft units are maintained along the exterior building facades to keep the original design concept intact.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.3 – Sidewalk / Ramp Reconfiguration

The design per approved DSP-07074: Sidewalks/stairs reconfigured.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Sidewalks were relocated and an ADA ramp added.

“Changes were made to accurately reflect site/building access needs once construction drawings (i.e., CD’s) for Phase II were completed. Problems with pedestrian circulation around the site would be a marketing problem for the project, and the ramp addition is to provide ADA compliance and resident safety.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.4 – Sidewalk/Stair Reconfiguration

The design per approved DSP-07074: Sidewalks/stairs reconfigured.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Sidewalks and stairs were deleted.

“Changes were made to accurately reflect site/building access needs once construction drawings (i.e., CD’s) for Phase II were completed. Building access was no longer needed at this location.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.5 – Small Plaza Changed to Dog Park

The design per approved DSP-07074: Fireplace and small area of pavers shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Area redesigned to incorporate fenced-in dog park. Sidewalks were reconfigured and ADA ramp added.

“Dog parks have become a standard amenity for this type of development therefore the dog park was added to address market demand. In the experience of the project architect over the last several years, every project they designed without a dog park had to be retrofitted with a park. The ramp addition is to provide ADA compliance.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.6 – Zen Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: Stream feature with bridges, paths, and wood trellises shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with a greater amount of open space, and two (2) BBQ grills were added.

“The stream feature and meandering path were removed to provide additional hardscape area conducive to socializing. The project design team has determined that the stream is long-term maintenance problems, and with most of them ultimately ending up being changed to planters once they cease to function as designed. The immediate localized climate restricts the number of months that fountains are seasonably operable. Removing the fountains created additional room for impressive landscaping. Attractive landscaping is a more marketable feature than fountains as it continues to grow and mature over time, increasing the marketability over time.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.7 – Fireplace Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: Fireplace, wood trellises, and a water feature were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with two bocce ball courts.

“Currently, bocce ball courts are a major market trend well received by residents of all ages, while affording the project an increase in active recreation area.

“Fountains are long-term maintenance problems, and with most of them ultimately ending up being changed to planters once they cease to function as designed. The immediate localized climate restricts the number of months that fountains are seasonably operable. In addition, fireplaces are a potential hazard and are not looked upon favorably by fire code officials.

“Therefore in the opinion of the project design team, these changes in the design will better serve market demands, address potential maintenance issues, and provide a safer outdoor amenity.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.8 – Resort Pool Courtyard

The design per approved DSP-07074: Fireplace, wood trellises, and masonry piers were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Specified elements were replaced with a greater amount of open space.

“Removing these elements provides more open space for lounge chairs and soft seating in keeping with market trends. Also, fire features are a potential hazard and are not looked upon favorably by fire code officials.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.9 – Competition and Tai Chi Node

The design per approved DSP-07074: Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps and stairs were not included.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“Upon development and refinement of the design, ADA compliant ramps and stairs added to address Code requirements for accessibility.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

Item 2.10 – Landscaping

The design per approved DSP-07074: A number of trees shown; no shrubs or groundcover were shown.

The applicant is proposing the following:

“The revised plan proposes the same number of trees, supplemented by the addition of shrubs and groundcover.

“The original DSP plans only included trees, and did not include shrubs or groundcover, which was not helpful from a marketability standpoint. In reevaluating the plan, the project design team has prepared a plan with landscaping that creates a visual a ‘layering effect’ in the plantings, as well as proposing plant stock with variations in color. Overall, the architects believe that the mix of trees, shrubs, and groundcover provide for better project aesthetics.”

The Planning Board approves the proposed revisions to the plans.

