



Note: Staff reports can be accessed at www.mncppc.org/pgco/planning/plan.htm.

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN PLAN

CDP-0301

Application	General Data
Project Name: SUMMERFIELD AT MORGAN STATION Location: INTERSECTION OF GARRETT A. MORGAN BLVD. AND CENTRAL AVENUE (MD 214) AND RIDGEFIELD BLVD. Applicant/Address: NORAIR CORP, SUMMERFIELD INVESTORS, LLP, C/O MAGRUDER REED COMMUNITIES, LLC 12165 DARNESTOWN ROAD GATHERSBURG, MD 20878	Date Accepted: 3/21/2003
	Planning Board Action Limit: N/A
	Plan Acreage: 91.9
	Zone: L-A-C
	Dwelling Units: 900
	Square Footage: 60,000 sq. ft.
	Planning Area: 72A
	Council District: 5
	Municipality: NA
	200-Scale Base Map: 201NE07

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
900 DWELLING UNITS 60,000 SQUARE FEET OF RETAIL	Adjoining Property Owners: (CB-15-1998) 03/18/03
	Previous Parties of Record: (CB-13-1997) NA
	Sign(s) Posted on Site: 06/20/03
	Variance(s): Adjoining Property Owners:

Staff Recommendation			Staff Reviewer: LAXMI SRINIVAS
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

August 28, 2003

MEMORANDUM

TO: Prince George's County Planning Board

VIA: Steven Adams, Urban Design Supervisor

FROM: Laxmi Srinivas, Senior Planner

SUBJECT: Summerfield at Morgan Station
Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0301
Tree Conservation Plan I/27/03

PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance with the Comprehensive Design Plan provisions of Section 27-520, Subtitle 27-Zoning, of the Prince George's County Code, a public hearing is scheduled before the Prince George's County Planning Board at 11:00 a.m. on September 4, 2003. The purpose of this hearing is to consider the Comprehensive Design Plan for Summerfield at Morgan Station, CDP-0301. Notice of the public hearing was published in the *Enquirer-Gazette*, the *Journal Newspaper* and the *Prince George's Post*, on or before June 24, 2003. At the meeting on July 24, 2003, the Planning Board continued the case until September 4, 2003.

INTRODUCTION

The Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department has coordinated a review of the subject application with all offices having any planning activities that might be affected by the proposed development. This staff report documents that process and presents findings and a recommendation to be acted upon by the Prince George's County Planning Board.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The staff recommends APPROVAL of the Comprehensive Design Plan with conditions.

COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN ZONES

The Comprehensive Design Plan (CDP) phase of the three-phase Comprehensive Design Zone (CDZ) process requires the submittal of a plan that establishes the general location, distribution and sizes of buildings and roads. The plan includes several drawings and a text that includes the schedule for development of all or portions of the proposal and standards for height, open space, public improvements

and other design features. The regulations for any of the Comprehensive Design Zones are at the same time more flexible and more rigid than are those of other zones in Prince George's County. The zones are more flexible in terms of permitted uses, residential densities and building intensities. They are more rigid because some of the commitments made by a developer carry the force and effect of law upon approval by the Planning Board.

The principal difference between Comprehensive Design Zones and conventional zones is that the Comprehensive Design Zone includes a list of public benefit features and density or intensity increment factors. If a development proposes to include a public benefit feature, the Planning Board, at this stage of the process, may grant an increment factor that increases the dwelling unit density or building intensity. The value of the public benefit feature or density/intensity increment proposal determines the size of the increase. A public benefit feature is an item that will improve the environment or lessen the public cost of a development. The intent is to create a development, through the granting of incremental density increases, that will result in a better quality residential, commercial and industrial environment.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

This Comprehensive Design Plan was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

1. Conformance with Basic Plan A-9678-C.
2. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance for the L-A-C Zone and Comprehensive Design Plans.
3. The requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
4. Referral agency comments.

FINDINGS

Based on an analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design Review Section recommends the following findings. Finding 4 below is required by Section 27-521 before the Planning Board may approve a Comprehensive Design Plan.

1. The subject Comprehensive Design Plan is for the Summerfield at Morgan Station development. The original Basic Plan approval (A-9678-C) rezoned the property to L-A-C.

Location—The property is located on the east and west sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard. The adjacent properties are as follows:

West of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard:

North—	Willow Hills zoned R-80
South—	Central Avenue and residential
West—	Hill Road Park zoned R-80
	WMATA zoned R-R

East of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard:

North—	Ridgefield Boulevard
South—	Summerfield zoned R-M
East—	Summerfield zoned R-M

2. On January 9, 1989, the Prince George's County District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9678-C and the accompanying Basic Plan for the subject site (Zoning Ordinance No. 3-1989) for approximately 91.9 acres of land in the northwest quadrant of Brightseat Road and Central Avenue with nine conditions and 16 considerations and with the following land use types and quantities applicable to the L-A-C-zoned portion of the site:

Land Use Types (L-A-C Zone):

All uses except the following:

- warehouses, as accessory structures and uses
- mobile home, any and all types
- ambulance service, private
- satellite dish antenna, serving only one dwelling unit

Land Use Quantities (L-A-C Zone):

Gross Residential Area:	77.28 acres
Base Density:	10 dwelling units per acre (773 units)
Maximum Density:	15 dwelling units per acre (1,200 units)*
Gross Commercial Area:	14.2 acres
Base Intensity:	0.2 FAR (128,240 square feet)
Maximum Intensity:	0.29 FAR (184,000 square feet)

*The actual number of dwelling units and commercial intensity will be determined at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan approval after an analysis of public benefit features set forth in Section 27-496 (a & b) of the Zoning Ordinance.

Presently, a sector plan is in the process of being developed for the future Garrett A. Morgan and Largo Metro stations, both of which are under construction. A number of meetings have been held in which public input has been received and applied to the property. The draft sector plan has been completed and has been scheduled for a Planning Board hearing on September 22, 2003. The sector plan recommendations encourage higher density and mixed uses around the Metro stations in accordance with the General Plan and master plan recommendations.

3. The Summerfield at Morgan Station project, consisting of approximately 91.90 gross acres, is proposed to be developed with 900 residential units comprised of 500 townhouses and 400 multifamily units and a maximum of 114,000 square feet of retail and 200,000 square feet of office. Summerfield at Morgan Station aspires to be a high-quality community incorporating Smart Growth policies and Transit-Oriented Development principles to take advantage of the economic development opportunities generated by the Garrett A. Morgan Metro Station. The base density approved by the Basic Plan for the L-A-C Zone is 10 units per acre. The applicant is seeking an increase in density by providing public benefit features as described in Finding 5 below.

Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard divides the property into two distinct communities, the East Village and the West Village. Each village is further divided into north and south by natural features resulting in four different neighborhoods. Each community has its own distinct features. The West Village is focused on Morgan Woods and the Metro station and the East Village is focused around a formal open space. The south neighborhood of the West Village features a transit-oriented development with luxury apartments and townhouses creating an urban edge. The north neighborhood of the West Village contains townhouses to provide an appropriate transition to the single-family detached homes in the adjoining properties. The southernmost portion of the West

Village to the south of the Metro station has commercial/retail uses that provide a compatible transition to the regional arterial highway MD 214 (Central Avenue). This commercial area is a narrow strip fronting on Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard. It is intended to initiate the retail/mixed-use development to the west. The West Village is adjacent to the stream valley natural preserve area. The north neighborhood of the East Village has townhouses and a neighborhood green and recreation center. The south neighborhood of the East Village has commercial/retail uses and proximity to the commercial areas of the site. The south neighborhood of the East Village, consisting of 11.23 acres and the south neighborhood of the West Village, consisting of 10.3 acres (comprising a total of 21.52 acres) is intended for commercial/mixed-use development. This land area is sufficient to support up to 114,000 square feet of retail (at 0.25 FAR) and almost 200,000 square feet of office (at 0.4 FAR).

