



The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Development Review Division
301-952-3530

Note: Staff reports can be accessed at <http://mncppc.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx>

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision Reconsideration Hearing Beech Tree C-S-C Parcel

4-09041

REQUEST	STAFF RECOMMENDATION
Reconsideration Hearing	APPROVAL

Location: South of Leeland Road, west of US 301 (Robert Crain Highway).			
Gross Acreage:	28		
Zone:	C-S-C		
Gross Floor Area:	300,000 sq. ft.		
Lots/Dwelling Units:	N/A		
Parcels:	19		
Planning Area:	79		
Council District:	06		
Election District:	03		
Municipality:	N/A		
200-Scale Base Map:	203SE14		
Applicant/Address: VOB Limited Partnership 8133 Leesburg Pike, Suite 300 Vienna, VA 22182		Planning Board Date:	09/10/2020
Staff Reviewer: Thomas Sievers Phone Number: 301-952-3994 Email: Thomas.Sievers@ppd.mncppc.org		Planning Board Action Limit:	N/A
		Memorandum Date:	09/02/2020
		Date Received:	06/17/2020
		Previous Parties of Record (Applicant)	06/10/2020
		Previous Parties of Record (M-NCPPC)	06/25/2020 08/26/2020

The Planning Board encourages all interested persons to request to become a person of record for this application. Requests to become a person of record may be made online at http://www.mncppcapps.org/planning/Person_of_Record/. Please call 301-952-3530 for additional information.

September 2, 2020

MEMORANDUM

TO: The Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Sherri Conner, Supervisor, Subdivision and Zoning Section
Development Review Division

FROM: Thomas Sievers, Senior Planner, Subdivision and Zoning Section
Development Review Division

SUBJECT: **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-09041**
Reconsideration Hearing
Beech Tree C-S-C Parcel

By letter dated June 10, 2020, Robert J. Antonetti, Jr, representing VOB Limited Partnership, requested a waiver of the Prince George's County Planning Board's Rules of Procedure (Section 10(a)), and a reconsideration of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision PPS 4-09041, which was originally approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on January 13, 2011. In this case, the resolution of approval (PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2)) was adopted by the Planning Board on February 10, 2011 and mailed out on February 15, 2011.

On July 9, 2020, the Planning Board granted a waiver of the Planning Board Rules of Procedure for a reconsideration request submitted more than 14 days from the mail out of the resolution. The Planning Board also granted the applicant's request for a reconsideration, in accordance with Section 10(e) of the Rules of Procedure, based on other good cause, inadvertence, and in furtherance of substantial public interest. Specifically, the applicant requests reconsideration of Conditions 7, 12, and 13(a) through (d), and Finding 8 related to transportation improvements and the trip cap for the site.

The subject PPS (4-09041) was approved based on a mix of retail uses totaling 300,000 square feet of gross floor area, which included a concept proposal for a food or beverage store and gas station. The traffic study, at that time, mistakenly excluded trips for a food or beverage store and gas station, which would generate more trips than an average commercial/retail use. Development continues to be proposed at a maximum of 300,000 square feet, however, the existing trip cap will not support the food or beverage store and gas station that were proposed with the original approval.

Conditions 7, 12, and 13(a) through (d) of the resolution are currently stated, as follows:

- 7. The total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 105 (64 in, 41 out) AM peak-hour trips and 672 (336 in, 336 out) PM peak-hour trips, in consideration of the approved trip rates and the approved methodologies for computing pass-by and internal trip capture rates. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new Preliminary Plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**
- 12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for each of the following stages of development, in lieu of construction along US 301, the applicant shall pay to DPW&T an amount calculated as \$1,165,325.00 x (Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index at time of payment) / (ENR Construction Cost Index for 2nd quarter, 1989).**

The aforementioned fee shall be prorated for each of the proposed development stages as follows:

**Stage I – 125,000 square feet
Stage II – 75,000 square feet
Stage III – 25,000 square feet
Stage IV – 25,000 square feet
Stage V – 50,000 square feet**