7. **Requested Amendments:** The following are the requested amendments to the previously approved conditions as stated in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-102:

2. **It is expected that construction will proceed one parcel at a time. Therefore, the parcels that are not under construction will be used for construction staging. Once the construction staging area is no longer needed, that parcel will either be constructed pursuant to the Detailed Site Plan, or prior to the release of any bonds from the Department of Environmental Resources, the interim park shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board or its designee, and it shall be constructed.**

The applicant provided the following request for the amendment of the condition:

~~“It is expected that construction may will precede one parcel with multiple parcels at a time. Therefore, the parcels that are not under construction will be used for construction staging. Once the construction staging area is no longer needed, the parcel will either be constructed pursuant to the Detailed Site Plan, or prior to the release of any bonds from the Department of Environmental resources, the interim park shall be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board or its designee, and it shall be constructed.~~

“The Applicant believes that in order to be able to respond to the fluctuations in the market, it is necessary to have the flexibility to permit the development of the second phase of the residential development in response to market conditions. The Applicant also requests the flexibility for the development of the retail Parcel F, in response market conditions and commensurate with the DHS/CIS submittal obligations.”

The applicant is asking for flexibility in the build-out of the project that was not expected at the time of the original review of the project. Since the market indications may allow for portions of the commercial development to proceed in the near future, the applicant would like to eliminate the requirement for the construction of an interim park. The Planning Board is in support of the applicant's proposal, but sees no need for the conditions to exist as proposed, as it is not a requirement in which the plans should be adjusted. Therefore, the Planning Board deletes the entirety of Condition 2.

4. The clocktower and surrounding sunken amphitheatre feature associated with Parcel F will be completed no later than completion of the first phase of residential development on either Parcel D or Parcel E.

The applicant provided the following request for the amendment of the condition:

“The clocktower and surrounding sunken amphitheater feature associated with Parcel F will be completed ~~no later than completion of the first phase of residential development on either Parcel D or Parcel E~~ commensurate with the construction of the Retail Parcel.

“This Amendment requests request amendment to the timing for the installation of ‘Clock Tower and ‘Amphitheater’ to be commensurate with the construction of the Retail Parcel instead of the Residential Parcels. In anticipation that the DHS / CIS Request for Proposal (‘RFP’) application obligations may require amendment of the DSP to facilitate the successful DHS / CIS selection decision, the Applicant request this condition amendment to allow greater flexibility in their ability to rapidly respond to potential change request.”

The applicant is asking for flexibility in the build out of the public plaza that was proposed at the time of the original approval of the plans. The applicant is not asking to remove the public plaza, but simply to allow the construction of the feature when the development of the retail construction takes place. In review of the plans, the Planning Board believes that the timing mechanism should be changed to a specific time frame, specifically upon the completion and prior to use and occupancy permits for Buildings 200 and 300, which surround the proposed public space. Therefore, the Planning Board approves of the modification of Condition 4 as follows:

Prior to use and occupancy permits for Building 200 and/or Building 300, [F]the clocktower and surrounding sunken amphitheatre feature associated with Parcel F will be completed [no later than completion of the first phase of residential development on either Parcel D or Parcel E].

5. That portion of the linear park lying on each parcel will be completed at the same time as the development on that parcel.

However, as part of the interim parks, there will be pedestrian connections linking both sides of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way.

The applicant requests full deletion of Condition 5.

“The Applicant requests deletion of reference to development of undeveloped parcels into interim parks. As discussed in in 1 above, the Applicant needs the flexibility to adjust rapidly to DHS / CIS application obligations, as well as responding to changes in rental market conditions he request modification of this finding to allow undeveloped parcels to be graded, stabilized and maintained as opposed to going to the expense of creating interim parks that may be in place for a few years, at most. Furthermore, in light of the significant pedestrian sidewalk improvements recently completed along Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way, coupled with the inappropriateness of encouraging pedestrian to use walkways through unlighted and unmonitored parcels, the Applicant request the deletion of the referenced pedestrian connections.”

