

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 January 17, 2019, regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-18026 for Retail at Melford Town Center, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is a detailed site plan (DSP) for 57,845 square feet of commercial retail space.
2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use	Vacant	Commercial/Retail
Acreage of the DSP	8.83	8.83
Building Square Feet (Gross floor area)	0	57,845
Building 1	-	6,500
Building 2		6,500
Building 3		12,025
Future Building 4		11,400
Future Building 5		21,420
Parking Spaces *		--
Retail (South Parcel)		171
Standard Spaces	-	121
Compact Spaces	-	44
Standard Handicapped Spaces	-	2
Van Accessible	-	4
Restaurant (North Parcel)		121
Standard Spaces	-	93
Compact Spaces	-	23
Standard Handicapped Spaces	-	3
Van Accessible	-	2
Total Spaces Provided	-	292
Loading Spaces Provided (12 ft. x 33 ft.)	-	2

Note: *Per Sections 27-574 and 27-583 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, there

is no specific required number of parking or loading spaces in the M-X-T Zone. The applicant is to submit an analysis to be approved by the Planning Board. See Finding 7 for a discussion of the parking analysis.

3. **Location:** The larger Melford property is located in the northeastern quadrant of the intersection of MD 3 (Robert Crain Highway) and US 50/US 301 (John Hanson Highway), in Planning Area 71B and Council District 4, within the City of Bowie. The specific site included in this DSP is located on the north side of Melford Boulevard, on both sides of East West Boulevard.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The overall Melford site is bounded to the north by single-family detached dwellings in the Residential-Agricultural (R-A) Zone and a vacant park property in the Reserved Open Space (R-O-S) Zone; to the east by the Patuxent River; to the south by the US 50/US 301 right-of-way and a vacant property in the Open Space (O-S) Zone; and to the west by the MD 3 right-of-way. The subject DSP is within the geographical center of Melford Town Center and is bounded to the north and west by an existing stormwater management (SWM) pond in the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone; to the east by approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-18007, The Aspen at Melford Town Center, a townhouse development (Detailed Site Plan DSP-18034, which is pending), and the historic Melford House; and to the south by the right-of-way of Melford Boulevard.
5. **Previous Approvals:** On January 25, 1982, the Prince George's County District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment (Basic Plan) A-9401 for the overall Melford development (formerly known as the Maryland Science and Technology Center), with 10 conditions (Zoning Ordinance No. 2-1982). The zoning map amendment rezoned the property from the R-A and O-S Zones to the Employment and Institutional Area (E-I-A) Zone. On July 7, 1986, the District Council approved Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-8601, affirming the prior Prince George's County Planning Board decision (PGCPB Resolution No. 86-107), for the Maryland Science and Technology Center, with 27 conditions and 2 considerations. Between 1986 and 2005, several specific design plans (SDPs) and preliminary plans of subdivision (PPS) were approved for the development.

The 2006 Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, and 74B (Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA) rezoned the property from the E-I-A Zone to the M-X-T Zone.

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was approved by the Planning Board on January 11, 2007, for a mixed-use development consisting of hotel, office, retail, restaurant, research and development, and residential (366 single-family detached and attached units and 500 multifamily units) uses. Subsequently, on May 11, 2009, the District Council approved CSP-06002 with 4 modifications and 29 conditions, rejecting the residential component of the proposed development. Over the years, numerous SDPs and DSPs have been approved for the subject property, in support of the office, flex, hotel, and institutional uses, although not all have been constructed.

On May 6, 2014, the District Council approved the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035), which created new center designations to replace those found in the

2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* and classified the Bowie Town Center, including the subject site, as a "Town Center." The subject site retained its status as an "Employment Area" in the plan.

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 was approved by the Planning Board on December 4, 2014 (PGCPB Resolution No. 14-128), for the addition of 2,500 residential units, including 500 townhouses, 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units, and 1,000 multifamily dwelling units; 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 square feet of office space, to the previous CSP development. The CSP amendment was appealed and heard by the District Council on February 23, 2015. The District Council subsequently issued an order of approval on March 23, 2015, supporting the development as approved by the Planning Board.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16006 was approved by the Planning Board on March 9, 2017, for 256 lots and 50 parcels to accommodate 359,500 square feet of commercial uses (124,500 square feet of commercial retail and 235,000 square feet of office and medical offices) and 1,793 residential units (283 attached units and 1,500 multifamily units). The Planning Board adopted PGCPB Resolution No. 17-45 on April 6, 2017. A request for reconsideration was granted on May 18, 2017. However, on June 29, 2017, the case was appealed to the Circuit Court for Prince George's County and the reconsideration request was dismissed, without prejudice, on July 20, 2017.

Detailed Site Plan DSP-17020 for grading and infrastructure of Melford Town Center was approved and its resolution adopted by the Planning Board on December 7, 2017 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-152) with three conditions. Detailed Site Plan DSP-18034 for approval of infrastructure for a townhouse development is being reviewed concurrently with the subject DSP.

The site also has an approved City of Bowie Stormwater Management Concept Plan, 01-0317-207NE15, which is valid until March 20, 2020.

6. **Design Features:** The subject DSP proposes development of 57,845 square feet of commercial retail uses in three buildings and two pad sites on the north and south sides of East West Boulevard. On the southern side, there are three buildings and one pad site proposed, and two vehicular accesses are provided via East West Boulevard and a new public right-of-way, Robert Byrd Way, running north-south along the east side of the DSP. On the northern side, one pad site for a future restaurant is proposed, and one vehicular access is provided from East West Boulevard. Sidewalks are provided on both sides of all roadways. On-street parking is provided on both sides of Robert Byrd Way and East West Boulevard.

Architecture

Buildings 1–3, to the south of East West Boulevard, have been designed as commercial multi-tenant buildings. Building 5, also to the south, and Building 4, to the north, are pad sites and no elevations have been provided. The applicant will need to revise this DSP for the two buildings in the future when specific tenants have been identified, prior to obtaining a building permit.

The architecture provided for the three multi-tenant buildings is designed in a coordinated manner with flat roofs. The buildings are finished predominantly with brick that will match the color schemes of the brick on the historic Melford House. Other building materials include exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) trim, white composite siding trim, aluminum store front windows, and standing seam metal roof sections. Tower elements have been applied at the locations that are fronting prominent intersections and between bays to break up the horizontal expanse of the building. There are two types of towers used in the design. One is a flat roof tower that is finished with an EIFS cornice. The other is an octagon, hip roof tower that is finished with metal. The proposed buildings also use building-mounted lighting fixtures and parapet walls screen the rooftop heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC) units. The subject buildings will also have fabric awnings, in a variety of colors, to complete the appearance of each building.

Outdoor amenity spaces have been provided in both areas. In the southern area, an outdoor hardscape area has been shown in the northern quadrant of the intersection of East West Boulevard and the main vehicular access road. The space features stamped concrete paving and seating wall segments, and is connected to the sidewalk network on the site. Additional open space, which is a linear park featuring a pavilion, is also proposed on the north side of East West Boulevard. The pavilion site is overlooking the existing SWM pond. Other outdoor areas, with stamped concrete pavement, are found at the end of Buildings 1–3.

In the northern area, an extensive patio has been proposed to the west of the future restaurant building, that provides an attractive view to the existing SWM pond to the west of the subject site. The patio will provide a premium dining site for future restaurant patrons.

Signage

Signage for the project includes an extensive entrance monument sign, curved in form and punctuated with piers on both sides of the feature. The project name “Melford Town Center” is located on the sign face. The entrance features are located on both sides of East West Boulevard, on the north side of Melford Boulevard, and are lit externally.

Other signage includes a 30-foot-high retail pylon sign along Melford Boulevard and building-mounted signs on each building for tenants. The retail sign is designed with two embedded panels with Melford Town Center and St. John text and logo on the host panel and with the other large panel for placing the signage of all retail tenants. The host panel has a brick base and projects a very contemporary appearance.

Building-mounted signs include projecting signs, wall signs, banner signs, awning and canopy signs, and restaurant menu signs. All building-mounted signs have been shown on the elevations of Buildings 1–3, with maximum sign face areas as shown on the elevations included in this DSP. The specific method of attaching the signs to the building is also provided.

The DSP covers an area that is identified as the commercial district in Melford Town Center under CSP-06002-01, which established detailed design guidelines including sign design guidelines for Melford Village. The proposed signs are designed in accordance with the guidelines.

Lighting

Freestanding pole and building-mounted lighting fixtures are provided with this DSP, but no photometric plan was provided and needs to be, as conditioned in this resolution.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site plan design guidelines of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance. The proposed commercial buildings and pad sites are in conformance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:
 - a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547 of the Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in all mixed-use zones. A variety of commercial retail uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone.
 - b. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547(d), which governs the required mix of uses in all mixed-use zones. The proposal is part of the overall Melford Town Center development, which was approved for a mixed-use development consisting of retail, office, hotel, and residential uses. The subject DSP, which proposes retail uses, contributes toward the overall mix of uses on the larger project, when the remainder of the overall development is taken into consideration.
 - c. Section 27-546, Site Plans, of the Zoning Ordinance has additional requirements for approval of a DSP in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:
 - (d) **In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:**
 - (1) **The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division;**

The purposes of the M-X-T Zone, as stated in Section 27-542 of the Zoning Ordinance, are as follows:

 - (a) **The purposes of the M-X-T Zone are:**
 - (1) **To promote the orderly development and redevelopment of land in the vicinity of major interchanges, major intersections, major transit stops, and designated General Plan Centers so that these areas will enhance the economic status of the County and provide an expanding source of desirable**

employment and living opportunities for its citizens;

The retail use proposed in this DSP is geographically located in the middle of the larger Melford development that is located at the major interchange of US 50/US 301 and MD 3, in accordance with this requirement. Additionally, the project will generate taxes, jobs, and additional residential options, also in accordance with this requirement.

- (2) To implement recommendations in the approved General Plan, Master Plans, and Sector Plans, by creating compact, mixed-use, walkable communities enhanced by a mix of residential, commercial, recreational, open space, employment, and institutional uses;**

The subject property will be developed in accordance with the relevant land use policy recommendations contained in Plan 2035 and the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA, as described in Section IV of the applicant's statement of justification, which is incorporated herein by reference. The retail use proposed in this DSP will provide needed service to the existing and proposed office and residential uses and serve as a catalyst for the mixed-use development contemplated by CSP-06002-01.