- 13. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the following improvements shall be in place, under construction, bonded (or letter of credit given to the appropriate agency for construction), 100 percent funded in a CIP/CTP or otherwise provided by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees:**

Leeland Road/Moores Plains Boulevard

- a. Construct a right turn lane at the eastbound approach**
- b. Construct a left turn lane at the westbound approach**
- c. Install a traffic signal if deemed necessary by DPW&T**

Oak Grove Road/Church Road

- d. Construct a separate left lane and a shared through and right turn lane on the eastbound approach**

Oak Grove Road/MD 193

- e. Widen the existing one-lane roundabout to provide two travel lanes**
- f. On the southbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and left turn lane**

- g. On the northbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and right turn lane**
- h. On the westbound (Oak Grove Road) leg of the roundabout, provide a left turn lane and a shared right and left turn lane**

Subsequent to the approval of the PPS, the applicant reviewed the possibility of constructing a gas station with a food and beverage store, and at that time determined that the trip cap was not sufficient to accommodate the proposed use. Even though the square footage of the use is small, due to the presence of the fuel pumps and the nature of the food service within the store, the use is very trip-intensive during peak hours, especially in the morning. A further review of the PPS case file indicated that the site development plan showed a building configuration very similar to what is depicted for a food and beverage store with gasoline pumps. Given that other recent cases had indicated that gas stations with food and beverage stores should be analyzed separately from general retail centers, staff agrees that the trip cap for PPS 4-09041, shown in Condition 7 of the resolution, should have taken into account the specific gas station with food and beverage store uses, in addition to the general retail uses, based on the evidence in the record.

The applicant requests that the Planning Board reconsider Conditions 7, 12, and 13(a) through (d) of PPS 4-09041 (PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2)), as well as Transportation Finding 8, as appropriate (to reflect the analysis resulting in the amended conditions), to include a corrected trip cap and the resulting modified transportation improvements. The applicant's June 10, 2020 reconsideration and waiver request letter sets forth the proposed revised conditions based on a May 5, 2020 traffic study, which reanalyzes the 2010 traffic study, which was part of the record and approval of PPS 4-09041, to include the food or beverage store and gas station uses.

The additional trips would result in the need to amend Condition 7 and would alter the applicant's pro-rata obligation to contribute to the approved US 301 Capital improvement Program (CIP) project. Consequentially, the applicant has requested that Condition 12 be amended to increase the pro-rata share of the US 301 CIP improvements. The applicant also requests amendments to Condition 13 that are discussed below.

The report provided by the applicant is identical to the traffic impact study that was provided during review of PPS 4-09041, but reflective of the adjusted trip cap to include the gas station and food and beverage store. The following comments are provided in support of each of the requests made by the applicant:

1. Regarding the revised trip cap, once again, a further review of the case file indicated that the site development plan showed a building configuration very similar to gasoline pumps and a food and beverage store. Given that other recent cases had indicated that gas stations with food and beverage stores should be analyzed separately from general retail centers, it was agreed that the trip cap for PPS 4-09041, shown in Condition 7 of the resolution, should have taken this into account. Given that the food and beverage store is proposed to be a maximum of 5,000 square feet, that amount has been deducted from the square footage of the retail center, and so the resulting commercial square footage proposed remains at 300,000 square feet, as originally approved. This is reflected in a new trip generation table to be added under Finding 8 in the recommendation below.