The applicant has proffered to limit any residential development on the subject property south of the Metro station until such time as an approval is in place for at least the base of 110,000 square feet of commercial development. A connected vehicular and pedestrian system links both villages and sub-neighborhoods within the villages and provides access to the Metro station.

The main access points into the community will be designed with entry monuments and tree-lined streets with median breaks. The following entry points are proposed for the development:

- a. The extension of Ridgefield Boulevard across Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard is the main entrance to the community.
- b. Additional entrances are located opposite each other north of the Metro Station, which provides access to the east and west villages and becomes a major east/west spine within the community.
- c. An additional access point to the East Village is on Ridgefield Boulevard.
- d. The southeast neighborhood access point shares the median cut with the Metro Station parking access drive.
- e. The commercial areas will have access directly onto Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the extension of Fieldstone Way.

The proposed street system is divided into a hierarchy of street types flanked by sidewalks and street trees. The street cross sections include a boulevard with a central tree-lined median, streets with parallel parking, and narrower residential streets with limited parking. Pedestrian and bikeway networks within the subject site provide connections to trails outlined in the approved master plan for Landover and vicinity.

The proposal provides neighborhood greens and pocket parks interspersed throughout the site. It also includes two active recreation areas, each with a pool and amenities. One of the recreation areas will be provided for the entire development and the other will be provided for the luxury apartments. Tot lots for children of different age groups are also proposed. Formal greens are proposed to be lined with buildings and streets to ensure their accessibility and prominence. The open space network offers passive recreation opportunities and includes the stream valley buffers that are enhanced with multiple paths, trails and connections to the community.

4. COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN PLAN

Findings Required by Section 27-521, Required findings for approval of a Comprehensive Development Plan

(a) **Prior to approving a Comprehensive Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

(1) **The plan is in conformance with the approved Basic Plan.**

The following table provides a comparison of the land uses approved for specific areas of the subject property on the Basic Plan and the proposed uses on the subject Comprehensive Design Plan:

Area	Basic Plan	CDP
West Village— northernmost quadrant	Single-family uses unless a residential density allowing more than 465 dwelling units is approved	Townhouses
West Village— north of Metro station	Residential and retail	Multifamily residential
West Village— south of Metro station	Office	Retail/Office
East Village— north quadrant	Residential and retail	Townhouses, neighborhood green and recreation center
East Village— south quadrant	Community center	Retail/Office/Multifamily Townhouse

In order to find substantial conformance with the Basic Plan, the proposed land uses need not be in exactly the same areas as shown on the Basic Plan. However, the overall land use mix shown on the Basic Plan must be provided. The subject Comprehensive Design Plan provides the mix of uses called for in the Basic Plan. Therefore, the subject Comprehensive Design Plan can be found to be in conformance with the Basic Plan.

The Basic Plan Map also shows vehicular and pedestrian connections between the following:

- The east side of Garrett Morgan Boulevard and Summerfield housing.
- The east and west sides of Garrett Morgan Boulevard.
- Access from Garrett Morgan Boulevard to the M-NCPPC property designated for a park on the west side of the subject property.
- The portion to the south of the Metro station to the Summerfield housing.

Pedestrian connections at the above-mentioned places have been shown but no vehicular connections have been provided. Interconnectivity between the land uses cannot be established without vehicular and pedestrian connections between the various areas of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan on both sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the adjacent properties.

The proposal will comply with the Basic Plan if the interconnectivity of the various development pods approved by the Basic Plan is provided as indicated in the proposed conditions below.

The following conditions and considerations of the approved Basic Plan are applicable to the subject Comprehensive Design Plan:

A-9678-C

Conditions

- 3.a Within the L-A-C Zone, there shall be no more than 465 dwelling units approved, unless the applicant can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Planning Board that there is sufficient economic justification for the increase; there will be compatibility with the surrounding land uses; and the provision of public benefit features to achieve maximum attached and/or multifamily dwelling unit density.**

The applicant is proposing 900 dwelling units (435 additional dwelling units over the above maximum).

Since the subject development is in the vicinity of a transit station, a higher residential and commercial density is justified to completely utilize the economic opportunities provided by the future Metro station. The applicant is also proposing 114,000 square feet of retail and 200,000 square feet of office uses. The applicant is completely utilizing the economic opportunities provided by the future Metro station for commercial uses. The applicant has submitted an economic analysis for higher residential density. The Research Section analyzed the economic analysis and concluded that there is adequate economic justification for increasing the residential density because the project is in the vicinity of a future Metro station. So, economic justification does exist for residential density greater than 465 dwelling units.

The proposed residential development will be compatible with the surrounding residential development.

The applicant has not demonstrated sufficient public benefit features to achieve their proposed increase in residential density. The public benefit features are discussed in detail in Finding 5.

If additional public benefit features are provided as discussed in Finding 5, the application will qualify for an increase in residential density over the 465 to the full 900 units requested.

- 3.b. The portion of Parcel 'X' between the Willow Hills and Royal Oak Subdivision (west) and the stream (east) shall be restricted to single-family uses until the Planning Board approves more than 465 dwelling units in accordance with Paragraph (a).**

Parcel 'X' is located in the northernmost portion of the West Village. The applicant is proposing townhouses in this area. With proposed conditions, adequate justification can be provided for an increase in residential density to the full 900 units requested. Therefore, some use other than single-family would be permissible in Parcel 'X,' though

the applicant is not requesting such a use at this time.

6. **Prior to authorized development of the site, there shall be no grading or cutting of trees, except on a selective basis by permission of the Prince George's County Planning Board; or by the Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission when necessary for water and sewer lines. All major stands of trees shall be delineated on the CDP and SDP and the developer shall demonstrate why it is necessary to remove any mature or specimen trees.**

Compliance with this condition is discussed in detail in Finding 13.

7. **The Metro station symbol shall be relocated to the northwest corner of the intersection of Ritchie Road and the Metro alignment (Parcel X). This symbol shall be considered a floating symbol. The precise location of the WMATA Metro station shall be determined at CDP review and approval.**

The exact location of the Metro station has been determined. The CDP drawings reflect the exact location of the WMATA Metro station.

8. **All Comprehensive Design Plans shall be reviewed for approval by the District Council.**

The Comprehensive Design Plan will be reviewed by the District Council at a future date.

Considerations

1. **A comprehensive woodland conservation/tree preservation plan shall be submitted with the CDP Plan.**

The applicant has submitted a Type I Tree Conservation Plan with the subject Comprehensive Design Plan application.

2. **Noise "corridors" are to be established for the Metro Line and extension of Ritchie Road and shown on the CDP.**

Compliance with this condition is discussed in detail in Finding 13.

3. **Development in proposed pods will be restricted to areas outside of the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and slopes of 25 percent or greater unless under specific conditions it can be shown to be appropriate to vary. The restriction does not apply to public and private street locations.**

The subject development encroaches into the floodplains to a certain extent. Compliance with this condition is discussed in detail in Finding 13.

4. **Road crossings of the floodplain or non-tidal wetlands shall be reviewed in detail with M-NCPPC staff prior to submittal of a CDP.**

Compliance with this condition is discussed in detail in Finding 13.