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

The retail development proposed in this DSP will enhance the value of surrounding land and buildings and serve as a catalyst to the mixed-use development contemplated by previously approved CSP-06002-01, in accordance with this requirement.

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

The subject DSP is the first retail development that is part of a larger CSP, which includes 2,500 residential dwelling units, 268,500 square feet of retail uses, and 260,000 additional square feet of office space. As this will result in shared trips and people being able to walk and bike between varying uses in the development, the subject proposed commercial development will support the above purpose. All trails-related issues have been included as conditions in this resolution, that will also facilitate this purpose with respect to walking, bicycle, and transit use.

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

The proposed retail shopping center will provide needed service to those uses already constructed and will further this goal, as it will be used 24-hours a day and will complement existing and proposed residential, office, and industrial land uses within Melford, and will further the interaction between uses, as some people who work in the area would have the option to shop in the area.

- (6) To encourage an appropriate horizontal and vertical mix of land uses which blend together harmoniously;**

The proposed shopping center will provide the first retail/commercial component of horizontal mixed-use development within the Melford Town Center. As mentioned previously, the interaction between uses and those who live, work, shop, and visit the area will blend together harmoniously and complement each other.

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

The proposed retail use will be a first step in completing the mixed-use community envisioned by CSP-06002-01. The design of the three buildings, in accordance with the design standards approved for the town center, create a

distinctive image. Future development applications will continue to reflect and emphasize the maximum relationships between individual uses to create a distinctive visual character and identity, consistent with the previously approved CSP and PPS.

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

SWM policies and other smart growth principles are incorporated into the site's development. The SWM concept plan for the project (01-0317-207NE15) was approved by the City of Bowie, with conditions, and incorporates innovative SWM techniques, as required above. The overall Melford Town Center will have up to 10 percent of its surface parking spaces utilizing pervious pavement, which is a sustainable development technique that will reduce the amount of impervious surface.

- (9) To permit a flexible response to the market and promote economic vitality and investment; and**

The mixed-use development approved by CSP-06002-01 included three major use categories that are necessary for any mixed-use development to be successful and allows maximum flexibility for a response to the market. As discussed previously, the retail uses proposed with this application are expected to provide the needed service to the office, residential, and industrial uses and catalyze the mixed-use development contemplated by CSP-06002-01.

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

The subject DSP proposes architectural design that is in accordance with the design guidelines approved in CSP-06002-01 for the town center. The buildings are

visually attractive, respond to existing site conditions, and utilize form and massing, architectural materials, and details that respond to the adjacent historic Melford House.

- (2) **For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;**

The subject property was placed in the M-X-T Zone on February 7, 2006, via the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan and SMA. Thus, the above section does not apply to this application. However, the approved CSP does include comprehensive design guidelines that guide the design of this retail center. The statement of justification submitted by the applicant provides a review of the applicable guidelines, that are incorporated into this resolution by reference.

- (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 development is designed to be physically integrated with both existing and future adjacent development in the area. The DSP is visually integrated with existing and future uses through the use of connecting streets (i.e., the future East West Boulevard and new Road "B") and pedestrian systems, as reflected on the DSP. Further details about the overall transportation network (including pedestrian, bicycle, and automobile connectivity) will be reflected on future DSPs, in conformance with the design guidelines approved with CSP-06002-01. In addition, the approved CSP requires the construction of a pedestrian connection from Melford Boulevard to the adjacent residential neighborhood to the west of MD 3. This pedestrian connection will add a further element of an outward orientation.

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

The proposed development of a shopping center on this site was anticipated by the previously approved CSP-06002-01 and PPS, and is therefore compatible with the development concept of Melford and other design elements recommended for the area.

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

The subject DSP proposes high-quality commercial/retail buildings that will represent the first (exclusive) retail uses developed within the boundaries of the Melford Town Center. The proposed development has been designed in anticipation of additional uses and structures that will be developed in future phases of the project. Details regarding future uses, building design, and public amenities will be reflected in forthcoming DSPs that reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability.

- (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 development shown on the DSP will be completed in one phase. However, this development is part of a larger project approved under one approved CSP. The development of this site will allow effective integration of subsequent development because this development will provide the needed retail services for future residents.

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

The overall Melford Town Center development plan (as reflected in approved CSP-06002-01) includes sidewalks on both sides of the internal roads and several internal trail/bicycle connections, in addition to a future master plan trail. The trail along the Patuxent River corridor is shown as two connections from both the north and south ends of the development. These connections are designed to meet the intent of the master plan recommendations. A modified grid road network will be proposed in future DSPs to accommodate relatively small block sizes and include sufficient crossing opportunities for pedestrians. In addition to the proposed network of sidewalks, pedestrian access is further supplemented by the stream valley trail, the trail around the pond, and the proposed trail/bicycle routes. In the review of the prior CSP-06002-01 application, the trails coordinator determined that the trail limits and alignment are acceptable, as shown on the submitted trail construction plans, and fulfill the master plan recommendations for a trail along the stream valley.

- (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**

Details pertaining to areas for pedestrian activities and gathering spaces have been provided in this DSP. The arrangement of these areas generally reflects a well-conceived design for pedestrian and gathering spaces, including attention to material type, landscaping, and street furniture, to give these spaces a well-defined sense of place.

- (9) **On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant, or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

This requirement is not applicable to this DSP.

- (10) **On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, 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, or to be provided by the applicant.**

The most recent adequacy finding for the overall M-X-T site was made in 2017 with PPS 4-16006, and the proposed DSP falls within the allowed trip cap.

- (11) **On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.**

The subject DSP does not propose a mixed-use planned community.

- d. Section 27-548, M-X-T Zone Regulations, of the Zoning Ordinance establishes additional standards for development in this zone. The DSP's conformance with the applicable provisions is discussed, as follows:

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

- (1) **Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR;
and**
- (2) **With the use of the optional method of development—8.00 FAR.**

This DSP is part of the approved CSP for the Melford Town Center. The CSP was approved using the optional method of development for the M-X-T Zone, as set forth in Section 27-545 of the Zoning Ordinance. As such, the Melford Town Center is entitled to a maximum floor area ratio (FAR) of 1.4 (0.4 base FAR, plus 1.0 bonus FAR for including 20 or more residential units). The proposed maximum FAR is approximately 0.67 for the entire Melford Town Center, including all existing, currently proposed, and approved gross floor area, in relation to the land area of CSP-06002-01.

- (b) **The uses allowed in the M-X-T Zone may be located in more than one (1) building, and on more than one (1) lot.**

The DSP includes three buildings and two pad sites on five separate parcels, as allowed by this regulation.

- (c) **Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.**

The dimensions for coverage, height, and location of all improvements are reflected on the DSP and are acceptable. Once this DSP is approved, those indicators will be the regulations for the development of this shopping center.

- (d) **Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual.**

Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land uses.

The required landscaping shown is in accordance with the requirements of the applicable sections of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). See Finding 11 below for a detailed discussion.

- (e) In addition to those areas of a building included in the computation of gross floor area (without the use of the optional method of development), the floor area of the following improvements (using the optional method of development) shall be included in computing the gross floor area of the building of which they are a part: enclosed pedestrian spaces, theaters, and residential uses. Floor area ratios shall exclude from gross floor area that area in a building or structure devoted to vehicular parking and parking access areas (notwithstanding the provisions of Section 27-107.01). The floor area ratio shall be applied to the entire property which is the subject of the Conceptual Site Plan.**

The FAR for Melford Town Center, including the proposed development, is 0.67, which is calculated in accordance with this requirement and is within the maximum permitted FAR of 1.4 for this development.

- (f) Private structures may be located within the air space above, or in the ground below, public rights-of-way.**

No proposed structures will infringe upon public rights-of-way. The subject project meets this requirement.

- (g) Each lot shall have frontage on, and direct vehicular access to, a public street, except lots for which private streets or other access rights-of-way have been authorized pursuant to Subtitle 24 of this Code.**

The development parcels have frontage on and direct access to public streets, or as determined in PPS 4-16006.

- (h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet in size, and shall have at least sixty percent (60%) of the full front facades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco. In addition, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would**

create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. The minimum lot size, maximum number of units per building group and percentages of such building groups, and building width requirements and restrictions shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half (½) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000. In no event shall there be more than ten (10) dwelling units in a building group and no more than two (2) building groups containing ten (10) dwelling units. For purposes of this section, a building group shall be considered a separate building group (even though attached) when the angle formed by the front walls of two (2) adjoining rows of units is greater than forty-five degrees (45°). Except that, in the case of a Mixed-Use Planned Community, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except when the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. Garages may not dominate the streetscape. Garages that are attached or incorporated into the dwelling shall be set back a minimum of four (4) feet from the front façade and there shall not be more than a single garage, not to exceed ten (10) feet wide, along the front façade of any individual unit. Garages may be incorporated into the rear of the building or freestanding in the rear yard and accessed by an alley. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all public and private streets and parking lots. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve a request to substitute townhouses, proposed for development as condominiums, in place of multifamily dwellings that were approved in a Conceptual Site Plan approved prior to April 1, 2004. Such substitution shall not require a

revision to any previous plan approvals. Further, at the time of Detailed Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Planned Community, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve modifications to these regulations so long as the modifications conform to the applicable regulations for the particular development.

The DSP is for commercial retail uses; therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

- (i) The maximum height of multifamily buildings shall be one hundred and ten (110) feet. This height restriction shall not apply within any Transit District Overlay Zone, designated General Plan Metropolitan or Regional Centers, or a Mixed-Use Planned Community.**

The DSP is for commercial retail uses; therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

- (j) As noted in Section 27-544(b), which references property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, regulations for Conceptual or Detailed Site Plans (such as, but not limited to density, setbacks, buffers, screening, landscaping, height, recreational requirements, ingress/egress, and internal circulation) should be based on the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or the Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change and any referenced exhibit of record for the property. This regulation also applies to property readopted in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006 and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation of a concurrent Master Plan or Sector Plan (see Section 27-226(f)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance).**

As the subject property was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone through an SMA approved on February 7, 2006, this section does not apply to the subject DSP.