2. The additional trips that would result in amending Condition 7 would alter the applicant's pro-rata obligation to contribute to the approved US 301 CIP project. This is a fair and supportable change to Condition 12.
3. The applicant proposes several changes to Condition 13, and the proposed changes are discussed further below:
 - a. The applicant desires to delete Conditions 13(a) and 13(b) and merge these two conditions into Condition 13(c). All three subconditions relate to the intersection of Leeland Road and Moores Plains Boulevard. The first two require construction of separate left-turn and right-turn lanes on the east-west approaches; the third requires the installation of a signal, if deemed necessary by the County. The applicant proposes that the signal be installed, if deemed warranted and necessary, and the Transportation staff agrees with this modification, given that installation must meet warrants. The applicant also proposes that the installation include any turn lanes determined to be necessary by the County. In response, staff finds that the lanes were apparently proffered by the applicant in the original traffic study, but were not required for adequacy. Also, the staff notes that the "Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1" state that, "Signalization shall be considered only when all approaches to an intersection are a minimum of two approach lanes." In other words, when a signal is warranted, the County is very likely to require that the approaches be widened or restriped to provide at least two approach lanes on each leg, which is likely the rationale as to why the original traffic study chose to proffer the turn lanes. While the revisions proposed by the applicant are very consistent with current and past policies, the applicant should be aware that the County may require the turn lanes to be constructed if the signal is warranted.
 - b. The applicant desires to modify Condition 13(d). This condition requires improvements at the existing Oak Grove Road and Church Road intersection, and the applicant asserts that the condition should be modified to require this improvement, "unless modified by DPW&T." This additional language is necessary to reflect the likely complete relocation of the existing Oak Grove/Leeland Road alignment, consistent with the requirements of the most recent master plan for the area. The realignment of this intersection is currently under plan review by the County.

The applicant provides compelling justification, which is supported by staff, for a reconsideration and amendment of the conditions explained above, and Finding 8 as set forth in the recommendation below. The staff analysis shows that a number of relevant facts were not included in the original traffic study provided by the applicant, which would have resulted in a different outcome in the transportation analysis and conditions of approval of the PPS. The facts are related to the inclusion of trip generations specific to food or beverage store and gas station uses, which were anticipated as probable uses for the site. As set forth in the Transportation Planning Section memorandum dated August 21, 2020 (Masog to Sievers), incorporated by reference herein, staff reviewed the applicant's analysis and concurs with its findings and conclusions and further finds that adequate transportation facilities will exist to serve the proposed development, as required by Section 24-124 of the Subdivision Regulations, subject to the recommended conditions.

If the Planning Board approves the reconsideration, staff will prepare an amended resolution to reflect the amended findings and conditions, which will be placed on a future Planning Board agenda for adoption.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL of a reconsideration of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-09041 (PGCPB Resolution No. 11-02(C)(A/2)) to **amend Finding 8 and Conditions 7, 12, and 13(a) through (d)**, as follows (strikethrough indicates deletion, underlining indicates added text):

Amendment 1-Finding 8

Under Finding 8 of PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2), Transportation, following the Background Conditions table on page 36, revise the entire discussion to the end of the subheading Analysis of Traffic Impacts to read as follows:

Using the “Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals,” as well as the Institute of Transportation Engineer (ITE) Trip Generation Manual, 8th Edition, the traffic study has indicated that the proposed development (~~300,000 square foot shopping center~~) will add ~~105 (64 in, 41 out) AM peak-hour trips and 672 (336 in, 336 out) PM peak-hour trips at the time of full build-out~~ will generate the following traffic:

<u>Trip Generation Summary: 4-09041: Beech Tree C-S-C Parcel</u>								
<u>Land Use</u>	<u>Use Quantity</u>	<u>Metric</u>	<u>AM Peak Hour</u>			<u>PM Peak Hour</u>		
			<u>In</u>	<u>Out</u>	<u>Tot</u>	<u>In</u>	<u>Out</u>	<u>Tot</u>
Food and Beverage Store with Gasoline Pumps	16	Fueling positions	132	133	265	152	153	305
Less Pass-By (50 percent AM and PM)			-66	-67	-133	-76	-77	-153
Net Gas/Food and Beverage Store Trips			<u>66</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>132</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>76</u>	<u>152</u>
Retail	295,000	Square feet	183	117	300	944	944	1,888
Less Internal Trips (30 percent from 2010 TIS)			-55	-35	-90	-283	-283	-566
Less Pass-By (50 percent from 2010 TIS)			-65	-41	-106	-330	-331	-661
Net Retail Trips			<u>63</u>	<u>41</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>331</u>	<u>330</u>	<u>661</u>
Total Trips			<u>129</u>	<u>107</u>	<u>236</u>	<u>407</u>	<u>406</u>	<u>813</u>
Trip Cap					<u>236</u>			<u>813</u>