5. **The CDP shall indicate the following highway improvements:**

- a. **Provision of separate right turn lanes in and out of Brightseat Road at its intersection with Central Avenue.**
- b. **Provision of full time split phase signalization by modification of the existing signal at the intersection of Central Avenue/Ritchie Road to permit two left turn lanes on westbound Central Avenue onto southbound Ritchie Road.**
- c. **Provide a separate right-turn lane on westbound Central Avenue onto northbound Ritchie Road.**
- d. **Construction of separate left and right-turn lanes on east-bound Central Avenue at Ritchie Road.**
- e. **Provide a new through lane on northbound Ritchie Road at Central Avenue.**
- f. **Provide a four-lane approach on southbound Ritchie Road, striped to provide a double left-turn lane, a through lane, and a right-turn lane.**

The applicant has submitted a traffic study that addresses required road improvements. Compliance with this consideration is discussed in detail in Finding 12.

- 8. **All multifamily and commercial development shall have sprinkler systems as recommended by the fire chief.**

This condition will be carried forward in slightly modified form to the subject CDP.

- 9. **A minimum buffer of 50 feet on either side of streams and 25 feet around the perimeter of wetlands shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Patuxent River Policy Plan. Said area may be included within lots, provided that the appropriate nondisturbance easements or covenants are imposed.**

The subject development encroaches into the floodplain and wetland buffers to a certain extent. Therefore, the proposal does not completely comply with this condition. Compliance with this condition is discussed in detail in Finding 13.

- 10. **Minor (private) recreational areas will be provided between the development pods wherever appropriate (one of which is to be of sufficient size to accommodate a community center/pool complex).**

The proposal includes neighborhood greens and pocket parks interspersed throughout the site. It also includes two active recreation areas, each with a pool and amenities. One of the recreation areas will be provided for the entire development and the other will be provided for the luxury apartments. Tot lots for children of different age groups are also proposed. The open space network offers passive recreational opportunities and includes the stream valley buffers that are enhanced with multiple paths, trails and connections to the community.

- 11. **The alignment of the extension of the proposed WMATA rail line for Manor Farm shall be identified during the CDP review. The approval of any alignment shall take into consideration: WMATA performance standards, engineering criteria, environmental considerations and cost factors.**

- 12. The land area needs for the proposed WMATA Metro Station shall be identified on the CDP.**

The location and land area for the WMATA rail line extension and the future Garrett A. Morgan Metro station are shown on the subject CDP.

- 13. The location of a potential regional stormwater lake proposed by WSSC/DER shall be shown on the CDP.**

This condition can be carried forward if determined to still be applicable.

- 15. The required CDP description of design principles shall pay special attention to how structures fit the land form and use of the topography for variation in building envelope placement. For example, groupings of structures may form along ridgelines. Methods of preservation and conservation of woodlands and trees should be proposed in relationship to accommodation of structures. Compatibility issues, off-site and on-site, should be discussed with mitigation measures proposed. Continuity and variety of building design exterior materials should be addressed; topics such as building articulation, finish materials, fences, decks, and auxiliary structures; and, relationship of building envelopes with common and private open space shall be considered and addressed in the principals section.**

The proposal has to a certain extent paid attention to how structures fit the land form and use of topography for variation in building envelope placement. However, the development intrudes into floodplains in some areas and minimum buffers have not been provided.

Since the integration of the land uses with the existing natural features and interconnectivity of the various land uses are not adequately addressed, the proposal does not comply with this condition. The applicant has however, addressed the topics of building articulation, finish materials, fences, decks, and auxiliary structures. If the applicant revised the CDP to improve integration of the land uses with the existing natural features, interconnectivity of the land uses and a mix of land uses, the proposal will comply with this consideration.

The applicant has also not provided information on the net lot areas available for development. The information on net lot areas will be useful for determining the maximum amount of development that can be accommodated on the various quadrants of the proposed development. A condition of approval has been added to require information on the net lot areas available for development.

- 16. The applicant shall develop a trip reduction program and the elements of the program must be applied prior to approval of a Comprehensive Design Plan (an example of one possible concept for a program element would be a shuttle bus to provide service to the Addison Road Metro station).**

Compliance with this condition is addressed in detail in Finding 12.

- (2) The proposed plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations.**

The applicant is proposing all the commercial uses to the south of the Metro station. There are no commercial/retail uses to the north of the Metro station to serve the residential uses proposed on the north side of the Metro Station. If retail is proposed on the north side of the Metro station, it would serve as an amenity for the proposed residential development. A condition of approval has been added to require the applicant to provide commercial uses ancillary to the proposed residential development. With the proposed condition, the proposed plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations.

- (3) **Approval is warranted by the way in which the Comprehensive Design Plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities and satisfies the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project.**

The CDP includes the following design elements, facilities and amenities:

Design elements: The overall design theme includes creation of neighborhood open areas with residential areas around them, creating interesting street frontages with the use of superior architecture and landscaping techniques; creation of adequate pedestrian connections between the various areas of the development; and creation of adequate landscape buffers to screen parking areas and adjacent properties.

Facilities: All public utilities plus electric, telephone and gas will be available on site for the proposed development. Water and sewer will be provided by WSSC. Stormwater management facilities in the vicinity of the subject site will be utilized for the subject site.

Amenities: The proposal includes neighborhood greens and pocket parks interspersed throughout the site. It also includes two active recreation areas, each with a pool and amenities. One of the recreation areas will be provided for the entire development and the other will be provided for the luxury apartments. Tot lots for children of different age groups are also proposed. The open space network offers passive recreation opportunities and includes the stream valley buffers that are enhanced with multiple paths, trails and connections to the community

The applicant has proposed commercial and retail uses on the south side of the Metro station. The Basic Plan shows a community center in the eastern portion. The master plan defines a community center as a core containing 120,000 to 300,000 square feet of commercial development, with a residential density of 10 to 20 dwelling units per acre.

The Comprehensive Design Plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities to satisfy the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project in the manner foreseen by the Basic Plan.

- (4) **The proposed development will be compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings;**

The site is surrounded on the north, south, east and west sides by existing residential development. The subject proposal would be compatible with the surrounding residential development. The proposed commercial and residential uses would also be compatible with the future Metro station.

- (5) **Land uses and facilities covered by the Comprehensive Design Plan will be compatible with each other in relation to:**

- (A) Amounts of building coverage and open space
- (B) Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses
- (C) Circulation access points

Land uses and facilities covered by the Comprehensive Design Plan will be compatible with each other in relation to:

- (a) Amounts of building coverage and open space.

The proposed development standards ensure adequate open space. The open space network offers passive recreation opportunities and includes the stream valley buffers that are enhanced with multiple paths, trails and connections to the community.

- (b) Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses.

The proposed development standards propose adequate building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses

- c. Circulation access points.

The proposed street system is divided into a hierarchy of street types flanked by sidewalks and street trees. The street cross sections include a boulevard with a central tree-lined median, streets with parallel parking and narrower residential streets with limited parking. Pedestrian and bikeway networks within the subject site provide connections to trails outlined in the approved master plan for Landover and vicinity. The approved Basic Plan shows a number of areas requiring vehicular and pedestrian connections. Pedestrian connections at these locations have been proposed but no vehicular connections have been provided. Interconnectivity between the land use mixes cannot be established without vehicular and pedestrian connections between the various areas of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan on both sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the adjacent properties.