The applicant is asking to be relieved from the construction of any pathways in the location of the linear park areas which would temporarily connect to the retail parcel and Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way. At the time of the review of the original project, it was not known how the timing of the project would evolve and the thought was that the east-west connection linking both sides of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way should be connected with interim asphalt pathways. However, the applicant is asserting that these pathways should not be required at this time, as the evolution of the project is such that it has been expedited. The applicant is asking for the deletion of the entire condition. The Planning Board believes that the first sentence of the condition should remain as follows:

That portion of the linear park lying on each parcel will be completed at the same time as the development on that parcel. ~~[However, as part of the interim parks, there will be pedestrian connections linking both sides of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way.]~~

13. The plans shall be revised prior to signature approval to include the following:

- c. If approved by the DPW&T, street trees shall be shown on the plans to be located approximately 35 feet on center in the right-of-way of Capital Gateway Drive /Auth Way, and shall have shade trees a minimum of 2½–3 inch caliper in size. A staggered row of the same species shall be planted at the same interval on the other side of the sidewalk, unless buildings are located at or near the street line. Any existing dead or dying trees within the right-of-way adjacent to the property shall be replaced. Specific trees along the Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way may be omitted if in conflict with a site wall, plaza or other feature.**

- e. **If allowed by DPW&T, shade trees shall be provided in the median of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way directly across from the subject site and be of size and species to create a residential, pedestrian-friendly boulevard.**

The applicant provided the following request for the amendment of conditions:

“If approved by the DPW&T, street trees shall be shown on the plans to be located approximately 35 feet on center in the right-of-way of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way, and shall have shade trees a minimum of 2 ½ -3 inch caliper in size. A staggered row of the same species shall be planted at the same interval on the other side of the sidewalk, unless buildings are located at or near the street line. Any existing dead or dying trees within the right-of-way adjacent to the property shall be replaced. Specific trees along the Capital Gateway Drive/Auth way may be omitted if in conflict with a site wall, plaza or other feature. The timing for the planting of street trees and other landscaping shall be commensurate with the timing for the completion of property improvements and before final inspections and issuance of Certificates of Occupancy are made for the immediate adjacent phase/parcel.

“If allowed by DPW&T, shade trees shall be provided in the median of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way directly across from the subject site and be of size and species to create a residential, pedestrian-friendly boulevard. The timing for the planting of street trees and other landscaping shall be commensurate with the timing for the completion of property improvements and before final inspections and issuance of Certificates of Occupancy are made for the immediate adjacent phase/parcel.

“Response: Typically during the development of land parcels, the installation of final landscaping stock such as street trees is one of the final items, i.e., property improvements to be completed before final inspections and issuance of Certificates of Occupancy are made. Otherwise, planting the street trees and other landscaping prematurely greatly increases the risk of said plant materials being damaged or destroyed.”

The applicant is asking that the conditions be revised to place a timing mechanism into each of the conditions as a signal to the Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) as to when the implementation of the requirement should be completed. The Planning Board has no objection to the added language and agrees with the applicant that the street trees should be completed at the end of the project. The revised conditions as proposed are included in the approval of this report.

- 15. **If WMATA approves the applicant’s sidewalk plan across WMATA’s parking lot, the applicant will agree to fully fund and construct the walkway.**

The applicant requests full deletion of Condition 15 with the following justification:

“After making multiple unsuccessful attempts at obtaining a written response our requests to construct the pedestrian connections through the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) property, (see attached two letters from Ms. Emily Vaia of Linowes & Blocher where attempts were made by the applicant as required by condition #14), the Applicant request deletion of Condition 15. The fact that WMATA has not responded should be sufficient grounds to request deletion of condition #15. Additionally the Applicant believes that likelihood of WMATA someday may wish to redevelop the Branch Avenue Metro through a joint venture as they have been with many other of their stations throughout the metro area supplement the reasons behind deleting condition #15.”

The applicant is asking to be relieved from the requirement to access WMATA property directly from the subject site, through the parking lot to the Metro station. The above Condition 15 cannot be read without understanding the preceding Condition 14, of which Condition 15 is a continuance of those requirements.

