



*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at [www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm](http://www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm).*

## Preliminary Plan 4-06061

Application	General Data
<b>Project Name:</b> <b>EAST GATE SHOPPING CENTER, LOT 2</b>  <b>Location:</b> North side of East Gate Drive at the southwest quadrant of Greenbelt Road and Lanham-Severn Road.  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> Greenbelt Hospitality, LLC. 1721 Reisterstown Road Pikesville, Maryland 21208	Date Accepted: 06/28/06
	Planning Board Action Limit: 10/7/06
	Plan Acreage: 2.65
	Zone: C-S-C
	Lot: 1
	Parcels: 0
	Planning Area: 70
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 03
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 209NE09

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
COMMERCIAL SUBDIVISION	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-58-2003)
	05/17/06
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed:
	09/05/06

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Ivy R. Thompson	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
		X	

**THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION**

**PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD**

**STAFF REPORT**

**SUBJECT:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06061  
East Gate Shopping Center, Lot 2

**OVERVIEW**

The subject property consists of approximately 2.65 acres of land in the C-S-C Zone. It is currently undeveloped land adjacent to the East Gate Shopping Center in the Lanham-Severn area. The applicant proposes to re-subdivide Lot 2 for development with a hotel. Access is proposed from an existing driveway to Greenbelt Road and from Forbes Boulevard, a road the applicant will dedicate and construct.

The subject property was previously reviewed as Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-01067. The Planning Board's conditions of approval on Preliminary Plan 4-01067 are found in Resolution No. 02-26, which was approved on February 14, 2002.

The Planning Board also approved DSP-02039 and their conditions of approval are found in Resolution No. 02-258 C, which was approved on December 19, 2002. Grading and building permits have been issued for the site and much of the infrastructure has been built. A revision to DSP-02039 was approved in August 2006 to revise a building footprint. A second revision to DSP-02039 is pending to develop Lot 2 with a hotel.

At the writing of this staff report, in accordance with Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations, staff is compelled to recommend disapproval of the subject application, as discussed further in Finding Two of this report due to inadequate transportation facilities.

This case is within the first seventy days of its review period. The applicant submitted a seventy-day waiver letter dated September 25, 2006. The applicant has also submitted a letter dated September 25, 2006, requesting a continuance to a non-specified date to allow additional time to negotiate transportation concerns.

**SETTING**

The property is located in the southwest quadrant of the intersection of Greenbelt Road (MD 193) and Lanham-Severn Road (MD 564.) It is adjacent to the East Gate Shopping Center along Greenbelt Road. The overall property is zoned C-S-C and totals 19.95 acres. Lot 2 contains 2.65 acres. Abutting property to the east is zoned R-R, but is undeveloped.

**FINDINGS AND REASONS FOR STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

1. **Development Data Summary**—The following information relates to the subject preliminary plan application and the proposed development.

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone	C-S-C	C-S-C
Use(s)	Vacant	Commercial
Acreage	2.65	2.65
Lots	1	1
Parcels	0	0
Mitigation	0	None

2. **Transportation**—The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the preliminary plan of the above-referenced property. The 2.65-acre, C-S-C-zoned property is located to the east of Lanham Severn Road (MD 564), south of Greenbelt Road (MD 193) and adjacent to the existing Eastgate Shopping Center. The subject application proposes the construction of an All Suites Hotel/Motel consisting of 122 rooms.