With the proposed conditions, the proposed land uses and facilities covered by the Comprehensive Design Plan will be compatible with each other in relation to circulation access points.

- (6) **Each staged unit of the development (as well as the total development) can exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability.**

The development will be constructed in the following four phases:

- Phase I— Approximately 500 to 600 units in the northern quadrant of the West Village immediately north of the future Metro station.
- Phase II— Approximately 150 to 180 units in the northern quadrant of the East Village.
- Phase III— Approximately 115 to 135 units in the northernmost quadrant of the East Village.
- Phase IV— Approximately 60 to 68 units in the south quadrant of the East Village and the retail component.

If the CDP were approved as proposed, each staged unit of the development (as well as the total development) could in all likelihood exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability.

- (7) **The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities.**

Compliance with this requirement is addressed in detail in **Finding 14. [wrong #]**

- (8) **Where a Comprehensive Design Plan proposal includes an adaptive use of a Historic Site, the Planning Board shall find that:**

- (A) **The proposed adaptive use will not adversely affect distinguishing exterior architectural features or important historic landscape features in the established environmental setting.**
- (B) **Parking lot layout, materials, and landscaping are designed to preserve the integrity and character of the Historic Site.**
- (C) **The design, materials, height, proportion, and scale of a proposed enlargement or extension of a Historic Site, or of a new structure within the environmental setting, are in keeping with the character of the Historic Site.**

This section is not applicable to this proposal.

- (9) **The Plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle, and where townhouses are proposed in the Plan, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the requirements set forth in Section 27-433(d).**

The plan incorporates several design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 regarding green areas, public spaces and architecture. A combination trail and sidewalk system will be proposed along the streets and the stream valley. Internal green areas will be provided to create open spaces within the development. The development standards ensure adequate setbacks and open spaces.

- (10) **The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan.**

A Type I Tree Conservation Plan has been submitted with the CDP application. Compliance with this requirement is addressed in detail in Finding 13.

5. Density Increment Analysis

The Comprehensive Design Zones include a list of public benefit features and density or intensity increment factors. If a development proposes to include a public benefit feature in a development, the Planning Board may grant a density increment factor that increases the dwelling unit density or building intensity. The value of the public benefit feature determines the size of the density or intensity increase.

Gross Residential Area:	77.28 acres
Base Density:	10 dwelling units per acre (773 units)

Maximum Density:	15 dwelling units per acre (1,200 units)*
Proposed Density:	12 dwelling units per acre (900 units)

(Density is based on an average number of dwelling units per gross acre, minus 50 percent of the density attributed to any land located within a 100-year floodplain according to the requirements of Section 27-486, Density and Intensity Calculations, of the Zoning Ordinance)

The applicant is proposing 127 additional units above the number of units they claim are allowed by the base density. The applicant originally claimed the base density for the project is 880 dwelling units by using the formula used in the Basic Plan to calculate the base density. However, revisions by the applicant to the proposed land use mix will result in a revised base density figure that is not yet available. Therefore, staff will provide a final analysis of density increments at the time of the Planning Board hearing.

6. Development Standards

In the Comprehensive Design Zones, the applicant proposes development standards and standards for architectural massing, style and detail as part of the Comprehensive Design Plan.

Development Data

Proposed Residential:

Townhouses/Condos	500 units
Luxury Apartments	400 units
Total	900 units

Proposed Commercial:	60,000 square feet
Average square feet per dwelling unit	1,512 square feet

Townhouse Development Standards:

Width	16 to 22 feet
Depth	36 to 45 feet

Multifamily Dwellings:	1,100 square feet
------------------------	-------------------

The applicant has developed design guidelines for exterior walls, brick facades, siding, windows, shutters, doors, roofs, fences, decks, porches and terraces.

Other issues

Section 27-515(b), Table of Uses for the Comprehensive Design Zones permits multifamily residential and townhouses in the L-A-C Zone according to the following restrictions in Footnote 29:

- Townhouses may comprise no more than 40 percent.
- Multifamily residential may comprise no more than 30 percent.
- Therefore, the remaining 30 percent has to be single-family.

CB-25-2003, removing the restrictions on the percentage of townhouse and multifamily dwellings, was approved by the District Council on July 1, 2003.

Referral Responses

7. The Department of Environmental Resources (De Guzman to Srinivas, April 17, 2003) has stated that the office has not received an application for stormwater management concept for this project.
8. The Community Planning Division (Osei to Srinivas, May 29, 2003) has stated that the proposal is inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan development pattern policies for the Developed Tier and regional center designation for the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station. The range of land use mixes in a regional center are: residential—20 to 70 percent; employment—10 to 60 percent; and public uses—10 to 20 percent. Placing appropriate mix of uses at designated centers is key to ensuring a diversity of uses that generate transit ridership. Regional centers have a greater proportion of nonresidential uses than a community center. The proposal is inconsistent with the land use mix and percentage recommended for this area by the General Plan. Townhouses are inappropriate uses in this area according to the General Plan.

The 1992 Landover and vicinity master plan recommends a community activity center in this area. A community activity center includes retail, residential, community facilities, and offices. A community center is defined as a core containing 120,000 to 300,000 square feet of commercial development and residential density of 10 to 20 du/acre.

Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance does not specifically require findings for approval of a Comprehensive Design Plan to be consistent with the General Plan or in conformance with the master plan. However, the General Plan and master plan recommendations should be taken into consideration. A condition of approval has been added to require the applicant to submit information regarding the proposal's consistency with the General Plan.

The memorandum from the Community Planning Division states that:

“DETERMINATIONS

- This application is inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan development pattern policies for the Developed Tier and Regional Center designation for the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station.
- The proposed Comprehensive Design Plan for 900 dwelling units and 60,000 square feet of retail and commercial uses does not conform to the recommendations of the master plan for a Community Activity Center and the 1989 Approved Basic Plan (A-9518) for the subject property.

“BACKGROUND

Location: The Norair property is located on both sides of (Summerfield) Morgan Boulevard, north of Central Avenue (MD 214).

Size: 91.9 ± acres

Existing Uses: Undeveloped

Proposal: This proposal consists of the development of 900 dwelling units and 60,000 square feet retail/commercial uses.

“GENERAL PLAN, MASTER PLAN AND SMA

2002 General Plan: A Regional Center in the Developed Tier

Master Plan: The Landover & Vicinity Master Plan (1993). The master plan recommends the following:

“A community-level activity center is proposed for location in the Hill Road area, related to the future Hill Road Metro Station on proposed Summerfield Boulevard. This center is recommended to serve the future Hill Road area as part of the “New Community” concept recommended for new development in this section of the planning area. The center should consist of uses including major community facilities and retail and office uses, well integrated with the Metro station facility. The Hill Road Metro area can function as a transit hub for the Hill Road community with concentrated mixed-use-development appropriate for sites with future planned Metro stations. The master plan recognizes that commercial development in the proximity of Metro stations is a great source of unrealized development for the county and will help to promote the economic well being of the planning area as well as Prince George’s County.

“The master plan provides an opportunity to strengthen the Hill Road Metro area and develop a compact central core, with an appropriate mix of retail, residential, and office uses. The master plan recommends a mix of uses of this area but with the appropriate, concentrated land uses located within a one-quarter mile radius of the Metro station in order to make greatest use of the Metrorail facility. The proposed mixed-use-development will enable the county to provide for high-quality, attractive development consistent with other jurisdictions and to enjoy the tax revenues that such development provides.