- 14. Prior to the issuance of any building permit within the subject property, the applicant shall provide written evidence to Staff of its submission to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) seeking approval of a plan to provide two direct, ground-level, safe and attractive pedestrian walkways that extend from the terminus of the proposed north-south walkways through the WMATA property directly to the northern pedestrian entrance of the Branch Avenue Metro Station. Each of the walkways will be on axis with Residential and Retail Boulevards.**
- 15. If WMATA approves the applicant’s sidewalk plan across WMATA’s parking lot, the applicant will agree to fully fund and construct the walkway.**

At the time of the review of the building permit for Phase I, Condition 14 was determined to have been fulfilled and the permit was released. Condition 14 required the applicant to seek permission from WMATA and Condition 15 required the applicant to fund and construct the walkway, only if WMATA granted permission. The applicant is asking for deletion of Condition 15 because two letters have been written and claims that WMATA has not responded to the request. Staff and the applicant met with WMATA staff during a field visit and the applicant was asked by WMATA staff to prepare plans for submission that would then go through a process by which the connections would be evaluated. It is unclear if this plan application process was submitted to the agency by the applicant. The Planning Board finds that the direct access suggested in Condition 14 may no longer be appropriate considering that the redevelopment of the Branch Avenue Metro Station will ultimately come to fruition, and any interim access may no longer be appropriate.

Therefore, the Planning Board approves the deletion of Condition 15.

- 16. The applicant shall design and agree to construct the left-turn lane along Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way to allow left-hand turns into Parcel F, as shown on the detailed site plan, subject to approval by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation.**

At the Planning Board hearing, the applicant requested a revision to the original Condition 16 to modify the condition as follows:

16. The applicant shall design and agree to construct the left-turn lane along Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way to allow left-hand turns into Parcel F, as shown on the detailed site plan, subject to approval by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation. The timing of the construction or installation of the left-turn lane into Parcel F shall be commensurate with the construction of the retail improvements on Parcel F.

The Planning Board had no objection to the proposed language and agrees with the applicant that the timing of the improvements within the public right-of-way should be flexible and installed commensurate with the construction associated with Parcel F.

8. Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:

- a. The proposed mixed-use development is a permitted use in the M-X-T Zone. The revised DSP-07074-01 is found to comply with the following findings listed in Section 27-546(d), Site Plans, of the Zoning Ordinance:

- (1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this division;**

The proposed revisions to the plan and the conditions will not impact the previous findings of conformance to the purposes and other provisions of the division in that the revisions are relatively minor and only for a constructed building. The revisions to the plans will have no impact on the orderly development of the land surrounding the Branch Avenue Metro Station. The project will provide for an expanding source of employment and living opportunities, and will promote the use of transit. The project will contribute to providing a 24-hour environment and the uses will blend together harmoniously, particularly when the retail components come on-line. The architecture as proposed and revised will continue to provide for a distinctively urban visual character, and the mix of uses promote the optimum of land planning with efficiency and economies of scale. The proposed revisions are recommended for approval in accordance with the M-X-T Zone requirements for flexibility in responding to the market without impacting the findings of

compatibility with the surrounding development.

- (3) The proposed development has an outward orientation, which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The proposed revisions have no impact on the development being integrated visually with the surrounding architectural design of the buildings directly across Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way and the buildings across Telfair Boulevard.

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

The proposed revisions are recommended for approval in accordance with the M-X-T Zone requirements for flexibility in responding to the market without impacting the findings of compatibility with the surrounding development.

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

The proposed revisions do not change the mix of uses or the general exterior architectural design of the buildings which are intended to blend the various uses visually and functionally.

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

The applicant's proposed phasing plan is proposed to be changed from the following described below:

Phase I	416 units-East Building.
Phase II	385 units-West Building. and Clock Tower/Amphitheater
Phase III	65,359 retail square footage

To the below:

Phase I	417 units-East Building.
Phase II	384 units-West Building.
Phase III	65,359 retail square footage and Clock Tower/Amphitheater

The applicant's proposal to phase in the clock tower/amphitheater to the retail component will allow for the residential component being completed in its entirety without any progress on the clock tower/amphitheater. This is acceptable because the public space

consisting of hardscape will look incomplete without the retail structures developed around it.

- (7) **The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;**

A comprehensive vehicular and pedestrian system has been provided around the subject site to encourage pedestrian activity.