- e. The DSP is in general conformance with the applicable site design guidelines, as referenced in Section 27-283 and contained in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance, as follows:

(2) Parking, loading, and circulation.

- (A) Surface parking lots should be located and designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site, while minimizing the visual impact of cars. Parking spaces should be located to provide convenient access to major destination points on the site. As a means of achieving these objectives, the following guidelines should be observed:**
- (i) Parking lots should generally be provided to the rear or sides of structures;**
 - (ii) Parking spaces should be located as near as possible to the uses they serve;**
 - (iii) Parking aisles should be oriented to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians;**
 - (iv) Large, uninterrupted expanses of pavement should be avoided or substantially mitigated by the location of green space and plant materials within the parking lot, in accordance with the Landscape Manual, particularly in parking areas serving townhouses; and**
 - (v) Special areas for van pool, car pool, and visitor parking should be located with convenient pedestrian access to buildings.**

The instant DSP proposes parking spaces in surface parking lots that have been designed in conformance with the CSP design guidelines and the appropriate provisions of the Landscape Manual. The northern parking lot is located to the side and rear of the proposed building and the southern parking lot is located to the rear.

- (B) Loading areas should be visually unobtrusive and located to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**
- (i) Loading docks should be oriented toward service roads and away from major streets or public view; and**
 - (ii) Loading areas should be clearly marked and should be separated from parking areas to the extent possible.**

There are two proposed loading spaces to be located next to future Building 5 that are oriented towards the interior of the site and is blocked from view of the surroundings streets by the proposed building and plantings.

- (C) Vehicular and pedestrian circulation on a site should be safe, efficient, and convenient for both pedestrians and drivers. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**
- (i) The location, number and design of driveway entrances to the site should minimize conflict with off-site traffic, should provide a safe transition into the parking lot, and should provide adequate acceleration and deceleration lanes, if necessary;**
 - (ii) Entrance drives should provide adequate space for queuing;**
 - (iii) Circulation patterns should be designed so that vehicular traffic may flow freely through the parking lot without encouraging higher speeds than can be safely accommodated;**
 - (iv) Parking areas should be designed to discourage their use as through-access drives;**
 - (v) Internal signs such as directional arrows, lane markings, and other roadway commands should be used to facilitate safe driving through the parking lot;**
 - (vi) Drive-through establishments should be designed with adequate space for queuing lanes that do not conflict with circulation traffic patterns or pedestrian access;**
 - (vii) Parcel pick-up areas should be coordinated with other on-site traffic flows;**
 - (viii) Pedestrian access should be provided into the site and through parking lots to the major destinations on the site;**
 - (ix) Pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes should generally be separated and clearly marked;**
 - (x) Crosswalks for pedestrians that span vehicular lanes should be identified by the use of signs, stripes on the pavement, change of paving material, or similar techniques; and**

- (xi) Barrier-free pathways to accommodate the handicapped should be provided.**

The proposed commercial/retail uses in this DSP are consistent with the design approved in CSP-06002-01 for a mixed-use community. The construction of East West Boulevard through the site will implement a vital circulation element identified in the CSP. The proposed driveway entrances for the surface parking lots will be along the future East West Boulevard. Pedestrian and vehicular circulation routes will be separated with the use of sidewalks and appropriately sized drive aisles, to avoid any conflicts between vehicular and pedestrian movements. All crosswalks along pedestrian sidewalk routes will be prominently marked, and Americans with Disability Act (ADA) compliant curb cuts will be installed to accommodate handicap access requirements.

(3) Lighting.

- (A) For uses permitting nighttime activities, adequate illumination should be provided. Light fixtures should enhance the site's design character. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**
 - (i) If the development is used at night, the luminosity, orientation, and location of exterior light fixtures should enhance user safety and minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts;**
 - (ii) Lighting should be used to illuminate important on-site elements such as entrances, pedestrian pathways, public spaces, and property addresses. Significant natural or built features may also be illuminated if appropriate to the site;**
 - (iii) The pattern of light pooling should be directed on-site;**
 - (iv) Light fixtures fulfilling similar functions should provide a consistent quality of light;**
 - (v) Light fixtures should be durable and compatible with the scale, architecture, and use of the site; and**
 - (vi) If a variety of lighting fixtures is needed to serve different purposes on a site, related fixtures should be selected. The design and layout of the fixtures should provide visual continuity throughout the site.**

No photometric plan was provided to ensure that these guidelines are followed. Therefore, a condition is provided in this resolution requiring this to be provided.

(4) Views.

(A) Site design techniques should be used to preserve, create, or emphasize scenic views from public areas.

The subject DSP proposes thoughtfully designed commercial/retail structures that preserve scenic views. Primarily, views to and from the Melford Historic Site will be maintained, as required by the design guidelines approved with the CSP. Further, the linear park on the north side of the future East West Boulevard will create an important gathering and focal point for the project, while at the same time accentuating views to and from the existing SWM pond.

(5) Green area.

(A) On-site green area should be designed to complement other site activity areas and should be appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill its intended use. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) Green area should be easily accessible in order to maximize its utility and to simplify its maintenance;**
- (ii) Green area should link major site destinations such as buildings and parking areas;**
- (iii) Green area should be well-defined and appropriately scaled to meet its intended use;**
- (iv) Green area designed for the use and enjoyment of pedestrians should be visible and accessible, and the location of seating should be protected from excessive sun, shade, wind, and noise;**
- (v) Green area should be designed to define space, provide screening and privacy, and serve as a focal point;**
- (vi) Green area should incorporate significant on-site natural features and woodland conservation requirements that enhance the physical and visual character of the site; and**

- (vii) Green area should generally be accented by elements such as landscaping, pools, fountains, street furniture, and decorative paving.**

The DSP contains appropriate green areas for the proposed buildings. The pedestrian network proposed for the shopping center will connect retail users to other amenities planned within Melford Town Center. Further, this same pedestrian network will connect people to the existing SWM pond and trail areas to the north.

(6) Site and streetscape amenities.

- (A) Site and streetscape amenities should contribute to an attractive, coordinated development and should enhance the use and enjoyment of the site. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**
 - (i) The design of light fixtures, benches, trash receptacles, bicycle racks and other street furniture should be coordinated in order to enhance the visual unity of the site;**
 - (ii) The design of amenities should take into consideration the color, pattern, texture, and scale of structures on the site, and when known, structures on adjacent sites, and pedestrian areas;**
 - (iii) Amenities should be clearly visible and accessible, and should not obstruct pedestrian circulation;**
 - (iv) Amenities should be functional and should be constructed of durable, low maintenance materials;**
 - (v) Amenities should be protected from vehicular intrusion with design elements that are integrated into the overall streetscape design, such as landscaping, curbs, and bollards;**
 - (vi) Amenities such as kiosks, planters, fountains, and public art should be used as focal points on a site; and**
 - (vii) Amenities should be included which accommodate the handicapped and should be appropriately scaled for user comfort.**

The subject DSP contains details related to the proposed streetscape amenities

and hardscape. The proposed streetscape amenities will contribute to an attractive and coordinated design to be shared throughout future sections of the Melford Town Center development.

(7) Grading.

(A) Grading should be performed to minimize disruption to existing topography and other natural and cultural resources on the site and on adjacent sites. To the extent practicable, grading should minimize environmental impacts. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) Slopes and berms visible from streets and other public areas should appear as naturalistic forms. Slope ratios and the length of slopes should be varied if necessary to increase visual interest and relate manmade landforms to the shape of the natural terrain;**
- (ii) Excessive grading of hilltops and slopes should be avoided where there are reasonable alternatives that will preserve a site's natural landforms;**
- (iii) Grading and other methods should be considered to buffer incompatible land uses from each other;**
- (iv) Where steep slopes cannot be avoided, plant materials of varying forms and densities should be arranged to soften the appearance of the slope; and**
- (v) Drainage devices should be located and designed so as to minimize the view from public areas.**

All grading will conform to the approved SWM concept plan. Excessive grading will be avoided through the proposed design and all proposed drainage devices will be designed to minimize views of them from public areas.

(8) Service areas.

(A) Service areas should be accessible, but unobtrusive. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:

- (i) Service areas should be located away from primary roads, when possible;**

- (ii) Service areas should be located conveniently to all buildings served;**
- (iii) Service areas should be effectively screened or enclosed with materials compatible with the primary structure; and**
- (iv) Multiple building developments should be designed to form service courtyards which are devoted to parking and loading uses and are not visible from public view.**

The service areas are located in the rear of Buildings 1, 2, and 3. These areas will allow for quick and efficient delivery of items needed for the commercial/retail tenants. Trash/dumpster areas are shown on the plans and will be located in the parking lots adjacent to the proposed buildings. All dumpster areas will be fully screened with brick enclosures to match the buildings.

(9) Public spaces.

- (A) A public space system should be provided to enhance a large-scale commercial, mixed-use, or multifamily development. To fulfill this goal, the following guidelines should be observed:**
 - (i) Buildings should be organized and designed to create public spaces such as plazas, squares, courtyards, pedestrian malls, or other defined spaces;**
 - (ii) The scale, size, shape, and circulation patterns of the public spaces should be designed to accommodate various activities;**
 - (iii) Public spaces should generally incorporate sitting areas, landscaping, access to the sun, and protection from the wind;**
 - (iv) Public spaces should be readily accessible to potential users; and**
 - (v) Pedestrian pathways should be provided to connect major uses and public spaces within the development and should be scaled for anticipated circulation.**

The DSP includes linear public spaces in the form of wide and inviting sidewalk areas across East West Boulevard. A hardscaped planter-wall area is proposed along the East West Boulevard, between Buildings 2 and 3. On the north side of the future East West Boulevard, the DSP also shows a linear park consisting of an open pavilion with seating, an ample pavement/sidewalk area, a decorative

retaining wall (with brick piers and decorative fencing) overlooking the SWM pond, and a pedestrian connection, which will connect to the existing trail around the pond. To enhance pedestrian connectivity, several pedestrian crosswalks are proposed across Melford Boulevard, East West Boulevard, and within the parking lots. Bike racks, accommodating 20 bicycles, are proposed in three locations close to each building.