“Mixed-use development for the Hill Road Metro area is appropriate both now and in the future but at different levels depending upon existing highway infrastructure and the planned extension of the Blue Line Metrorail. Therefore, this master plan recommends that the development of the site, consistent with mixed-use development, be phased in accordance with the approvals obtained for the Metro station development. In recognition that high density, mixed-use development is appropriate around Metro stations, the plan recommends L-A-C development at this time and proposes that **an expanded development potential could accrue to the future Hill Road Metro Station area when the station is funded; however, any expansion should be preceded by a TDOZ or small area plan** that included more than any one portion of the area. Consideration of any expanded development potential should only occur through a comprehensive evaluation of the entire transit district area. The subsequent timing of these plans and the funding of Metro should be coordinated. **Consideration should be given to zones, such as the M-X-T Zone, the M-A-C Zone, or a combination of other zones.** Any development that takes place in the Hill Road Metro area prior to the reevaluation of the transit district area should be planned in a manner that will allow for the possibility of greater intensification of all or part of the transit district area at a later date.

“The plan fully supports the concept of mixed-use development around Metro stations and foresees the possibility of mixed-use development at the Hill Road Metro area. A mix of uses is appropriate for the Norair and Ridgely properties both now and in the

future. The maximum density permitted upon approval of the development of the Metro Station shall be determined by a small area study or similar process.

- **Planning Area/Community:** 72/Hill Road Community.
- **Land Use:** The master plan recommended a community level activity center for the Norair and the Ridgely properties with the intent that the construction of the “Hill Metro Station” would justify the support for high density mixed-use-development around the Metro station core area.
- **Environmental:** The subject property has steep slopes and woodlands.
- **Historic Resources:** None identified.
- **Transportation:** Access is provided along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard (Summerfield) C31. Morgan Boulevard is a collector recommended as a four-to-six-lane road within a 120-foot right-of-way.
- **Public Facilities:** The Prince George’s County 911 emergency facility and FedEx Field are located in the immediate vicinity of the subject property—southwest and north respectively.
- **Parks & Trails:** The 40-acre Hill Road community park site is adjacent to the subject property. Extensive proposed trails network is shown on the approved basic plan for the subject property (A-9518). Most of these trails are not shown on the submitted CPD.

“SMA/Zoning: The 92-acre Norair property was zoned L-A-C in 1989. Council Resolution (CR-57-1993) states that “the Norair property is appropriate for mixed-use development phased in accordance with approvals for Metro station development as explained in CR-11-1993. The SMA retains the L-A-C Zone for the property, but recognizes that an expanded development potential could accrue to the future Hill Road Metro Station area when the station is funded. Any expansion should be preceded by a TDOZ or small area plan that includes both the Ridgely and Norair properties. Consideration of an expanded development potential should occur through a comprehensive evaluation of the entire transit district area. The timing of these plans and the funding of Metro should be coordinated. Consideration should be given to the M-X-T Zone, the M-A-C Zone, or an appropriate combination of other zones. Any development that takes place prior to the reevaluation of the transit district area should be planned in a manner that will allow for the possibility of greater intensification of all or part of the transit district area at a later date.”

“PLANNING ISSUES

“Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance does not specifically requires findings for approval of a Comprehensive Design Plan to be consistent with the General Plan or in conformance with the master plan. It must be in conformance with the approved Basic Plan. However, staff has the following concerns with the proposed CPD in light of the approved 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for a Regional Center in the Developed Tier, the consistency of the draft preliminary Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center sector plan, and the conformance of the

1993 Landover & Vicinity Master Plan.

“1. 2002 General Plan:

“The subject property is located in a Regional Center in the Developed Tier. The General Plan recommends a range of land use mix at Regional Centers that are as follows: residential—20 to 70 percent; retail and services—10 to 60 percent; employment—10 to 60 percent; and public uses—10 to 20 percent (page 41).

“The General Plan further defines core areas for centers (page 40) to ensure that most intensive development occurs in close proximity to and is supportive of mass transportation facility, with less intensive development radiating out to the edges. The distinction between the core area and the edge is most significant in the centers with rail transit stations. In these centers, the core, in most cases, should generally include the area that is between one-quarter and one-third of a mile walking distance from a transit or stop. The edge of a center, in most cases, will generally be located an additional one-quarter to one-third mile walking distance beyond the primary core. Placing appropriate mix of uses at designated centers is key to ensuring diversity of uses that generate transit ridership throughout the day, as well as promote walking trips within the center. Although such mix of uses will respond to market conditions, Regional centers will have a greater proportion of nonresidential development than a community center. Example of inappropriate uses in the primary core areas include single-family residences.

“This proposal consists of only two uses—residential and retail. It is inconsistent with the land use mix and percentage recommended for a Regional Center in the Developed Tier by the General Plan. It also includes townhouse development that is one example of inappropriate uses in the primary core areas specified by the General Plan.

“2. Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Sector Plan

“The draft preliminary Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center sector plan proposes a tightly defined core area, which includes undeveloped properties that are in close proximity to the Metro station (the Norair property) and have the greatest potential for transit-oriented development. The sector plan endorses a regional center concept for the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station in recognition of the General Plan’s land use densities and development patterns recommendations for regional centers. The regional center concept for Morgan Boulevard provides for a focal point creating a sense of place, with a horizontal and vertical mix of uses of residential and nonresidential uses. These uses are intended to be orientated toward the Metro station with the intensity of the development designed to be compatible with the existing uses, providing for pedestrian linkages to connect in, and to, the core area from surrounding neighborhoods and commercial areas.

“The sector plan recommends mixed-use (office, residential and retail) of mid-rise development for the portions of the Norair property north of the Metro station. A residential component (townhouses and multifamily) of the mixed-use concept is proposed specifically for the northern portions of the subject property. This sector plan recognizes the previous approval of the mixed-use L-A-C (Local Activity Center) Zone for the Norair property in 1989 by the County Council. The approved L-A-C Zone Basic Plan includes a mix of residential, office and retail uses with an emphasis on residential

uses. Nonresidential land use was approved with a 184,000-square-foot limit (additional square footage permitted subject to an economic justification). A greater office component is encouraged by this sector plan.

“The southern and central portion of the Norair property, adjacent to the Metro station, is recommended to develop at high residential and office densities (20 dwelling units per acre, 0.68 floor area ratio per the L-A-C Zone) to maximize the potential for transit-oriented development. Multifamily residential development and mid-rise office development is envisioned. The northern portion of the property is recommended for a residential development. As this portion of the Norair property is farther from the Metro station, a step-down in density is appropriate and providing for more compatible development next to the existing residential neighborhoods.

“3. 1992 Landover & Vicinity Master Plan

“The master plan recommends a Community Activity Center in the Hill Road Area. A Community Activity Center is defined by the master plan as a core containing 120,000 to 300,000 square feet of commercial development. The residential density should be in a range of 10 to 20 dwelling units per acre. It should contain elements of retail/residential, community facilities, and office. The Hill Road illustrative sketch in the master plan defines the need for office and retail uses on the subject (Norair) property, north of the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station and on both sides of Morgan Boulevard.”