- (8) **On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

The revised plan continues to provide for the above requirements.

- b. Section 27-548(a) allows the optional method of development in the M-X-T Zone up to 1.40 floor area ratio (FAR) for the subject site, as stated below:

- a. **Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):**

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

Section 27-548(a) limits the development within the M-X-T Zone to a maximum FAR of 0.40, unless an applicant proposes the use of a specified optional method of development, which would increase it to a maximum of 8.00. A residential component within the developed awards 1.0 additional FAR. Section 27-548(e) also indicates that the FAR shall be applied to the property that is the subject of the CSP. The following chart lists all development within the Town Center at Camp Springs development for calculating FAR:

DSP	Development Quantity	Status
DSP-02023	475,790 sq. ft.	Built
DSP-02024	1,173,925 sq. ft.	Built
DSP-05051	873,596 sq. ft.	Built
DSP-07074-01	1,185,661 sq. ft.	This plan
Total	3,708,972 sq. ft.	

The FAR, including all approved and pending development on the 100.27-acre Town Center at Camp Springs Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015, is reflected in the chart above, and totals 0.85. The proposed revisions to the plans do not impact the FAR, as there is no increase in the gross floor area of the project.

9. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015:** The proposed revisions to the plans impact the following conditions of approval of CSP-01015:

3. **Future detailed site plans shall, at a minimum, provide the level of pedestrian connections that are shown conceptually on the current plans. Additionally, future plans shall include the following considerations:**

- d. **The concept of a central pedestrian link through the semicircle to the station shall be retained on all future plans.**

The applicant is proposing several internal walkways, a linear park, and sidewalks along both sides of most roads. Originally, in the review of the DSP-07074, staff recommended revisions to the plan to effectively accommodate pedestrian movement through the site and to the adjacent Metro station. The following finding was made by the Planning Board in their review of the application:

CSP-01015 Condition 3d (PGCPB No. 01-120) required a central pedestrian link through the semicircle to the Metro Station. This connection is being revised through the subject site to include two sidewalk corridors along Retail and Residential Boulevards. Staff supports this revision with the above modifications. *In keeping with the intent of this recommendation for a direct pedestrian connection to Metro, staff also recommends that design drawings be submitted prior to certificate approval, demonstrating how the direct pedestrian connection through the semicircle of Auth Way will be made from the subject site to the adjacent Metro property. This connection may necessitate either ramps or stairs due to the steep topography. Although this connection will not be constructed until the redevelopment of the Metro site, the design plans should demonstrate the future viability of this connection. (emphasis added)*

It is important to note that the last portion of the finding above considers the connection shown on the CSP from the site to the Metro station would be challenging based on the existing topography. The access to the Metro stations is highly regulated and a mid-parcel connection is not likely to be approved until such time as the Metro station site is redeveloped.

14. **The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities for each in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall consider the feasibility of organizing the recreational facilities into one or more central recreational areas.**

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

The applicant has provided a full package of revised recreational facilities as proposed.

PHASE I—East Building

Indoor Recreational Facilities

- A private 7,000-square-foot club house on two floors containing, at a minimum, a 2,000-square-foot fitness room with cardiovascular and weight equipment, a private studio for yoga or other class situations, and a kitchenette. A 500-square-foot pool facility (bathrooms and changing areas) is located off the lobby area and provides for residents using the outdoor pools.

Mondrian-Style Pool Courtyard

- Swimming pool with 1,777 square feet of water area and a lap lane (irregularly shaped, fits within a 30-foot by 80-foot footprint)
- Three grills
- Seating area with tables and chairs

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Telfair Boulevard (private road) – between Residential Boulevard and Retail Boulevard

- Three small sitting areas (two of the areas are 300 square feet with two benches; the other area is 300 square feet with three benches).
- A water fountain area (six feet wide)
- Eight six-foot-long benches

Blossom Courtyard

- Herb garden
- Walled planter
- Two trellis swings

Water Courtyard

- Group picnic area with two barbecue grills and two tables
- Seating area with tables and chairs
- Four barbecue grills