(10) Architecture.

- (A) When architectural considerations are referenced for review, the Conceptual Site Plan should include a statement as to how the architecture of the buildings will provide a variety of building forms, with a unified, harmonious use of materials and styles.**
- (B) The guidelines shall only be used in keeping with the character and purpose of the proposed type of development and the specific zone in which it is to be located.**
- (C) These guidelines may be modified in accordance with Section 27-277.**

The proposed commercial/retail buildings conform to the relevant portions of the Melford Village design guidelines approved with CSP-06002-01. The architecture for Buildings 1–3 will provide a complimentary palate of materials and features including, but not limited to, brick, EIFS trim, white composite siding trim, aluminum store front windows, and standing seam metal roof sections. The proposed buildings will use building-mounted lighting fixtures and parapet walls that will screen rooftop HVAC units. The subject buildings will also have fabric awnings, in a variety of colors, to complete the appearance of each building.

- f. In accordance with Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, the number of parking spaces required in the M-X-T Zone is to be calculated by the applicant and submitted for Planning Board approval at the time of DSP. Detailed information regarding the methodology and procedures to be used in determining the parking ratio is outlined in Section 27-574(b).

In a memorandum dated June 11, 2018, Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc. provided the required parking analysis for this development and concluded that, with a base parking requirement of 276 spaces and a parking supply of 292 spaces, there are projected to be a surplus of 16 parking spaces using the parking calculation procedures, as outlined in Section 27-574. Lenhart Traffic Consulting, Inc. further concluded that, based upon this information, the site will be adequately parked with the 292 parking spaces, as proposed. The Planning Board is in agreement with the conclusion of the parking analysis.

- 8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 and its amendment:** Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002 was

approved by the District Council on May 11, 2009. Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01, to add 2,500 residential units, including 500 townhouses, 1,000 age-restricted multifamily dwelling units, and 1,000 multifamily dwelling units; 268,500 square feet of retail uses; and 260,000 square feet of office space to the previous CSP development, was approved by the District Council on March 23, 2015, entirely superseding the original CSP-06002 approval. The conditions of CSP-06002 have been fully analyzed in the approval of CSP-06002-01. The 25 conditions attached to CSP-06002-01 are relevant to the review of the subject DSP, as follows:

1. **The proposed development shall be limited to a mix of uses where the trip cap associated with the uses within the boundary of CSP-06002-01 shall not exceed 4,441 AM and 4,424 PM peak hour trips. Any development with an impact beyond that identified hereinabove shall require a revision to the conceptual site plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

As of this writing and pursuant to PGCPB Resolution No. 18-66 (DSP-18007), two developments have been approved by previous DSP applications, with a collective trip generation of 802 AM and 788 PM peak-hour trips. The subject application represents the construction of 57,845 square feet of retail use. With the consideration of internal trip capture and the effect of pass-by traffic, it is estimated that this development will result in a net of 67 AM and 249 PM peak-hour trips. Under concurrent review is pending DSP-18034, which represents a proposal for 205 townhomes. These 205 homes are projected to generate 144 AM and 164 PM peak trips. Collectively, all approved DSPs, plus the two pending, will generate a total of 973 AM and 1,201 PM peak trips. Consequently, the trip cap will not be exceeded.

7. **Prior to approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate:**
 - a. **The development plans shall show minimization of impervious surfaces to the maximum extent possible, through all phases of the project, with the use of permeable paving surfaces in accordance with the approved storm water management concept plan for Melford. Structured parking should be used to the maximum extent reasonably practicable.**

Impervious surfaces in this application are minimized to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the approved SWM concept plan. This DSP will use pervious pavement for approximately 10 percent of the surface parking within this shopping center.
 - b. **The required 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain shall be retained in an undisturbed or restored state to the fullest extent possible, except for impacts approved by the Planning Board. Master-planned trails and connectors to the master plan trail from interior trail networks shall be allowed subject to minimization of impacts.**

The subject DSP satisfies the approved 100-foot natural buffer for streams and the 150-foot buffer for the 100-year floodplain.

- c. **Clearing for utility installation shall be minimized, especially in environmentally-sensitive areas, and clearing for utilities in those areas shall be coordinated, to minimize ground or buffer disturbance. Woodland disturbed for that purpose shall be reforested, in cooperation with the appropriate utility.**

The utility installation proposed in this application has been designed to minimize any impacts to environmentally sensitive areas. Any area cleared for this purpose will be reforested.

- d. **The open space system, including but not limited to environmentally-sensitive areas, shall extend through the site and shall link the different uses. Portions of the open space system shall be visible to and accessible from public streets.**

This DSP includes a linear park to the west of East West Boulevard and several public open spaces associated with Buildings 1–3. The public open spaces do not intrude into any planned natural open spaces, as previously shown on the approved CSP or PPS. The proposed development in this application will allow for a continuation of the planned pedestrian and street network concepts endorsed by the Melford Town Center design guidelines.

- 8. **All stream channels on the site shall be depicted on all plans in their entirety, with the regulated stream buffer shown as required.**

The correct delineation of streams and regulated stream buffers is shown on the most recent natural resources inventory (NRI). There are no streams, stream buffers, or primary management area (PMA) within the DSP area.

- 9. **At the time of detailed site plan (DSP), the following design issues shall be addressed:**

- a. **The plans shall show the stormwater management ponds as amenities, with gentle natural slopes and extensive native planting.**

The DSP does not include a SWM pond within its boundaries.

- b. **Prior to the approval of any detailed site plan that includes a portion of the Melford and Cemetery Environmental Setting, in consultation with archaeology staff, the applicant shall provide for additional public interpretation of the significance of archeological findings within the property. That public interpretation may take the form of on-site signage, a**

printed brochure, public lectures or a website. The location and wording of any additional signage, brochure text, or website shall be subject to approval by the Prince George's County Planning Department staff archeologist.

The applicant's cultural resources consultant submitted an interpretive plan for the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site that includes wording for an interpretive sign that will be located near the existing grave stones on the cemetery knoll and an interpretive sign that will be placed at the northwest corner of the parcel where the Melford House is located. The existing interpretive sign that is now located at the end of the current entry road for the house will be relocated to the end of the new entry lane, which will be located to the west of the house.

- c. The proposed lighting system shall use full cut-off lighting systems, with limited light spill over.**

No photometric plan has been provided to indicate that light values at the periphery of the site is such that it causes limited light spill over. A condition has been included in this resolution requiring the applicant to provide a study to verify limited light spill over, as well as labeling that the proposed light is full cut-off.

- d. Applicable DSPs that may affect the historic vista of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) shall demonstrate that any portion of a proposed building either partially or fully within the designated view corridors established in Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 comply with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set forth in the design guidelines.**

This condition has been addressed in prior DSPs and is applicable to the subject DSP. Based on the submitted plans, the building is entirely out of the viewshed of the historic site and, therefore, complies with the height requirements for buildings within the view corridors set in the design guidelines.

- e. Prior to approval of any DSPs that include any portion of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site (71B-016) environmental setting and impact review area, the applicant shall demonstrate that the scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture for new construction in the proposed northwest and southwest neighborhoods appropriately relate to the character of the historic site.**

The applicant proposes architecture for three commercial buildings located to the west of the Melford House. The height of the buildings proposed in this application range from approximately 31 to 41 feet. Brick façades and standing seam metal roofs are proposed to complement the materials of the Melford House. The commercial buildings are at a lower elevation than the Melford

Historic Site, as demonstrated by the applicant's exhibit. The scale, mass, proportion, materials, and architecture of the proposed new construction appropriately relates to the character of the historic site.

12. Before approval of a detailed site plan for any retail uses, the plans shall demonstrate that the retail uses are designed to:

- a. Create a sense of place by, among other techniques, creating a design focused upon a village or main street theme; providing amenities such as plazas, parks, recreational opportunities, entertainment and cultural activities, public services, and dining; and providing attractive gateways/entries and public spaces.**

The design of the retail village reinforces the "Main Street" feel contemplated in the Melford Town Center design guidelines by locating buildings along East West Boulevard in an attractive arrangement, that emphasizes pedestrian activity with ample sidewalks. With the exception of on-street parking along the boulevard, vehicles will be primarily parked behind or to the side of retail buildings and sufficiently screened from the views from the public roadways. Furthermore, the positioning of the proposed buildings emphasizes views to and from the pond to the north, providing highly attractive gateways and outdoor spaces.

- b. Create outdoor amenities to include, at a minimum, such amenities as brick pavers, tree grates, decorative lighting, signs, banners, high-quality street furniture, and extensive landscaping, including mature trees.**

The proposed improvements in this application include brick pavers at a number of pedestrian crossings along the surrounding public roadways. In addition, the DSP also provides landscaping (including numerous street trees), signage, street amenities, and lighting fixtures to create a welcoming pedestrian environment.

- c. Create attractive architecture by using high-quality building materials such as stone, brick, or split-face block, and providing architectural elements such as façade articulation, dormer windows, canopies, arcades, varied roofscapes, and customized shopfronts to create a street-like rhythm.**

The proposed architecture for Buildings 1, 2, and 3 utilizes a variety of high-quality materials (such as brick and metal seam roof elements) in its construction that is complementary to the historic Melford House and surrounding development. The proposed buildings are sufficiently articulated to create an attractive shopping environment for future patrons.

- d. Provide attractive quality façades on all commercial buildings visible from public spaces and streets; and completely screen loading, service, trash,**

HVAC (heating, ventilating, and air conditioning), and other unsightly functions.

The proposed buildings are finished predominantly on all four sides with brick. The buildings are also designed with articulated elevations on four sides that have the same aesthetic quality found on the main façade.