9. The Community Planning Division (Fields to Srinivas, June 24, 2003) has stated that the subject CDP does not conform to the recommendations of the draft preliminary Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro areas sector plan. The plan envisions mixed uses around the Metro stations. The sector plan project was initiated in 2001. A joint Planning Board and District Council public hearing will be held in September 2003. Approval of the sector plan and sectional map amendment by the District Council is anticipated by May 2004. In reviewing the conceptual plan for nonresidential mixed uses to the south of the future Metro station, the Division has questioned the appropriateness of a concentration of a nonresidential mix of uses in the area to the south of the Metro station

The following table provides a comparison of the uses proposed by the CDP and the draft sector plan:

Area	Draft Sector Plan	CDP
West Village—northernmost quadrant	Townhouses	Townhouses
West Village—north of Metro Station	Residential, office and limited retail	Multifamily residential
West Village—south of Metro Station	Retail and Residential	Retail
East Village—north quadrant	Townhouse and multifamily	Townhouses, neighborhood green and recreation center
East Village—south quadrant	Townhouse and multifamily	Mixed uses

10. The Research Section (Perry to Srinivas, April 24, 2003) has stated that the proposed increase in allowable dwelling units is based on transit supportiveness and the existing public investment due to the future Metro station, which is defined as a Regional Center in the General Plan. Regional Centers are intended to support transit and stimulate economic development. To this extent, there is reasonable justification for increasing residential density.
11. The Transportation Planning Section (Shaffer to Srinivas, May 21, 2003) has stated that the subject site's location next to a future transit station makes it ideal for provision of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. The adopted and approved Landover and Vicinity master plan makes several bicycle, pedestrian, and trail recommendations for the subject site. Opportunities exist for connecting the subject site to the existing trails. The section has recommended conditions of approval for various trail connections.
12. The Transportation Planning Section (Masog to Srinivas, July 10, 2003 and August 28, 2003) has concluded that the proposed development will not be an unreasonable burden on transportation facilities which are existing, under construction or for which 100 percent construction funding is contained in the county CIP or the state CTP. Therefore, the transportation staff believes that the requirements pertaining to transportation facilities under Section 27-521 of the Prince George's County Code would be met if the application is approved with conditions requiring various transportation improvements.

The July 10, 2003 memorandum addressed the original proposal to develop the property as a mixed-use development with 900 residences and 60,000 square feet of retail space.

The August 18, 2003 memorandum addresses the current proposal for 900 residences and 120,000 square feet of retail space.

There are some inadequacies at the MD 214/Ritchie Road/Morgan Boulevard intersection.

The applicant has proffered to construct a second westbound left-turn lane along MD 214 as a mitigation. The proposed mitigation meets the requirements of the Subdivision Regulations. In all other cases, the Transportation findings remain unchanged.

The memorandum dated August 28, 2003 from the Transportation Planning Section states that:

"The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the Comprehensive Design Plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 91.9 acres of land in the L-A-C Zone. The property is located on both sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard north of MD 214.

"The original application proposed to develop the property as a mixed-use development with 900 residences and 60,000 square feet of retail space. Since the original technical staff report was released, the applicant has revised the application to show a more mixed-use concept in conjunction with adjacent properties. The amount of development currently proposed for the site currently under review is 900 residences and 120,000 square feet of retail space.

"The applicant originally prepared a traffic impact study dated January 2003 and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. With the above-cited change, the applicant has provided an addendum dated August 2003 that has been reviewed by staff. For the most part, all findings in the July 10, 2003, memorandum remain intact. In consideration of the changes now proposed and all factors described in the original memorandum, the site trip generation would be 338 AM peak-hour trips

(93 in, 245 out) and 624 PM peak-hour trips (360 in, 263 out). Therefore, with the revised development quantities the following results under total traffic are obtained:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive	1,416	1,519	D	E
MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Morgan Boulevard	1,584	2,005	E	F
MD 214 and Hampton Pk/Brightseat Road	1,189	1,472	C	E
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Fieldstone	17.2*	+999*	--	--
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Metro access	719	681	A	A
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Ridgefield	33.6*	163.3*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i>, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.</p>				

“In response to the inadequacy at the MD 214/Ritchie/Morgan Road intersection, the applicant has proffered mitigation. This intersection is eligible for mitigation under the first, second, and the fourth criteria in the Guidelines for Mitigation Action (approved as CR-29-1994). The applicant recommends the improvements described below to mitigate the impact of the applicant's development in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 24-124(a)(6). The improvements include:

- “• Construction of a second westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.

“The impact of the mitigation actions at this intersection is summarized as follows:

IMPACT OF MITIGATION				
Intersection	LOS and CLV (AM & PM)		CLV Difference (AM & PM)	
MD 214/Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard				
Background Conditions	F/1516	F/2017		
Total Traffic Conditions	F/1584	F/2005	+68	-12
Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation	E/1584	D/1756	-0	-249

“The LOS E standard in the Developed Tier is met during the AM peak hour.

“As the CLV at MD 214/Ritchie/Morgan is greater than 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 100 percent of the trips generated by the subject property during the PM peak hour, and bring the CLV to no greater than 1,813, according to the Guidelines. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate at least

100 percent of site-generated trips during the PM peak hour, and it brings the CLV to 1,813 or less. **Therefore, the proposed mitigation at MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.**

“For the MD 214/Ritchie/Morgan Road intersection, the numbers have changed slightly but the improvements required to address the inadequacy remain unchanged. In all other cases, the transportation findings remain unchanged.

“Transportation Staff Conclusions

“Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the revision to the proposed development will not be an unreasonable burden on transportation facilities that are existing, under construction, or for which 100 percent construction funding is contained in the county CIP or the state CTP. Therefore, the transportation staff believes that the requirements pertaining to transportation facilities under Section 27-521 of the Prince George's County Code would be met if the application is approved with the identical conditions that were provided in the July 10, 2003, memorandum.”

The memorandum from the Transportation Planning Section dated July 10, 2003 states that:

“The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed the Comprehensive Design Plan application referenced above. The subject property consists of approximately 91.9 acres of land in the L-A-C Zone. The property is located on both sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard north of MD 214. The applicant proposes to develop the property as a mixed-use development with 900 residences and 60,000 square feet of retail space.

“The applicant prepared a traffic impact study dated January 2003, and prepared in accordance with the methodologies in the *Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals*. The findings and recommendations outlined below are based upon a review of relevant materials and analyses conducted by the staff of the Transportation Planning Section, consistent with the *Guidelines*. Comments from the county Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and the State Highway Administration (SHA) are attached.

Growth Policy - Service Level Standards

“The subject property is located within the developed tier, as defined in the General Plan for Prince George's County. As such, the subject property is evaluated according to the following standards:

“Links and signalized intersections: Level-of-Service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Ordinance, is permitted at signalized intersections within any Tier subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the *Guidelines*.

“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.

Staff Analysis of Traffic Impacts

“The traffic impact study prepared and submitted on behalf of the applicant analyzed the following intersections:

- MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive (signalized)
- MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard (signalized)
- MD 214 and Hampton Park Boulevard/Brightseat Road (signalized)
- Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and Fieldstone Way/site access (unsignalized)
- Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and Metro access/site access (future/unsignalized)
- Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and Ridgefield Boulevard/site access (unsignalized)

Existing traffic conditions were based on traffic counts done in November 2002. Existing conditions within the study area are summarized as follows:

EXISTING CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive	1,432	1,447	D	D
MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Morgan Boulevard	1,385	1,752	D	F
MD 214 and Hampton Pk/Brightseat Road	1,159	1,361	C	D
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Fieldstone	10.0*	11.1*	--	--
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Metro access		Planned	--	--
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Ridgefield	12.7*	15.4*	--	--
*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i> , an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.				