Portion of the Linear Park

- Eight-foot-wide trail (540 linear feet)
- Cubed/climbing node (consisting of approximately 15 blocks, each two feet by two feet with varying heights)
- 2,400-square-foot lot with sitting area and two picnic tables (Play Sense Design No. 301N Ages 5–12 or similar); 300-square-foot area with one bench
- Six, six-foot-long benches

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Residential Boulevard (private road) – east side

- Large sitting area (2,000 square feet with four benches and two grills)
- Walled planters

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Retail Boulevard (private road) – west side

- Large sitting area (600 square feet with eight benches)
- Trellised walkway (two 45-foot-long trellises)
- Small sitting area (200 square feet with two benches)
- 12 benches

PHASE II –West Building

Indoor Recreational Facilities

- A private 6,000-square-foot club house on two floors containing, at a minimum, a 2,000-square-foot fitness room with cardiovascular and weight equipment, private studio for yoga or other class situations and a kitchenette, and 500 square feet of pool facilities (bathrooms and changing areas).

Resort-Style Pool Courtyard

- Swimming pool with 2,482 square feet of water area (irregularly-shaped, fits within a 25-foot by 120-foot footprint)
- 3,100-square-foot pool deck
- Group picnic area with two barbecue grills and three picnic benches and other outdoor seating
- Two grills
- Large sitting area with two couches and ten lounge chairs
- Two additional picnic tables

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Telfair Boulevard (private road) – west of Residential Boulevard

- Large sitting area (4,000 square feet with two benches)

Zen Courtyard

- Paved sitting areas with tables and chairs

Fireplace Courtyard

- Large sitting area (615 square feet with six benches, one couch, and four freestanding chairs)
- Human-sized checker/chessboard (20 feet by 20 feet)
- Four additional six-foot-long benches
- Six additional picnic tables

Portion of the Linear Park

- Eight-foot-wide trail (385 feet long)
- Large sitting area (3,500 square feet with four benches and five table/chair sets)
- Competition node/large sitting area (625 square feet with four checker/chessboard tables with chairs)

- Tai Chi node (24 feet by 24 feet, with raised meditation platform)
- Six additional six-foot-long benches
- One picnic table

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Auth Way (private road) – west side of Residential Boulevard

- Six-foot-long benches

Outdoor Recreational Facilities along Residential Boulevard (private road) – west side

- Large sitting area (940 square feet with six benches)
- Six, six-foot-long benches

Clock Tower (physically shown in Phase III on plans), to be developed with retail portion of project.

- 9-foot by 9-foot by 57-foot clock tower with open base to allow for pedestrian travel

Amphitheater (physically shown in Phase III on plans), to be developed with retail portion of project.

- 30-foot by 6-foot performance area
- Sunken seating area for 90 viewers
- The open base of the clock tower serves as a backstage area
- Central lawn (17 feet by 36 feet)
- Ten additional six-foot-long benches

PHASE III – Amenities

Court between Retail Buildings 100 and 200

- Large sitting area (3,900 square feet with four benches)
- Medium water fountain area (round, 16-foot diameter)

Court between Retail Buildings 500 and 600

- Large sitting area (1,300 square feet with four benches)
- Medium water fountain area (round, 18-foot diameter)
- 26 additional six-foot-long benches are distributed around Phase III

Additional Features not Listed Above

- Three bicycle racks will be provided in each of the three phases

The proposed revisions to the recreational facilities are reflected in the list above.

- 16. Submission of three original, executed Recreational Facilities Agreements (RFA) or similar alternative to DRD for their approval, three weeks prior to a submission of a grading permit. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.**

An RFA has been recorded in Liber 35287 at Folio 302 in the Prince George's County Land Records.

- 17. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit or other suitable financial guarantee in an amount to be determined by DRD, within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.**

This condition has been fulfilled based on the previously approved list of recreational facilities. The bond was posted for \$1,272,260 on November 18, 2013 for Phase I only.