### **Background**

On January 24, 2002, the Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-01067 (PGCPB No. 02-26) for Eastgate Shopping Center. Pursuant to PGCPB 02-26, the preliminary plan (Lots 1, 2 and 3) was approved with several conditions, including the following that relate to transportation:

7. **Total development within the proposed subdivision shall be limited to the equivalent of 36,300 square feet of gross floor area of commercial retail development or any other permitted uses which generate no more than 74 AM and 129 PM peak hour vehicle trips. Any development other than that identified herein shall require an additional preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**
8. **Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for construction through the SHA access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the SHA or the DPW&T:**
  - a. **Change the eastbound and westbound MD 193 exclusive right turn lanes to right/through lanes at its intersection with Good Luck Road;**
  - b. **Provide an additional left turn lane to northbound Mission Drive and an additional left turn lane to westbound MD 193 at the intersection of MD 193 with Mission Drive;**
  - c. **Provide access frontage widening to provide for four lanes along MD 564, a left turn lane along northbound MD 564 at the proposed intersection of MD 564 and the proposed access to Forbes Blvd.**
9. **At the time of final plat, the applicant shall dedicate to public use, the right-of-way for Forbes Boulevard as shown on the preliminary plan.**

Staff is in receipt of a traffic study prepared for the applicant dated June 2006. Staff's initial review of the study revealed that an incorrect procedure was used to analyze the intersection of MD 564 and the site entrance. The traffic consultant was notified of this and was required by staff to provide an addendum utilizing the appropriate procedure. The results of the analyses below reflect the correct procedures pursuant to our guidelines.

### Traffic Study Analyses:

The study identified the following intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD 193 and Mission Drive	D/1,335	D/1,359
MD 193 and MD 564	F/1,346	F/1,321
MD 564 and site entrance	A/26.3 secs.	E/48.2 secs

The traffic study identified ten background developments whose impact would affect some or all of the study intersections. Additionally, a growth rate of 1 percent per year (between 2006 and 2009) was applied to the existing traffic counts along MD 564. A growth rate of 2 percent per year was applied to the through traffic along MD 193. A second analysis was done to evaluate the impact of the background developments on existing infrastructure. The analysis revealed the following results:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
MD 193 and Mission Drive	D/1,384	D/1,362
MD 193 and MD 564	<b>F/1,919</b>	<b>F/1,727</b>
MD 564 and site entrance	<b>F/59.5 secs.</b>	<b>F/479.1 secs.</b>

Discussion between the traffic consultant and staff revealed that at the time of the approval of the original Eastgate Preliminary Plan of Subdivision (4-01067), trips attributed to Lot 2, which is the subject of the current application, were not computed in any of the analyses on which adequacy was determined. It was further revealed that the total square footage or gross floor area (GFA) of the buildings that are now under construction pursuant to the original plan (4-01067) is less than the GFA that was used as the basis of the original findings of adequacy. This reduction in GFA has the practical effect of creating excess capacity that could be earmarked for "Lot 2" which is the subject of this application (4-06061). The following table shows the breakdown of reassigned trips:

Total Retail (2001 study)	16,000				
Total Restaurant (2001 study)	17,100				
Currently being constructed - Retail	8,400				
Currently being constructed - Restaurant	16,643				
		AM Peak		PM Peak	
		In	Out	In	Out
Remaining Retail	7,600	20	13	46	46
Remaining Restaurant	457	3	3	5	4
<b>Total Trips Remaining</b>		<b>24</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>49</b>
Pass-by (30%)*		7	5	15	15
Diverted (30%)*		7	5	15	15
Total New Trips Remaining		9	6	20	20
<b>New Land Use - Hotel (2006)</b>		43	37	55	43
<b>Total New Trips Generated by Hotel</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>23</b>
* Same percentage used in 2001 study					

Using the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*, the study has indicated that the proposed development of a hotel/motel (with 122 units) will be adding 65 (34 in; 31 out) new AM peak hour trips and 58 (35 in; 23 out) new PM peak hour trips at the time of full build-out. A third analysis was done, whereby the impact of the proposed developments was evaluated. The results of that analysis is as follows:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
MD 193 and Mission Drive	D/1,391	D/1,375
MD 193 and MD 564	<b>F/1,924</b>	<b>F/1,734</b>
MD 564 and site entrance	<b>F/69.4 secs.</b>	<b>F/568.5 secs.</b>

The results shown in the table above have indicated that the intersection of MD 193 and MD 564 will operate inadequately under “total” condition. In its conclusion, the traffic study has indicated that the MD 193/MD 564 intersection will operate inadequately with or without the proposed development. The study further stated that the previously approved Eastgate Shopping Center (PGCPB 02-26) had been approved with sufficient improvements to provide adequate mitigation measures at other intersections, such that the proposed application should not be charged to provide any additional improvement to the MD 193/MD 564 intersection.