The submitted traffic study provides an analysis for assessing the background traffic situation. The applicant has used the recent *Addison Road to Largo Town Center Metrorail Extension Access Study*, completed in 2001, to develop background traffic. This study considered the following:

- A 1.5 percent annual growth factor for through traffic along MD 214. This is consistent with past studies in the area. It is also consistent with historical data.
- Background development in the area.
- The impact on area traffic of the extension of the Metrorail Blue Line from Addison Road to the Largo Town Center. This mass transit extension is fully funded for construction. It is under construction at this time, and is planned to open in December 2004.
- The impact on area traffic of the I-95/I-495/Ritchie Marlboro Road interchange. This key roadway improvement is under construction, with full opening to occur within the month.

Background conditions are summarized as follows:

BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive	1,386	1,482	D	E
MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Morgan Boulevard	1,516	2,017	E	F
MD 214 and Hampton Pk/Brightseat Road	1,178	1,440	C	D
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Fieldstone	11.3*	13.5*	--	--
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Metro access	620	596	A	A
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Ridgefield	16.8*	22.2*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i>, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.</p>				

“The site is proposed for residential and retail development. The site trip generation makes reasonable assumptions about the site trip distribution. It also assumes a strong orientation toward the adjacent Morgan Boulevard Metrorail station, which is part of the funded extension of the Metrorail system. The trip generation includes the following assumptions:

- “• Base trip generation rates consistent with the *Guidelines* for the residential and retail uses.

- “• Use of vehicle occupancy rates of 1.60 for retail and 1.15 for residential to convert between vehicle trips and person trips. Person trips are needed for making an appropriate auto/transit mode split.
- “• Use of auto/transit mode splits of 50%/50% for residential development and 95%/5% for retail development.
- “• The *Guidelines* allow a pass-by trip rate of up to 60 percent for retail uses. This pass-by rate assumes that not all trips generated by the use are new trips, and a portion of the trips are already on the road. Also, because the project is mixed-use, there is an assumption that 5 percent of AM and 10 percent of PM trips to the retail use is generated by the residential component of the site.

“In consideration of the factors above, the site trip generation would be 298 AM peak hour trips (68 in, 230 out) and 533 PM peak hour trips (315 in, 218 out). Therefore, we obtain the following results under total traffic:

TOTAL TRAFFIC CONDITIONS				
Intersection	Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)		Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)	
MD 214 and Hill Road/Shady Glen Drive	1,414	1,516	D	E
MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Morgan Boulevard	1,578	1,997	E	F
MD 214 and Hampton Pk/Brightseat Road	1,187	1,467	C	E
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Fieldstone	15.1*	126.5*	--	--
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Metro access	716	675	A	A
Morgan Boulevard and site access/Ridgefield	32.2*	146.4*	--	--
<p>*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the <i>Guidelines</i>, an average vehicle delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Delays of +999 are outside the range of the procedures, and should be interpreted as excessive.</p>				

“In response to the inadequacy at the MD 214/Ritchie/Morgan Road intersection, the applicant has proffered mitigation. This intersection is eligible for mitigation under the first, second, and the fourth criteria in the *Guidelines for Mitigation Action* (approved as CR-29-1994). The applicant recommends the improvements described below to mitigate the impact of the applicant's development in accordance with the provisions of Sec. 24-124(a)(6). The improvements include:

“ Construction of a second westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.

“The impact of the mitigation actions at this intersection is summarized as follows:

IMPACT OF MITIGATION				
Intersection	LOS and CLV (AM & PM)		CLV Difference (AM & PM)	
MD 214/Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard				
Background Conditions	F/1516	F/2017		
Total Traffic Conditions	F/1578	F/1997	+62	-20
Total Traffic Conditions w/Mitigation	E/1578	D/1748	-0	-251

“The LOS E standard in the developed tier is met during the AM peak hour.

“As the CLV at MD 214/Ritchie/Morgan is greater than 1,813 during the PM peak hour, the proposed mitigation action must mitigate at least 100 percent of the trips generated by the subject property during the PM peak hour, and bring the CLV to no greater than 1,813, according to the *Guidelines*. The above table indicates that the proposed mitigation action would mitigate at least 100 percent of site-generated trips during the PM peak hour, and it bring the CLV to 1,813 or less. **Therefore, the proposed mitigation at MD 214 and Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard meets the requirements of Section 24-124(a)(6)(B)(i) of the Subdivision Ordinance in considering traffic impacts.**

“Also under total traffic, the issues at the unsignalized intersections must be addressed. There is evidence that a traffic signal will be installed at the entrance to the Morgan Boulevard Metrorail station. While this may be installed by other parties, it is also needed for safe access to a portion of the applicant’s site. Because the applicant would be adding a fourth leg to the intersection, the applicant will need to be responsible for any signal modifications that are needed. At the Morgan/Ridgefield intersection, the traffic study recommends study and possible installation of a signal by the applicant; this is appropriate. With regard to the Morgan/Fieldstone intersection, the traffic study makes an argument that the two other nearby traffic signals (at MD 214 and at Metro) would provide gaps in the traffic stream, making an additional signal unneeded. DPW&T appeared to disagree with that argument, and recommended the needed signal warrant study be done. The possibility of a signal should be reviewed by transportation planning staff and DPW&T at the time of preliminary plan, with possible determination of the need for a traffic signal warrant study at the time of Specific Design Plan.

“Comments – Operating Agencies

“Both DPW&T and SHA have provided comments on the traffic study, and the comments are attached.

“DPW&T indicated a need for left-turn bays along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at each site access point. This is reasonable, and will be made a condition of the plan. Also, DPW&T noted differences in service levels between the submitted traffic study and the *Addison Road to Largo Town Center Metrorail Extension Access Study*. There were no incidents on the particular date

that the counts were done, and all counts are less than one year old. Also, SHA did not comment upon the disparity even though the counts along MD 214 were from different sources and done on different dates.

“SHA generally concurred with the recommendations of the traffic study. Concern was expressed about the LOS E standard within the Developed Tier; however, that is a matter of county policy.

“Plan Comments

“The Comprehensive Design Plan is generally acceptable from the standpoint of access and circulation. However, given the possibility of the redevelopment of park property to the west of the subject property and north of the Metrorail alignment, the plan should be revised to provide a public street of Type B as identified in the Comprehensive Design Plan between Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the western property line.

“Conformance to Basic Plan

“This site was reviewed as Basic Plan A-9678, which was approved with several transportation-related conditions. The status of these conditions is summarized below:

A-9678:

“Condition 1: This condition requires that the development show that transportation service levels would be maintained at levels that would exist without the development. A traffic study has been submitted and reviewed, and the recommendations conform to the subject condition as well as current county regulations.

“Conditions 7 and 8: These conditions require that Metrorail alignments and station locations be shown on the CDP. The Metrorail Blue Line extension is funded and under construction, and all needed right-of-way has been purchased. The right-of-way for the tracks and the station is accurately shown on the CDP.

“Consideration 7: This consideration requires that certain roadway improvements in the area be shown on the CDP. All identified roadway improvements have been constructed.

“Consideration 11: This consideration requires that a Metrorail alignment be identified on the CDP. Once again, the Metrorail Blue Line extension is funded and under construction, and all needed right-of-way has been purchased. The right-of-way, consistent with current plans, is accurately shown on the CDP.

“Consideration 16: This consideration requires that the applicant develop a trip reduction program prior to CDP approval. With the proximity of the Morgan Boulevard Metrorail station, however, there is minimal need for a formal program beyond employing good principles of transit-oriented development and planning needed non-vehicular connections to the station. As this is a consideration and not a condition, given the proximity of the site to mass transportation facilities there is little need for a trip reduction program to be developed and implemented.