- 10. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-90037:** The original finding of conformance with the preliminary plan is still in effect, and the revisions to the plans as proposed do not impact the conditions of approval.
- 11. Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The proposed revisions to the plans should not impact the original finding of conformance to the Landscape Manual, but the plans must demonstrate that the revisions are still in conformance with the original requirements, prior to certificate of approval.
- 12. Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** The proposed revisions to the plan do not impact the applicability of the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance as was originally found in the approval of the plans.
- 13. Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** Given the nature of this requested revision, the summarized comments are as follows:
- a. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board has reviewed the limited minor amendment to Detail Site Plan DSP-07074-01 application referenced above. The subject property contains 19.37 acres located between and on the east and west sides of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way, directly north of the Branch Avenue Metro Station, known as the Town Center at Camp Springs. The subject property is part of the approved 100± acres comprising the Town Center at Camp Springs Conceptual Site Plan CSP-01015.

Background

The history of this development began with an approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-90037) for the Capital Gateway Office Park in 1990. In October 2000, the District Council rezoned the property from the I-1 and R-R Zones to the M-X-T Zone. The Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-01015) was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on June 28, 2001. On June 19, 2008, the Planning Board approved DSP-07074 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-102) with 18 conditions.

The subject application is seeking amendments to five of the 18 approved conditions. In reviewing the amendments being sought by the applicant, staff has concluded that, with the exception of Conditions 5 and 15, none of the proposed amendments will have any traffic-related ramifications to the current DSP approval. Regarding Condition 5, however, the applicant proposes the following:

“Amendment to Approval Condition #5:

“Condition #5 in DSP-07074 requires that: ~~That portion of the linear park lying on each parcel will be completed at the same time as the development on that parcel. However, as part of the interim parks, there will be pedestrian connections linking both sides of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way.~~

“Response: The Applicant request deletion of reference to development of undeveloped parcels into interim parks. As discussed in in 1 above, the Applicant needs the flexibility to adjust rapidly to DHS / CIS application obligations, as well as responding to changes in rental market conditions he request modification of this finding to allow undeveloped parcels to be graded, stabilized and maintained as opposed to going to the expense of creating interim parks that may be in place for a few years, at most. Furthermore, in light of the significant pedestrian sidewalk improvements recently completed along Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way, coupled with the inappropriateness of encouraging pedestrian to use walkways through unlighted and unmonitored parcels, the Applicant request the deletion of the referenced pedestrian connections.

Amendment to Approval Condition # 15:

“Condition #15 in DSP-07074 requires that: ~~If WMATA approves the applicant’s sidewalk plan across WMATA’s parking lot, the applicant will agree to fully fund and construct the walkway.~~

“Response: After making multiple unsuccessful attempts at obtaining a written response our requests to construct the pedestrian connections through the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) property, (see attached two letters from Ms. Emily Vaias of Linowes & Blocher where attempts were made by the applicant as required by condition #14), the Applicant request deletion of Condition 15. The fact that WMATA has not responded should be sufficient grounds to request deletion of condition #15. Additionally the Applicant

believes that likelihood of WMATA someday may wish to redevelop the Branch Avenue Metro through a joint venture as they have been with many other of their stations throughout the metro area supplement the reasons behind deleting condition #15.”

Condition 5 relates to temporary east/west connections to Auth Way/Capital Gateway Drive. The request to eliminate the temporary connections will not impact the final design connections and, therefore, the Planning Board agrees with the proposal per the applicant’s discussion.

The most salient issue regarding Condition 15 is the pedestrian connectivity between the proposed development and the adjacent WMATA Branch Avenue Metro Station. Throughout the various stages of the subject property’s development and the relevant transportation tests for adequacy, the applicant was allowed to utilize a certain amount of trip credits (trip reduction), given the site’s proximity and pedestrian friendliness to the Branch Avenue station. However, the Planning Department has already determined that Condition 14 had been fulfilled at the time of issuance of the building permit for Phase I and that the applicant had submitted sufficient evidence seeking approval of north/south connections to WMATA. The applicant asserts that they have been unsuccessful in obtaining WMATA’s approval. This change to the pedestrian circulation will have no impact to the previous trip reduction agreements, as it is unlikely that future residents will drive their vehicles to pay for parking in the Metro lot. The walking distance is approximately one-half mile.