- e. **Create a retail area where pedestrians may travel with ease, with attractive walkways and continuous street-front experiences, to maximize the quality of the pedestrian environment. All uses shall be connected by sidewalks; crosswalks shall run through and across the parking lots and drive aisles, to connect all buildings and uses; sidewalks shall be wide, appealing, shaded, and configured for safe and comfortable travel; pedestrian walkways shall be separated from vehicular circulation by planting beds, raised planters, seating walls, and on-street parallel parking or structures; walking distances through parking lots shall be minimized and located to form logical and safe pedestrian crossings; and walkways shall be made more pedestrian-friendly through the use of arcades, canopies, street trees, benches, and tables and chairs.**

Ample attention has been given to ensure a safe and attractive pedestrian environment in the proposed retail center, which is compact and clustered around a shared surface parking lot surrounded by buildings. Pedestrian walkways are separated from vehicular traffic and are prominently located along appropriate access points along East West Boulevard, Melford Boulevard, and Robert Byrd Way. Sufficient on-site amenities have been provided to strengthen pedestrian comfort and create a unique shopping experience. The buildings are fully articulated with tower elements to accent the visual importance of the main entrance and main façades. Sufficient signage has been used to identify the place and businesses.

- f. **Screen parking from the streets and ensure that attractive buildings and signage are visible from the streets.**

The parking proposed in this application will be screened by buildings or by appropriately placed landscaping.

- g. **Minimize the expanse of parking lots through the use of shared parking, structured parking or decks, or landscape islands.**

The parking lots proposed in this application utilize shared parking, as authorized in the M-X-T Zone, pursuant to Section 27-574. This results in a lower minimum requirement for total spaces, than would otherwise be required in other zones.

- h. Provide a hierarchy of pedestrian-scaled, high-quality, energy-efficient, direct and indirect lighting that illuminates walkways, ensures safety, highlights buildings and landmark elements, and provides sight lines to other retail uses.**

All proposed street lighting will be energy-efficient and provide sufficient illumination of all walkways and landmark elements, without impairing sight lines between retail uses.

- i. Provide a comprehensive sign package for signs and sign standards that integrate the signage guidelines within Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01 and the previously approved sign standards contained in Detailed Site Plan DSP-11008. The standards shall address size, location, square footage, materials, and lighting. Any revision to existing approved signage plans shall incorporate the previously approved designs. The revised signage plan to consolidate the signage standards and remove inconsistencies may be approved by the Planning Director, as designee of the Planning Board.**

This DSP includes a sufficient, yet balanced, amount of signage that is necessary for the operation of the proposed retail center. In addition, details such as the area, location, materials, and lighting for the proposed signage have been provided. These details are consistent with the Melford Town Center design guidelines.

- j. Eliminate all temporary signage on the site or attached to the exterior façades of a building.**

There is no temporary signage included in this DSP.

- k. Make retail pad sites compatible with the main retail/office/hotel/residential component. If the retail pad sites are located along the street, all off-street parking shall be located to the rear or side of the pad sites. Parking provided on the side of pad sites shall be buffered with appropriate screening and/or landscape features.**

All of the commercial uses are compatible with the surrounding uses within the overall Melford project. With the exception of on-street parking along the boulevard, vehicles will be primarily parked behind or to the side of buildings and sufficiently screened with landscaping or a screen wall.

- l. Provide green areas or public plazas between pad sites, to the maximum extent possible.**

On the north side of East West Boulevard, the applicant proposes the

development of a linear park consisting of an open pavilion with seating, an ample sidewalk area, a decorative retaining wall (with brick piers and decorative fencing) overlooking the SWM pond, and a pedestrian connection which will connect to the existing trail around the pond. In addition, an outdoor sitting area is proposed along East West Boulevard, between Buildings 2 and 3, which does not have sufficient shade. However, within the right-way of the previously approved East West Boulevard, there are two shade trees within the close vicinity of this sitting area that will provide needed shade in the summer months. In addition, the applicant has provided an exhibit (the Applicant's Exhibit #3) that shows three shade trees will be planted in the area. The Planning Board concluded that the measures stated above are sufficient and therefore no additional condition is needed.

- m. Ensure that restaurants have attractive outdoor seating areas, with views of public spaces, lakes, or other natural features, where reasonably practicable.**

Future restaurant users will have opportunities for outdoor seating areas. Future Building 4 will be the site of a restaurant (with architecture to be approved in a future DSP) that will have ample outdoor sitting areas overlooking the pond to the north.

- 13. All plans shall delineate and note both the environmental setting and the impact area for Melford and Cemetery, Historic Site 71B-016.**

The environmental setting and impact area for the Melford Cemetery, Historic Site 71B-016, is not clearly shown on the plans, in accordance with this requirement. This condition has been carried forward with this DSP.

- 14. Prior to Planning Board approval of the first detailed site plan for development in the northwest or southwest neighborhood of Melford Village, the applicant in the historic area work permit process shall submit a plan and timetable for the protection, stabilization, restoration, and planned adaptive use of the buildings and gardens of the Melford and Cemetery Historic Site. The Historic Preservation Commission shall review and approve the plan and timetable through the Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) process.**

This condition has been satisfied by the Historic Preservation Commission's (HPC) approval of Historic Area Work Permit (HAWP) 2017-040. This approval is valid until September 20, 2020.

- 15. In the detailed site plan for the development of the Melford Historic Site (71B-016), its outbuildings, and its cemetery, the proposed development shall be compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the buildings. Sensitive and innovative site design techniques, such as careful siting, variation in orientation, roof shape, building materials, screening,**

landscaping, berming, and open space, should be incorporated into the proposal to minimize adverse impacts to the historic site.

This plan proposes architecture for three commercial buildings in the retail area to the west of the Melford House. The proposed architecture is compatible in scale, design, and character with the existing historical and architectural character of the Melford House. The proposed retail buildings are at a lower elevation than the Melford House and will not obstruct the views from the house to the cemetery.

- 16. Prior to approval of any preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plan applications, the Historic Preservation Section shall certify that all quarterly reports have been received in a timely manner and that the Melford site is being properly maintained.**

In a memorandum dated December 19, 2018, it was noted that the most recent quarterly report received by the Historic Preservation Section was on June 18, 2018, in accordance with this requirement. This condition will remain applicable to all future DSPs within CSP-06002-01.

- 17. The applicant shall provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, in keeping with Guideline 3 of Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-11-2006. In areas of high pedestrian activity, wide sidewalks shall be required where reasonably appropriate, unless modified by the City of Bowie for portions of sidewalk within the public right-of-way.**

The applicant is showing six-foot-wide sidewalks along the subject site's frontage on East West Boulevard, Melford Boulevard, and Robert Byrd Way, in accordance with this requirement. The subject project is in conformance with this requirement.

- 18. Curb extensions, curb cuts, crosswalks, pedestrian refuges, and other pedestrian safety features shall be provided where appropriate and shall be shown on all affected detailed site plans.**

This condition was addressed at the time of DSP-17020 for the infrastructure of the adjacent public roads. All the required crosswalks and sidewalks are shown correctly on this DSP.

- 20. The illustrative plan provided with the conceptual site plan (CSP) is for illustrative purposes only and does not reflect the final layout for any purpose, including limits of disturbance. The CSP may be used as a guide for the layout to be reviewed with the preliminary plan of subdivision or detailed site plans, but its proposed development should be modified, where development shown in the CSP is not consistent with environmental or other master plan considerations.**

The DSP has been modified from the CSP illustrative plan, in accordance with the

approved PPS and environmental, master plan, and other considerations, as allowed by this condition to implement the land use vision, as approved in CSP-06002-01.

- 21. No additional research and development flex space is permitted in the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone at Melford.**

The subject DSP does not propose any research and development flex space.

- 25. The phasing of all development proposed in CSP-06002-01 shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.**

The development proposed in this DSP will be completed in a single phase.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16006:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16006 was approved by the Planning Board on March 9, 2017, with 24 conditions. The resolution of approval (PGCPB No. 17-45) was adopted by the Planning Board on April 6, 2017. The conditions of approval, relevant to the review of this DSP, are as follows:

- 3. A substantial revision to the mix of uses on the subject property that affects Subtitle 24 adequacy findings, as set forth in a resolution of approval and on the approved plan, shall require the approval of a new preliminary plan of subdivision prior to the approval of any building permits.**

The DSP proposal regarding land use is consistent with the approved PPS.

- 9. At the time of detailed site plan and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) approval, the applicant may credit woodland conservation credit if permission of the cemetery owner is obtained, subject to approval of a historic setting vegetation management plan. The purpose of the plan is to determine where trees need to be removed to conserve the resource and where additional woodlands could be established. Implementation of the Plan would be subject to approval of a historic area work permit (HAWP). Development of a management plan would qualify trees within the environmental setting to be credit as “historic trees” at twice the usual woodland conservation ratio.**

At the time of TCP2, applicant may credit historic trees with the environmental setting of the cemetery as follows:

- a. Permission of the owner or ownership of the property shall be demonstrated.**
- b. A historic tree inventory of the environmental setting of the cemetery shall be prepared and included on the TCP2.**

- c. **A historic setting vegetation management plan for the cemetery shall be prepared for the purpose of identifying vegetation that should be removed to protect the existing graves on-site, to identify recommended maintenance activities, and to propose any additional planting appropriate for the site. The plan shall include a maintenance program for the cemetery to retain an open character over the known gravesites, a cost estimate for implementation of the plan and for a minimum of four years of maintenance and shall identify the party or parties responsible for the long-term maintenance of the environmental setting.**
- d. **The quantity of historic tree credits in the environmental setting shall be calculated and added to the woodland conservation worksheet.**
- e. **Prior to the issuance of grading permits for Melford Village which credit woodland conservation with the cemetery environmental for historic tree credit, a HAWP for implementation of the historic setting vegetation management plan shall be approved, and a bond for implementation of the plan shall be submitted. Bonding shall be held until the requirements of the plan is fully implemented, and four years of maintenance has been monitored.**

The ownership of the historic cemetery has been determined, and it is being incorporated into the DSP and the Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) with the current application. The inventory of historic trees has been completed, and a field meeting was held on-site to establish a framework for the historic setting vegetation management plan, which will be incorporated into the TCP2 and landscape plan, as appropriate. A condition has been included in this resolution requiring the provision of a historic setting vegetation management plan, to be approved by HPC or its designee, to be incorporated into the TCP2 and landscape plan prior to certification of this DSP.