As was the case for the background analyses, the study assumed full build-out up to the year 2015. Applying a growth rate of three percent per year for through traffic along US 301 and combining the site-generated traffic along with background developments, the following results were determined:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection/Link	(LOS/CLV) AM	(LOS/CLV) PM
Leeland Road (Church Rd. to Moores Plains Blvd.)	0.42 – v/c ratio	0.49 – v/c ratio
US 301 SB/ Old Central Avenue **	>999 secs.	>999 secs.
US 301 NB/ Old Central Avenue **	>999 secs.	>999 secs.
US 301/Trade Zone Ave.	F/2235 <u>F/2237</u>	F/2811 <u>F/2816</u>
US 301/Leeland Road	F/2410 <u>F/2413</u>	F/2872 <u>F/2861</u>
US 301/Swanson/Beech Tree	F/2049 <u>F/2053</u>	F/2672 <u>F/2675</u>
US 301/Village Drive	F/1716 <u>F/1719</u>	F/2139 <u>F/2142</u>
US 301/MD 725	F/2080 <u>F/2082</u>	F/2244 <u>F/2245</u>
US 301/Chrysler Drive-Chevy Drive	<u>F/1668</u>	<u>F/1995</u>
Leeland Road/Site Access	A/526 <u>A/620</u>	A/678 <u>A/781</u>
Leeland Road/Safeway Access **	26.2 <u>17.5</u> secs.	40.1 <u>29.3</u> secs.
Leeland Road/Moores Plains Blvd. **	314.4 <u>172.5</u> secs.	331.2 <u>253.3</u> secs.
Oak Grove Road/Church Road **	1051.0 <u>>999</u> secs.	2603.0 <u>>999</u> secs.
MD 193/Oak Grove Road (Roundabout) *	2.57 <u>1.980</u> – v/c ratio	1.29 <u>1.418</u> – v/c ratio
** Unsignalized		
* Roundabout		

To provide adequate levels of service at the facilities mentioned above, the traffic study cited improvements along US 301 between Central Avenue (MD 214) and Chevy/Chrysler Drive, which are described in the current Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (CIP) FY 2011–2016, Project FD669161. Specifically, the CIP describes the improvements as “providing one to three additional through lanes along north and south bound US 301 between MD 214 and MD 725 and further widening, as needed at Trade Zone Avenue, MD 214 and MD 725. Associated intersection improvements at Old Central Avenue, Trade Zone Avenue, Leeland Road and Village Drive West also will be undertaken.” Improvements along Leeland/Oak Grove Road were also identified; those improvements will be provided by the applicant.

The improvements that have been identified in the applicant's traffic impact study, as needed to provide adequate levels of service for the 2010 build-out, are as follows:

US 301 (NB, SB)/Old Central Avenue (CIP)

1. Construct one additional northbound through lane along US 301.
2. Construct one additional southbound through lane along US 301.

US 301/Trade Zone Avenue (CIP)

1. Construct an additional northbound left turn lane along US 301.
2. Construct a third eastbound left turn lane along Trade Zone Avenue.
3. Construct three additional southbound through lanes along US 301.
4. Construct two additional northbound through lanes along US 301.

US 301/Leeland Road (CIP)

1. Construct two additional northbound through lanes along US 301.
2. Construct an additional eastbound left turn lane along Leeland Road.
3. Construct three additional southbound through lanes along US 301.
4. Construct an additional northbound left turn lane along US 301.

US 301/Beech Tree Parkway—Swanson Road (CIP)

1. Construct two additional northbound through lanes along US 301.
2. Construct two eastbound left turn lanes along Beech Tree Parkway.
3. Construct three additional southbound through lanes along US 301.
4. Construct an additional northbound left turn lane along US 301.

US 301/Village Drive (CIP)

1. Construct two additional northbound through lanes along US 301.
2. Construct one additional southbound through lane along US 301.

US 301/MD 725 (CIP)

1. Construct two additional northbound through lanes along US 301.
2. Construct two additional southbound through lanes along US 301.
3. Construct an additional eastbound left turn lane along MD 725.