14. With the proposed conditions, the subject revised Detailed Site Plan DSP-07074-01 is found to represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.
15. This DSP proposes minor revisions to previously approved conditions and plans. The following list of conditions includes the original conditions that have not been fulfilled (Conditions 3, 8, 9,) and the conditions in which the original language has been modified (Conditions 4, 5, 13(c), 13(e), and 16). The following list of conditions does not include conditions that have been fulfilled (Conditions 1, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13(a), 13(b), 13(d) 13(f–j), 14, 17, and 18), or are deleted (Conditions 2 and 15), of the original approval as reflected in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-102.

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-07074-01, Town Center at Camp Springs, Aspire Apollo (formerly known as Archstone) subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of the building permit for the second phase of the residential development, the applicant shall present a report to the Prince George’s County Planning Board and the Branch

Avenue Metro Focus Group demonstrating that the applicant has employed its best efforts toward marketing of the retail parcel. Thereafter, the applicant shall report again to the Planning Board on an annual basis until the retail component is constructed. The timing of the construction or installation of the left-turn lane into Parcel F shall be commensurate with the construction of the retail improvements on Parcel F.

2. Prior to issuance of the use and occupancy permits for Building 200 and/or Building 300 within Phase III, the clocktower and surrounding sunken amphitheatre feature associated with Parcel F shall be completed.
3. That portion of the linear park lying on each parcel shall be completed at the same time as the development on that parcel.
4. Three original executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) for their approval three weeks prior to submission of a grading permit. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro. The residential project will contain two phases. The RFA shall correspond to these phases in the following manner:
 - a. The RFA shall provide for the completion of all indoor facilities within Phase I prior to issuance of the 208th certificate of occupancy within Phase I by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.
 - b. The RFA shall provide for the completion of all indoor facilities within Phase II prior to issuance of the 193rd certificate of occupancy within Phase II by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.
 - c. The RFA shall provide for the completion of all outdoor recreational facilities within Phase I prior to issuance of the 374th certificate of occupancy within Phase I by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.
 - d. The RFA shall provide for the completion of all outdoor recreational facilities within Phase II prior to issuance of the 347th certificate of occupancy within Phase II by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.
5. A performance bond, letter of credit, or other suitable financial guarantee shall be submitted to the Development Review Division (DRD) in an amount to be determined by DRD at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits for the phase in which the specified recreational facilities are located.
6. The plans shall be revised prior to signature approval to include the following:
 - a. If approved by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, street trees shall be shown on the plans to be located approximately 35 feet

on center in the right-of-way of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way, and shall have shade trees a minimum of 2.5- to 3-inch caliper in size. A staggered row of the same species shall be planted at the same interval on the other side of the sidewalk, unless buildings are located at or near the street line. Any existing dead or dying trees within the right-of-way adjacent to the property shall be replaced. Specific trees along the Capital Gateway Drive/Auth way may be omitted if in conflict with a site wall, plaza, or other feature. The timing for the planting of street trees and other landscaping shall be commensurate with the timing for the completion of property improvements and before final inspections and issuance of certificates of occupancy are made for the immediate adjacent phase/parcel.

- b. If allowed by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation, shade trees shall be provided in the median of Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way directly across from the subject site and be of size and species to create a residential pedestrian-friendly boulevard.
7. The applicant shall design and agree to construct the left-turn lane along Capital Gateway Drive/Auth Way to allow left-hand turns into Parcel F, as shown on the detailed site plan, subject to approval by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation. The timing of the construction or installation of the left-turn lane into Parcel F shall be commensurate with the construction of the retail improvements on Parcel F.

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 Washington, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Washington, Geraldo, Shoaff, Bailey and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, April 7, 2016, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of April 2016.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:SL:ydw