11. **In conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT)* and the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A and 74B*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:**

- b. **In addition to New Road "A" and New Road "C," shared-lane Markings shall be provided along Melford Boulevard, Currie Drive and Science Drive, or as modified by the City of Bowie.**

Road cross sections were approved as part of the PPS. The City of Bowie indicated, in discussions, that the City's Department of Public Works has reviewed and approved the road cross sections included in DSP-17020. No changes are necessary to the road cross sections shown in the submitted plans.

- 16. Total development shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 2,353 AM peak-hour trips and 2,766 PM peak-hour trips. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein shall require a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities and a new preliminary plan of subdivision.**

As discussed previously, the subject application represents the construction of 57,845 square feet of retail space. With the consideration of internal trip capture and the effect of pass-by traffic, it is estimated that this development will result in a net of 67 AM and 249 PM peak-hour trips. Under concurrent review is pending DSP-18034, which represents a proposal for 205 townhomes. These 205 homes are projected to generate 144 AM and 164 PM peak trips. Collectively, all approved DSPs, plus the two pending, will generate a total of 973 AM and 1,201 PM peak trips. The trip cap will not be exceeded.

- 10. Detailed Site Plan DSP-17020:** Detailed Site Plan DSP-17020, for rough grading and infrastructure for Melford Town Center, was reviewed and approved by the Planning Board on December 7, 2017, subject to three conditions. The condition relevant to the review of the subject DSP is discussed, as follows:

- 2. At time of the first detailed site plan that proposes development of the subject property, the applicant shall:**
- a. Provide an exhibit that illustrates the location, limits, specifications and details of all off-site improvements required in Condition 10 of PPS 4-16006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-45).**
 - b. Provide the design and details for the trailhead facility required in Condition 11 of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-16006 (PGCPB Resolution No. 17-45).**

In a memorandum dated December 10, 2018, the trails coordinator stated that the revised trail exhibit included with DSP-17020 contained the trailhead facility, which is acceptable as shown. The subcondition related to the Bicycle and Pedestrian Impact Statement (BPIS) exhibit was addressed at the time of DSP-18007.

- 11. 2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Per Section 27-548, landscaping, screening, and buffering within the M-X-T Zone shall be provided, pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. The proposed retail shopping center is subject to Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Landscape Manual. The required plantings and schedules are generally in conformance with these requirements and have been provided on the submitted landscape plan. However, it is noted that the landscape plans require alternative compliance (AC) from Sections 4.2, 4.3, and 4.7, and the applicant filed a request for Alternative Compliance, AC-18017, to seek relief, as follows:

Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets

Section 4.2 specifies that, for all nonresidential uses in any zone and for all parking lots, a landscape strip shall be provided on the property abutting all public and private streets. The applicant requests AC from the requirements of Section 4.2 for a reduction in the required landscape strip widths and number of plants for portions of the frontage along the internal public streets, as follows:

REQUIRED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along East West Boulevard – North (2) (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	99 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	10 feet
Shade Trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	3
Shrubs (10 per 35 linear feet)	29

PROVIDED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along East West Boulevard – North (2) (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	99 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	0 feet
Shade Trees	0
Shrubs	0

REQUIRED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along East West Boulevard – South (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	254 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	10 feet
Shade Trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	8
Shrubs (10 per 35 linear feet)	73

PROVIDED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along East West Boulevard – South (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	254 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	0–10 feet
Shade Trees	0
Shrubs	18

REQUIRED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along Robert Byrd Way (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	412 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	10 feet
Shade Trees (1 per 35 linear feet)	12
Shrubs (10 per 35 linear feet)	116

PROVIDED: 4.2 Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets, along Robert Byrd Way (Option 1)

Length of Landscape Strip	412 feet
Width of Landscape Strip	0–10 feet
Shade Trees	8
Ornamental Trees	3
Shrubs	65

Justification

The applicant is requesting AC from Section 4.2 for two sections of East West Boulevard, totaling 353 feet, or 32.7 percent, of the 1,077-foot total frontage length, and for the entire 412-foot frontage along Robert Byrd Way, east of the proposed commercial buildings. The landscape plan proposes Option 1 to satisfy the Section 4.2 requirements along all of these frontages. Under normal circumstances, the applicant would be required to provide a 10-foot-wide landscape strip fully on the subject property directly behind the right-of-way line, planted with 1 shade tree and 10 shrubs every 35 feet.

Along East West Boulevard, due to space limitations, on-street parking, underground utilities, and wider sidewalks, the applicant proposes no landscape strip for some portions where buildings are located and minimal plant material. As an alternative to the normal requirements, the applicant proposes to provide 11 shade trees within a median in the middle of East West Boulevard, along the retail frontage. These trees are approximately 40 feet from the building face and provide an additional 110 planting units. While these trees cannot be counted toward the fulfillment of the Section 4.2 requirement, the additional trees help to define the roadway and create a streetscape, in accordance with the purposes of Section 4.2.

The Planning Board agrees that the space limitations on the site make normal compliance with Section 4.2 requirements impractical due to the building placement, which is located on a build-to line, in accordance with the Melford Village Design Guidelines established in the approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-06002-01. It is noted that this public roadway will only serve users of Melford Village, as it does not connect to outside roadways. Additionally, the Planning Board notes that the streetscape design meets or exceeds the quantity requirements for plant materials along the majority of the frontage. The applicant is proposing shade trees within the street right-of-way, which helps to clearly define the roadway, promote pedestrian activity, and establish human scale in accordance with the purposes of Section 4.2, as stated in the Landscape Manual.

However, the Planning Board conditioned that a minimum of three additional shade trees, or six ornamental trees, be provided where space allows, along the southern portion of East West Boulevard, adjacent to the commercial buildings. The additional planting will exceed the cumulative required number of trees by 10 percent and help to enhance the commercial frontage and improve the streetscape. Given the inclusion of the additional trees along the southern portion of East West Boulevard and within the median, the build-to line for the commercial buildings, and the limited users of the roadway, the Planning Board finds the applicant's proposed AC measures to be equally effective as normal compliance with Section 4.2, as conditioned.

Along Robert Byrd Way, due to the location of the roadway adjacent to the historic site to the east, in addition to the space limitations created by the travel lane, on-street parking, underground utilities, and wider sidewalks, the landscape strip width and planting requirements are not fully met on the west side, between the commercial buildings and the right-of-way. As an alternative to the normal requirements, the applicant proposes to provide an additional 13 shade trees off-site, along the east side of Robert Byrd Way.

The Planning Board notes that the plan provides the required number of shade trees in this area on the eastern and western sides of the roadway, but is deficient in the required number of shrubs, and no shrubs are proposed off-site on the east side of Robert Byrd Way. It is recommended that the applicant provide 63 shrubs, where suitable, along the east side of Robert Byrd Way, adjacent to the historic site. The additional planting will exceed the required number of shrubs by 10 percent and help to define and clearly delineate the roadway, improving the streetscape in this area. Given the inclusion of the additional trees and shrubs along the east side of Robert Byrd Way, the Planning Board finds the applicant's proposed alternative compliance measures to be equally effective as normal compliance with Section 4.2, as conditioned.

Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements

The applicant also requests AC from the requirements of Section 4.3(c)(2), Parking Lot Interior Planting, to provide 8.4 percent of interior planting area, instead of the required 10 percent, for the southern parking lot.

REQUIRED: Section 4.3(c)(2) Parking Lot Interior Planting Requirements for the southern parking lot

Parking Lot Area	67,483 square feet
Interior landscape area required	10% or 6,748 square feet
Minimum number of shade trees required (1 per 200 square feet of interior planting area provided)	34

PROVIDED: Section 4.3(c)(2) Parking lot Interior Planting Requirements for the southern parking lot

Interior landscape area provided	8.4% or 5,663 square feet
Shade trees provided	29

Justification

The applicant is requesting AC from Section 4.3(c)(2) in order to provide less than the required amount of interior planting area and shade trees. Two parking lots are proposed with this application, one north of East West Boulevard adjacent to the proposed restaurant, and one south of East West Boulevard adjacent to the proposed retail buildings. The parking lot for the restaurant provides the required amount of interior planting area and the required number of shade trees. The southern parking lot provides 1.6 percent less than the required amount of interior planting area and 15 percent less of the required number of shade trees. The requirement for interior parking lot planting is calculated independently for each parking lot, but when considered cumulatively, the amount of interior planting area and the number of shade trees proposed exceeds the required amount of interior planting area and the number of shade trees that would be required for both parking lots combined. The application proposes a total of 10,099 square feet of interior planting area and a total of 50 shade trees, which is 10.7 percent more interior planting area and 8.0 percent as many shade trees than would be required if the parking lot was combined.

While the additional planting area and shade trees within the combined parking lot is desirable, one of the design guidelines of Section 4.3 is to evenly distribute the plantings throughout the lot to maximize shading. With this in mind, the Planning Board finds that the planting size of the shade trees in the southern parking lot be increased from the normal 2- to 2.5-inch caliper to 3- to 3.5-inch caliper to provide more immediate shade to the asphalt areas. Given the provision of additional planting area and shade trees within the overall site and the enlarged tree planting size, as conditioned, the Planning Board finds the proposed alternative compliance measures to be equally effective as normal compliance with the requirements of Section 4.3(c)(2).

Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses

The DSP is subject to the requirements of Section 4.7 because it involves new buildings and is directly adjacent to uses defined as incompatible in the Landscape Manual. Specifically, it is adjacent to a historic cemetery on the northern property boundary. The M-X-T-zoned property west of proposed retail development contains a stormwater management pond and does not require an incompatible use buffer. The M-X-T-zoned property to the east, which is proposed to be developed with multifamily residential, does not require an incompatible use bufferyard, as it is part of the overall mixed-use development under a unified scheme as approved in CSP-06002-01. The appropriate schedules have been provided; however, it is noted that some of the northern and eastern schedules are incorrect. The submitted plan requires AC for the bufferyard width along the northern boundary, adjacent to the historic cemetery site.

REQUIRED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses, adjacent to the historic site

Length of bufferyard	880 feet
Minimum building setback	60 feet
Landscaped yard width	50 feet
Fence or wall	No

Percent with existing trees	60 percent
Plant units (180 per 100 l.f.)	634*

*The provided schedule incorrectly states that 140 plant units are required and must be corrected.