#### **Staff review and comments:**

Upon review of the applicant’s traffic study, staff does not concur with its findings and conclusion.

Because the traffic from the proposed development will impact county as well as Maryland State roads, copies of the traffic study were referred to both the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and transportation (DPW&T) for review and comments. In

its review of the study, the SHA (in an August 21, 2006, letter to staff) concurred with the study that the MD 193/MD 564 intersection will indeed operate inadequately and suggested, “mitigating” improvements. Specifically, the SHA suggested that the applicant provide double left turn lanes on the northbound and westbound approaches to the intersection. Staff agrees that these improvements suggested by SHA would mitigate well above 150 percent of the site-generated critical trips required to meet the criterion for mitigation. However, neither the MD 193 nor MD 564 corridor is among the eligible corridors for which mitigation is allowed. Consequently, any improvement provided by the applicant for this intersection, must meet the LOS D/1450 threshold.

Like SHA, the DPW&T did offer comments based on the original traffic study that was sent out on referral. In an August 1, 2006, memorandum to staff (Issayans to Burton) Mr Issayans, the county’s Chief Traffic Engineer— recommends a number of off-site improvements, many of which fall under the jurisdiction of the SHA. Within DPW&T’s purview however, Mr. Issayans recommends that the applicant conduct a signal warrant study for the MD 564/site entrance intersection after build-out of the subject application occurs, and that the applicant install a signal if deemed necessary. DPW&T also requires that the applicant construct the proposed Eastgate Drive, which is a master planned urban collector road.

## TRANSPORTATION STAFF FINDINGS

The application is a preliminary plan of subdivision for a Hotel/Motel consisting of 122 units. Based on trip rates from the Guidelines, this proposed development will be generating 80 (43 in; 37 out) AM peak hour trips and 98 (55 in; 43 out) PM peak hour trips at the time of full build-out. However, taking into consideration the effect of pass-by traffic, as well as surplus capacity created by the un-built portion of the previously approved Eastgate center, the net number of new trips that this site will generate is 65 (34 in; 31 out) AM peak hour trips and 58 (35 in; 23 out) PM peak hour trips.

The traffic generated by the proposed preliminary plan would impact the following intersections:

- MD 193 and Mission Drive;
- MD 193 and MD 564;
- MD 564 and site entrance.

None of the intersections, identified above are programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Maryland Department of Transportation Consolidated Transportation Program or the Prince George’s County Capital Improvement Program:

The subject property is located within the Developing Tier as defined in the *Prince George’s County Approved General Plan*. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards: **Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) D, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,450 or better; **Unsignalized intersections:** *The Highway Capacity Manual* procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, the Planning Board has generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

The following intersections, when analyzed with the total future traffic as developed using the Guidelines, were not found to be operating at or better than the policy service level defined above:

- MD 564 and MD 193;
- MD 564 and site entrance.

While the DPW&T recommends that a traffic signal warrant study be conducted *after* the site is constructed, the inadequacy at the MD 193/MD 564 intersection must be addressed prior to preliminary plan approval. To date, the applicant has offered no improvement that would ameliorate the inadequacy; consequently staff cannot make an affirmative finding of adequacy at this time.

#### **TRANSPORTATION STAFF CONCLUSIONS**

The Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate access roads will not exist as required by Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends DISAPPROVAL of Preliminary Plan 4-06061 and TCPI/26/01-01, because of inadequate transportation facilities as required under Section 24-124 of the Prince George's County Code.