US 301/Chrysler—Chevy Drive (CIP)

1. Construct one additional northbound through lane along US 301 pursuant to Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) standards.
2. Construct one additional southbound through lane along US 301 pursuant to SHA standards.

Leeland Road/Site Access

1. Construct a right turn lane at the eastbound approach.
2. Construct a left turn lane at the westbound approach.
3. Construct a separate left and right turn lane at the northbound approach.
4. Install a traffic signal if deemed necessary by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T).

Leeland Road/Moores Plains Boulevard

1. ~~Construct a right turn lane at the eastbound approach.~~
2. ~~Construct a left turn lane at the westbound approach.~~
3. 1. Install a traffic signal if deemed warranted and necessary by DPW&T. This would also include any turn lanes deemed necessary by DPW&T.

Oak Grove Road/Church Road

1. Construct a separate left lane and a shared through and right turn lane on the eastbound approach, unless modified by DPW&T. Further, this improvement is not required if relocated Oak Grove Road is bonded to create the new relocated intersection of Oak Grove Road at Church Road.

Oak Grove Road/MD 193

1. Widen the existing one-lane roundabout to provide two travel lanes.
2. On the southbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and left turn lane.
3. On the northbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and right turn lane.
4. On the westbound (Oak Grove Road) leg of the roundabout, provide a left turn lane and a shared right and left turn lane.

Citing these improvements, the traffic study projected the following levels of service:

TOTAL CONDITIONS with improvements		
Intersection/Link	(LOS/CLV) AM	(LOS/CLV) PM
US 301 SB/ Old Central Avenue	B/1083 <u>B/1084</u>	D/1361 <u>D/1362</u>
US 301 NB/ Old Central Avenue	D/1399 <u>D/1401</u>	D/1340 <u>D/1341</u>
US 301/Trade Zone Ave.	C/1197 <u>C/1198</u>	D/1373 <u>D/1375</u>
US 301/Leeland Road	D/1313 <u>D/1315</u>	D/1413 <u>D/1410</u>
US 301/Swanson/Beech Tree	D/1427 <u>D/1428</u>	D/1401 <u>D/1403</u>
US 301/Village Drive	B/1132 <u>B/1133</u>	D/1339 <u>D/1341</u>
US 301/MD 725	D/1414 <u>D/1415</u>	D/1371 <u>D/1372</u>
US 301/Chrysler Drive-Chevy Drive	B/1145	D/1409
Leeland Road/Safeway Access **	26.2 <u>17.5</u> secs.	40.1 <u>29.3</u> secs.
Leeland Road/Moores Plains Blvd.	A/847 <u>A/881</u>	A/760 <u>A/797</u>
Oak Grove Road/Church Road (signalized)	D/1377 <u>D/1434</u>	D/1344 <u>C/1296</u>
MD 193/Oak Grove Road (with 2-lane roundabout)	0.70 <u>0.820</u> - v/c ratio	0.55 <u>0.799</u> - v/c ratio

Based on the results shown in the aforementioned table, all of the critical intersections were shown to operate at adequate levels of service.

In addition to analyzing the projected levels of service for the intersections along US 301, the traffic study also identified the overall cost of the CIP improvements, the capacity created as a result of the improvements, and the site's proportion of the capacity created by the improvements. According to the applicant's traffic study, the total cost of CIP improvements as used in the analyses would be \$33,295,000. The study also indicated that approximately ~~3.5~~ 3.9 percent of the capacity created by the CIP improvements would be needed for the proposed development. The study concludes therefore, that a reasonable fair share contribution towards the CIP improvements would be ~~\$1,165,325 (\$33,295,000.00 x 3.5%)~~ \$1,268,549 (\$33,295,000.00 x 3.9%).