PROVIDED: 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses, adjacent to the historic site

Length of bufferyard	880 feet
Minimum building setback	131 feet
Landscaped yard width	39--50 feet*
Fence or wall	No
Percent with existing trees	60 percent
Plant units (80 per 100 l.f.)	190

*The provided schedule incorrectly states that the provided width is only 39 feet, but the buffer ranges from 39--50 feet. Therefore, the schedule should be revised to provide the range of buffer width proposed.

Justification

A Section 4.7 Type E bufferyard is required along the northern property line, adjacent to the historic cemetery site, which includes a 60-foot building setback and a 50-foot-wide landscape yard. The applicant is requesting relief from these requirements due to the location of the proposed parking lot. The minimum building setback is provided; however, the proposed landscape yard is reduced to 39--50 feet in width. The required number of plant units has not been met and the plans show only 190, where 634 plant units are required. However, an additional 125 plant units are shown on the plan along the historic site, but were allocated to the eastern bufferyard, which is not required. Therefore, these 125 plant units, in combination with the 190 already shown, equal 315 plant units provided adjacent to the historic site. The Planning Board finds that the applicant provide the additional 319 plant units within this bufferyard in fulfillment of the total number of plant units.

The applicant suggests that the elevation difference, in addition to the existing vegetation on the cemetery grounds, with the proposed plantings will provide an adequate visual barrier that will screen the commercial development from the historic site. The Planning Board notes that, given the low impact of the cemetery use and the mixed-use nature of the overall village development, which includes the cemetery and commercial uses, the incursion into the landscape yard width is not substantial.

Given the inclusion of the required plant units, as conditioned, in combination with the elevation change and preservation of the existing plant material, the Planning Board finds the proposed alternative compliance measures to be equally effective as normal compliance with the requirements of Section 4.7.

The Planning Board approved of Alternative Compliance AC-18017, Retail at Melford Town Center, from the requirements of Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips Along Streets,

along East West Boulevard and Robert Byrd Way; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements: and Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*, adjacent to the Melford Cemetery Historic Site, subject to one condition with eight subconditions that have been included in this resolution.

12. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size and it contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. The site already has approved Type 1 (TCP1) and Type 2 tree conservation plans. A revised Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2-036-99-13) was submitted with the DSP application.

- a. A revised Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-054-06-02, was approved for the subject property on January 16, 2018 because the previous NRIs had exceeded the validity period, required a current delineation of the 100-year floodplain, and the stream buffers required for regulated streams effective September 1, 2010 needed to be addressed.

The environmental and cultural features identified on the revised NRI, and the delineation of the PMA, have been correctly transposed onto the current application plans. The site is adjacent to a designated historic resource, but contains no PMA.

A technical error has been made on the approval block of the NRI plan. Since the time of the original approval, the NRI number was incorrectly noted as NRI-059-06, when the correct number should be NRI-054-06. Additionally, the original approval (-00) was incorrectly labeled as the -01 revision, resulting in mislabeling with the most recent submittal. This error will be corrected with any future revision to the NRI.

- b. Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-036-99-05-13 indicates that it covers a gross tract area of 428.15 acres, which is the portion of the Melford development (formerly University of Maryland Science and Tech Center) that is subject to the WCO and is significantly larger than the DSP under review.

The standard woodland conservation worksheet for the overall Melford site shows that the woodland conservation threshold for the site is 43.26 acres, based on the M-X-T zoning and a net tract area of 288.38 acres. Two federal projects (the Institute for Defense Analysis and the Holocaust Museum Analysis) and previously dedicated rights-of-way have been subtracted from the gross tract area, consistent with a previous TCP approval. Based upon the clearing proposed, the applicant has calculated the total woodland conservation requirement for the development as 71.40 acres.

The TCP2 proposes to meet the requirement with 51.13 acres of on-site preservation, including 12.02 acres of woodland conservation located on property owned by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC); 12.02 acres of on-site afforestation/reforestation; 9.12 acres of specimen/historic tree credit; and 0.42 acre of fee-in-lieu.

The TCP1 plan originally proposed preservation, afforestation, and specimen/historic tree credits within the 1.02-acre cemetery and environmental setting, but it has not been shown on prior TCP2 approvals, while an ownership issue was resolved. With this TCP2 revision, the ownership issue has been resolved, and the cemetery site is being incorporated into the DSP and TCP2, for the propose of woodland conservation credits and the preparation of a historic setting vegetation management plan.

The TCP2 shows woodland conservation being provided on property currently owned by M-NCPPC, consistent with the most recent revision to the TCP1. At the time of PPS certification, written permission from the Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR) was provided by Helen Asan of the Park Planning and Development Division, agreeing to provide 10.45 acres of preservation on M-NCPPC property. The amount of woodland conservation provided on M-NCPPC parkland has increased from 10.45 acres to 11.51 acres on the -12 TCP2 revision. Written confirmation from DPR is required for this increase in woodland conservation provided on parkland.

There are differences in quantities between the most current TCP2 approval (-11), the -12 revision which is not yet certified, and the current revision (-13), which require reconciliation. The plan also requires technical revisions, to be in conformance with the applicable WCO, Environmental Planning Section policies, and the Environmental Technical Manual, prior to certification of this DSP. The recommended conditions have been included in this resolution.

13. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, of the Prince George's County Code requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading or building permit for more than 5,000 square feet of disturbance. Properties zoned M-X-T are required to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area in TCC. The subject property is 8.83 acres in size, resulting in a TCC requirement of approximately 38,463 square feet. The subject application provides the required schedule showing the requirement being met on-site by existing trees, preserved in an amount of 103,442 square feet.
14. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject case was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized, as follows:
 - a. **Historic Preservation and Archeological Review**—The Planning Board reviewed all applicable historic-related conditions attached to prior approvals, pertinent to the review of this DSP, that has been included in the findings of this resolution.
 - b. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board found that the DSP is in conformance with Plan 2035, and concluded that master plan conformance is not required for this application.

- c. **Transportation**—The Planning Board reviewed transportation-related conditions of previous approvals and concluded that on-site traffic circulation and parking is acceptable.
- d. **Subdivision Review**—The Planning Board reviewed the applicable conditions attached to PPS 4-16006 that are relevant to the review of this DSP, as included in Finding 9 above. The Planning Board concluded that the subject DSP is in conformance with the approved PPS-4-16006.
- e. **Trails**—The Planning Board noted that the submitted site plan complies with the previously approved conditions of CSP-06002-01 and PPS 4-16006. The two conditions related to the provision of additional bicycle parking at Buildings 2 and 3 and the provision of an updated pedestrian network plan have been fully addressed by the applicant via a resubmittal during the review process.
- f. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board provided a review of all applicable conditions attached to prior approvals that are relevant to the review of this DSP and concluded that the subject DSP meets all applicable environmental regulations as follows:

Preservation of Specimen, Historic and Champion Trees

Effective on September 1, 2010, TCP applications are required to meet of the requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, of the County Code, which includes preservation of specimen, champion, and historic trees, and every reasonable effort should be made to preserve the trees in place, with consideration of different species' ability to withstand construction disturbance.

After consideration has been given to preservation of specimen or historic trees, and there remains a need to remove any, a variance from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) is required. Applicants can request a variance from the provisions of Subtitle 25, provided all the required findings in Section 25-119(d) can be met and the request is not less stringent than the requirements of the applicable provisions of Code of Maryland Regulations (COMAR). An application for a variance must be accompanied by a letter of justification stating the reasons for the request and how the request meets each of the required findings.

The NRI and TCP1 indicated that 44 specimen trees are located on the TCP2, located outside of the environmental setting of the historic site. A Subtitle 25 Variance application for the removal of 12 specimen trees was submitted and approved with the PPS.

A Historic Tree Table, located on Sheet 2, addresses individual trees located within the environmental setting of the Cemetery (#71B-016), none of which are proposed for removal. The applicant is proposing to apply special woodland conservation credits allowed to incentivize the retention of specimen, historic, or champion trees. The removal

or planting of trees within an environmental setting is subject to an HAWP.

Conditions related to the appropriate treatment of the cemetery were approved with the PPS. The Environmental Planning and Historic Preservation Sections are coordinating on preparation of a historic setting vegetation management plan, which will address preservation of the historic cemetery and protection of specimen and historic trees for woodland conservation credits. The historic setting vegetation management plan shall be incorporated into the TCP2, bonded, and implemented with the current DSP.

The Planning Board approved DSP-18026 and TCP2-036-99-13, with six conditions that have been included in this resolution.

- g. **Permits**—Relevant comments related to this DSP have been addressed by the applicant during the review process.
- h. **Prince George’s County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated November 21, 2018 (Giles to Zhang), incorporated herein by reference, DPIE stated that the City of Bowie should be consulted for issues regarding right-of-way dedication and roadway improvements, and that a SWM concept was approved by the City of Bowie on March 20, 2017. In closing, DPIE stated that the proposed development will require a DPIE site development fine grading permit.
- i. **Prince George’s County Police Department**—At the time of this writing, the Police Department has not provided comments on the subject project.
- j. **Prince George’s County Health Department**—At the time of this writing, the Health Department has not provided comments on the subject project.
- k. **Verizon**—At the time of this writing, Verizon has not provided comments on the subject project.
- l. **Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO)**—At the time of this writing, PEPCO has not provided comments on the subject project.
- m. **City of Bowie**—In a letter dated June 21, 2018 (Robinson to Hewlett), the City of Bowie noted the following:

On Monday, April 2, 2018, the Bowie City Council conducted a public hearing on the referenced DSP. At the conclusion of the public hearing, the City Council voted to recommend approval of DSP-18026 for the Retail Village East Development in Melford Town Center, with two conditions on the proposed lighting requiring the applicant to revise the photometric plan. The applicant has indicated that they intend to comply with the City’s conditions, which have been incorporated, as appropriate, into this resolution.