Amendment 2-Finding 8

Under Finding 8 of PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2), Transportation, revise subheading "Transportation Findings," items a and c (no revisions to item b), to read as follows:

- a. The application is a preliminary plan for commercial retail development consisting of a 300,000-square-foot ~~shopping~~ commercial center. The proposed development will generate ~~105 (64 in, 41 out)~~ 236 (129 in, 107 out) AM peak-hour trips and ~~672 (336 in, 336 out)~~ 813 (407 in, 406 out) PM peak-hour trips at the time of full build-out. These trip rates have factored in the effect of pass-by traffic as well as trips that were captured internally, given the site's proximity to the Beech Tree residential development. If the historic site and barn which are to remain are utilized as commercial, they are subject to the trip cap and all transportation conditions as opposed to being utilized as residential.
- c. All of the intersections (along US 301) identified in (b) above are programmed for improvement with 100 percent construction funding within the next six years in the current Prince George's County Capital Improvement Program (FY 2011-2016). While the CIP identifies this project as being fully funded, there is also a provision for developer contributions should funding from the State of Maryland be delayed. This applicant has proffered a contribution of ~~\$1,165,325~~ \$1,268,549, to be made in phase with development.

To date, the following developments have made financial commitments towards the aforementioned CIP improvements through Planning Board resolutions:

Project Name	Plan Number	PGCPB Resolution	Amount Contributed
Collington (Safeway)	4-97044	No. 97-214(C)	\$456,000.00
Marlboro Square	4-96084	No. 96-342	\$30,880.00
Meadowbrook	4-89227	No. 90-102	\$106,948.31
Karington	4-04035	No. 04-247(C)	\$725,094.25
Beech Tree	CDP-9706	No. 98-50	\$1,194,805.08
Buck Property (Balmoral)	4-03100	No. 04-21	\$172,252.64
Willowbrook	4-06066	No. 07-43	\$1,096,920.00
Locust Hill	4-06075	No. 07-28	\$858,700.00
	TOTAL		\$4,641,600.28

Amendment 3-Condition 7

Revise Condition 7 of PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2) to read as follows:

7. The total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than ~~105 (64 in, 41 out)~~ 236 AM peak-hour trips and ~~672 (336 in, 336 out)~~ 813 PM peak-hour trips, in consideration of the approved trip rates and the approved methodologies for computing pass-by and internal trip capture rates. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified herein above shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

Amendment 4-Condition 12

Revise Condition 12 of PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2) to read as follows:

12. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for each of the following stages of development, in lieu of construction along US 301, the applicant shall pay to DPW&T an amount calculated as ~~\$1,165,325.00~~ \$1,268,549.00 x (Engineering News Record (ENR) Construction Cost Index at time of payment) / (ENR Construction Cost Index for 2nd quarter, 1989).

The aforementioned fee shall be prorated for each of the proposed development stages as follows:

Stage I – 125,000 square feet
Stage II – 75,000 square feet
Stage III – 25,000 square feet
Stage IV – 25,000 square feet
Stage V – 50,000 square feet

Amendment 5-Condition 13

Revise Condition 13 of PGCPB No. 11-02(C)(A/2) to read as follows:

13. Prior to the issuance of any building permit, the following improvements shall be in place, under construction, bonded (or letter of credit given to the appropriate agency for construction), 100 percent funded in a CIP/CTP or otherwise provided by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees:

Leeland Road/Moores Plains Boulevard

- ~~a.~~ Construct a right turn lane at the eastbound approach
- ~~b.~~ Construct a left turn lane at the westbound approach
- ~~c.~~ a. Install a traffic signal if deemed warranted and necessary by DPW&T. This would also include any turn lanes deemed necessary by DPW&T.

Oak Grove Road/Church Road

- ~~d.~~ b. Construct a separate left lane and a shared through and right turn lane on the eastbound approach, unless modified by DPW&T. Further, this improvement is not required if relocated Oak Grove Road is bonded to create the new relocated intersection of Oak Grove Road at Church Road.

Oak Grove Road/MD 193

- ~~e.~~ c. Widen the existing one-lane roundabout to provide two travel lanes
- ~~f.~~ d. On the southbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and left turn lane
- ~~g.~~ e. On the northbound (MD 193) leg of the roundabout, provide a through lane and a shared through and right turn lane
- ~~h.~~ f. On the westbound (Oak Grove Road) leg of the roundabout, provide a left turn lane and a shared right and left turn lane