- n. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In comments dated October 24, 2018, WSSC offered numerous comments, which will be addressed through their separate permitting process.
- 15. Based on the foregoing analysis and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the DSP, if approved in accordance with conditions proposed below, represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9, of the County Code, without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.
- 16. The requirement of Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance reads as follows:

(4) The Planning Board may approve a Detailed Site Plan if it finds that the regulated environmental features have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130(b)(5).

The Planning Board found that the regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved and/or restored, to the fullest extent possible, based on consistency with the limits of disturbance shown on the previously approved CSP-06002-01 and Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCPI-044-98-04; Preliminary Plan 4-16006 and TCP1-044-98-05; and DSP-17020 and TCP2-036-99-11. There are no new regulated environmental features located on the development site.

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 Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP2-036-99-13 and APPROVED Alternative Compliance AC-18017 and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-18026 for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. Prior to certification, the applicant shall revise the detailed site plan (DSP) as follows or provide the specified documentation:
 - a. Provide a photometric plan to confirm that no light will spillover onto the adjoining residential development to the east of the subject site and the historic sites to the north and east.
 - b. Indicate that all lighting fixtures will be full cut-off.
 - c. Delineate the proposed property lines with all bearings and distances and label the proposed parcels.
 - d. Clarify the acreage of the land area included in the DSP and area of each proposed parcel in the general notes and on the plans.
 - e. Provide consecutive numbering of the parcels included in the DSP to correspond with the

parcel numbering on previously approved DSPs within Melford Village.

- f. Prepare a historic setting vegetation management plan in accordance with PGCPB Resolution No.17-45, Condition 9a–d, to be reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Commission or its designee, and to be incorporated into the Type 2 tree conservation plan and landscape plan.
- g. Provide written confirmation from the Prince George’s County Department of Parks and Recreation affirming any additional woodland conservation provided DPR property in excess of 10.45 acres.
- h. Delineate both the environmental setting and the impact area for Melford and Cemetery, Historic Site 71B-016, on all plans.
- i. Reconcile the DSP, landscape plan, and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2), as follows:
 - (1) The limit of disturbance affecting the cemetery and the Type E bufferyard shall be reviewed for consistency. Grading into the Type E bufferyard associated with the cemetery shall be limited to the least amount of disturbance shown on the DSP, Landscape Plans, or TCP2.
 - (2) No grading shall be shown within the environmental setting of the historic cemetery.
 - (3) A palette based on the existing tree ecotype located on the cemetery site shall be applied to the Type E bufferyard and any adjacent afforestation/reforestation areas.
 - (4) All areas credited as woodland conservation shall be planted with native material appropriate for a mixed-hardwood successional forest.
 - (5) Notes shall be added to the TCP2 plan indicating approval of Alternative Compliance AC-18017 for impacted buffer areas.

- j. The Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2) shall be revised, as follows:
- (1) On the cover sheet overall map:
 - (a) Add the correct limits of the current Detailed Site Plan, DSP-18026, and previously approved DSPs approved for the Melford development, including those that are part of Melford Town Center shall be delineated based on proposed property lines and label with the DSP application number. The limits of the DSPs which comprise Melford Town Center shall also be shown on individual sheets, as appropriate, and the graphic element delineating the limits of the DSPs shall be included in the legend.
 - (b) The location of the historic site and cemetery shall be delineated by property lines and labeled.
 - (c) The historic cemetery shall be shown as included in Detailed Site Plan DSP-18026. The remaining area of the historic resource (not including the cemetery) shall be shown as incorporated into Detailed Site Plan DSP-18034.
 - (d) Remove the label for “Limit of NRI.”
 - (e) Label the three federally developed properties on the site (the Holocaust Museum, the Census Bureau, and the Institute for Defense Analysis), and indicate that they are not included. Also label on individual plan sheets.
 - (2) The legends shall be revised to include all graphic elements used on the plans, using the standard symbols and terms shown in the Environmental Technical Manual (ETM), and be consistent on all plan sheets, as follows:
 - (a) Correctly label “afforestation/reforestation area.”
 - (b) A “temporary tree protection fence TPF” and “permanent tree (PPF) protection fence” shall be included in the legend. Revise the graphic in the legend and on the plan so the TPF is differentiated from the PPF. The TCP2 plan shows the use of TPF and PPF appropriately; TPF is temporary fencing to protect existing vegetation during clearing and grading operation and PPF is for the protection of vulnerable edge of planted area.
 - (c) The note under the legend on the coversheet indicating that temporary tree protection fence will not be used shall be removed.
 - (d) Add an additional graphic pattern in the legend and apply the plan to

differentiate “Preservation on M-MNCPPC property” from “Preservation on non-MNCPPC property,” to match the categories in the Woodland Conservation Summary Sheet.

- (3) The Standard Woodland Conservation Worksheet shall be revised as follows:
 - (a) Provide the correct TCP2 number and revision number: TCP2-036-99-13
 - (b) Correct the name of the project to “Melford – Overall”
 - (c) The quantities included in the worksheet shall be reconciled with previous approvals of the TCP2 and revisions proposed on the current plan.
 - (d) Confirm the gross tract area of the site, and the gross tract area of Melford Town Center after the addition of the historic cemetery.
 - (e) All tables and calculations shall be revised, as needed, to reflect the required revisions and reconcile quantities.
- (4) A phased woodland conservation worksheet for the overall Melford development, as of the current application, shall be included on the TCP2, which is reconciled with the Standard Woodland Conservation Worksheet quantities and includes separate columns for Detailed Site Plans DSP-18007 and DSP-18026.
- (5) An individual TCP2 worksheet for a site with a previous TCP2 shall be added to the plan to clarify the requirements and woodland conservation required and provided with the current DSP.
- (6) Revise the Woodland Conservation Summary Table, as follows:
 - (a) Revise the column titles so that the 100-year floodplain, net tract area, woodland in the 100-year floodplain, and woodland on the net tract are correctly identified.
 - (b) Include clearing in parkland as part of total clearing for the site or justify why it should be accounted for in a separate column.
 - (c) Change the title of “Donated Parkland Floodplain Clearing” to “100-Year Floodplain Cleared (acres),” or justify the purpose for the current column title.
 - (d) Confirm the correct amount of existing floodplain, 100-year floodplain clearing, and how it is addressed in the worksheet.

- (7) Confirm that all plan sheets have Woodland Conservation Sheet Summary Tables.
- (8) The standard TCP2 notes shall be revised to correct Note 3, to indicate that the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement is the responsible agency for grading permits.
- (9) Show the proposed property lines and provide metes and bound for the property lines for the retail project.
- (10) On Sheets 6, 9, and 10:
 - (a) Show the proposed property lines with metes and bounds for the retail project.
 - (b) Delineate the limits of the Type E bufferyard required for the cemetery, showing both building setback limits and landscape buffer limits, correctly labeled.
 - (c) Clearly label any retaining wall proposed, with associated grading, and provide top-of -wall and bottom- of- wall elevations.
 - (d) Provide no woodland conservation in a clear zone 10 feet wide from the top and bottom of wall.
 - (e) Show the limits of the unimpacted critical root zone (CRZ) for the specimen and historic trees within the historic cemetery, for which woodland conservation credits are proposed. Label the site as "Specimen, Historic and Champion Tree Credits" and provide the area of the associated CRZ.
 - (f) Identify individual trees proposed for "Specimen, Historic or Champion Tree Credit," which suffer critical root zone impacts, due to site grading, and may require maintenance bonding.
 - (g) Remove overlapping limits of disturbance shown on the plan, adjacent to Detailed Site Plan DSP-18007.
 - (h) Remove the dumpster enclosure out of the Type E bufferyard required for the cemetery.
- (11) Show the location of all stormwater management (SWM) features on all plans, and the location of any stormwater management easements to be consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan.

- (12) All woodland conservation areas shall meet applicable required minimum width and size design standards.
 - (13) All tables and calculations shall be revised, as needed, to reflect the required revisions,
 - (14) Add a root pruning detail to the detail sheet.
 - (15) Add an aeration detail to the detail sheet.
 - (16) Have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it.
- k. Revise the landscape plan to reflect the improvements approved in Detailed Site Plan DSP-17020 and all aspects of Alternative Compliance AC-18017.
 - l. Clearly label the various lengths of the Section 4.2 landscape strip on the plan, relative to the schedules.
 - m. Provide a minimum of three additional shade trees or six ornamental trees (or any combination thereof equal to 30 plant units) as depicted in Applicant's Exhibit #3, as space allows, along the southern side of East West Boulevard, or adjacent to the commercial buildings.
 - n. Update the schedule to provide the range of landscape strip width provided for the Section 4.2 landscape strip, along East West Boulevard – North (2).
 - o. Provide an additional 63 shrubs, where suitable, along the eastern side of Robert Byrd Way, adjacent to the historic site.
 - p. Increase the planting size of the shade trees in the interior planting area in the southern parking lot to 3- to 3.5-inch caliper.
 - q. Revise the Section 4.7 schedules to accurately reflect all of the requirements.
 - r. Provide the required number of plant units within the Section 4.7 Northern (1) bufferyard, which should include the plant units previously counted towards the Eastern (1) bufferyard.
 - s. The Site Photometric Plan should be revised to eliminate dark areas of 0.0 foot-candles of illumination west of Building #4, south of Building #5, and between Buildings #1 and #2.
 - t. The number of S3 light/pole locations on the Site Photometric Plan should be recalculated to resolve the discrepancy between the number of locations vs. the number

provided in the table.

2. Prior to approval of the final plat, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a variation from Section 24-122(a), in accordance with Section 24-113 of the Subdivision Regulations, for placement of the utilities within the right-of-way for Lake Melford Avenue and Robert Byrd Way, and obtain agreement from the City of Bowie.
3. Prior to issuance of grading permits for this detailed site plan (DSP), the applicant shall:
 - a. Submit a copy of the technical stormwater management plan, to be reviewed for conformance with the DSP and Type 2 tree conservation plan.
 - b. Submit a copy of the approved final erosion and sediment control plan, to be reviewed for conformance with the limit of disturbance shown on the DSP and Type 2 tree conservation plan.

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, Bailey, Doerner, and Hewlett voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 17, 2019, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 24th day of January 2019.

Elizabeth M. Hewlett
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

EMH:JJ:HZ:gh