“Based on the above information, from the standpoint of transportation the submitted plan is in conformance to the approved Basic Plan.

“Transportation Staff Conclusions

“Based on the preceding findings, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that the proposed development will not be an unreasonable burden on transportation facilities which are existing, under construction or for which 100% construction funding is contained in the County CIP or the State CTP. Therefore, the transportation staff believes that the requirements pertaining to transportation facilities under Section 27-521 of the Prince George’s County Code would be met if the application is approved with the following conditions:

1. “Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall have full financial assurances, have been permitted for construction, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA/DPW&T:
 - a. At the MD 214/Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard intersection, construction of a second westbound left-turn lane along the MD 214 approach.
2. “Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Metrorail access/site access: The applicant shall submit acceptable signal studies to DPW&T for the modification of this signal (to be installed by others) and the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access. The timing of this study shall be determined at the time of Specific Design Plan.
3. “Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Ridgefield/site access: Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T at this location. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by DPW&T at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T. The improvements at this location shall include the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access.
4. “Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Fieldstone/site access: Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T at this location (during review of the preliminary plan, the need for this study and resulting signal installation may be waived by DPW&T upon review of traffic operations along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard). The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by DPW&T at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T. The improvements at this location shall include the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access.
5. “Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at east village/west village access: The improvements at this location shall include modification of the intersection to provide left-turn bays at the median break to serve the site accesses.
6. “The plan shall be revised to provide a public street of Type B as identified in the Comprehensive Design Plan between Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the western property line at MNCPPC Parcel 14.”

13. The Environmental Planning Section (Metzger to Srinivas, July 15, 2003) has stated that the approval of the Basic Plan by the District Council included numerous conditions which dealt with environmental issues that were to be addressed during the review of this Comprehensive Design Plan. The following conditions required by the Basic Plan have not been shown on the Comprehensive Design Plan:

- The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and along the Metro line have not been shown.
- The residential development impacts the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and slopes of 25 percent or greater
- Crossing for the access road does not appear to be in a location that minimizes impacts to the floodplain or nontidal wetlands
- Minimum buffers of 50 feet on either side of streams and 25 feet around the perimeter of wetlands have not been provided in accordance with the requirements of the Patuxent River Policy Plan
- The TCPI shows numerous impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA), which is to be protected to the greatest extent possible.

The Section has recommended conditions of approval to comply with the Basic Plan conditions.

The memorandum from the Environmental Planning Section states that:

“The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed the above referenced Comprehensive Design Plan stamped as accepted on March 24, 2003, and the revised CDP and associated information dated July 30, 2003. The Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0301, and Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/27/03, are recommended for approval subject to the conditions found in this memorandum. It should be noted that the revised plans dated July 30, 2003, did not contain any environmental information. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan will need to be revised to address the new layout. This memorandum supercedes all previous memos from this section.

“BACKGROUND

“There are two Basic Plans that contain conditions and considerations that are relevant to the review of the CDP (A-9518-C and A-9678-C).

“SITE DESCRIPTION

“The site, totaling 69.04 acres in the L-A-C zone, is located on the east and west sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Ridgefield Boulevard. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, areas of steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes are found to occur within the limits of the property. Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the above-ground portions of the proposed Metro station are transportation-related noise generators that will adversely impact the residential portions of this site. The soils found to occur according to the Prince George’s County Soil Survey include Collington fine sandy loam, Adelphia silt loam, Mixed alluvial land, and Sunnyside loam. The Mixed alluvial land, Adelphia and Sunnyside soils have detrimental limitations due to high water tables and impeded drainage. Collington soils pose few limitations to development. According to available information,

Marlboro clay is not found to occur in the vicinity of this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program publication titled "Ecologically Significant Areas in Anne Arundel and Prince George's Counties," December 1997, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this property. There are no designated scenic and historic roads located in the vicinity of this property. This property is located in the Southwest Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin and in the Developed Tier as reflected in the adopted General Plan.

"ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL TO BE ADDRESSED AT COMPREHENSIVE DESIGN PLAN

"The approval of the Basic Plan by the District Council included numerous conditions which dealt with environmental issues that were to be addressed during subsequent reviews. The environmental issues to be addressed during the review of this Comprehensive Design Plan are addressed below. The respective conditions are in **bold** type face, the associated comments are in standard type face and the recommended conditions are in italics.

"BASIC PLANS, A-9518-C and A-9678-C (Conditions)

"There are no environmental conditions associated with these approvals.

"BASIC PLANS, A-9518-C and A-9678-C (Considerations)

- "1. A comprehensive woodland conservation preservation plan shall be submitted with the CDP application.**

"A Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/27/03) was submitted with this application. The TCPI will be discussed later in this memorandum.

- "2. Noise "corridors" are to be established for the Metro Line and the extension of Summerfield Boulevard and shown on the CDP.**

"The CDP text indicates that the Metro is below ground or buffered by walls and therefore not an issue. If this is correct, the underground and below-grade sections should be shown on the plan along with the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. This is of particular concern because the original CDP Landscape Concept Plan shows proposed residential lots adjacent to the right-of-way of Morgan Boulevard on page 20 of the CDP document.

"This consideration also includes the extension of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard (Summerfield Boulevard), which is also a transportation-related noise generator. There are numerous residences proposed along this segment of the road that may be impacted by transportation-related noise.

"Recommended Condition: The CDP shall be revised to show the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and along the Metro line as appropriate.

- "3. Development in the proposed pods will be restricted to areas outside the 100-year floodplain, non-tidal wetlands, and slopes of 25% or greater unless under specific conditions it can be shown to be appropriate to vary. This restriction does not apply to public and private street locations.**

“Some of the residential development appears to intrude into these features. Some streets have also been placed extremely close to these features, necessitating impacts that could be easily avoided. The proposed road crossing for access to the western portion of the site is unavoidable but could be designed to minimize impacts. The two loop roads could easily be relocated to avoid all of the impacts to these features.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and TCPI shall be revised to avoid impacts to the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and slopes of 25 percent or greater except where road crossings, sewer connections, and storm drain outfalls are required. Where crossings are required they shall be placed at the point of least impact as determined by the Environmental Planning Section.

“4. Road crossings of the floodplain or non-tidal wetlands shall be reviewed in detail with M-NCPPC staff prior to submittal of a CDP.

“The applicant met with the Environmental Planning Section to discuss alternatives prior to the submittal of this application. However, the crossing for the access road does not appear to be in the location that minimizes impacts.

“9. A minimum buffer of 50 feet on either side of streams and 25 feet around the perimeter of wetlands shall be provided in accordance with the requirements of the Patuxent River Policy Plan. Said area may be included within lots, provided that appropriate non-disturbance easements or covenant are imposed.

“Streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes are found on this property. These features along with their respective buffers comprise the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA). The features and the PMA have been incorrectly shown on the plans as submitted. Wetland and 100-year floodplain studies have not been submitted for review.

“The stream buffer as shown on the plans is not consistently shown as being 50 feet wide on either side of the stream. In some areas where encroachment is being proposed it is shown as being only 25 feet in width.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification, the CDP and the TCPI shall be revised to show the centerline of the stream, the 50-foot stream buffer, the 100-year floodplain, the nontidal wetlands, the 25-foot wetland buffer, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes. The maximum limit of these features shall be delineated and labeled as the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA). Wetland and 100-year floodplain studies shall be submitted for review with the revised plans.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification, the plans shall be revised to minimize or eliminate any and all impacts to the PMA except those necessary for road construction and the installation of utilities.

“13. The location of a potential regional stormwater lake proposed by WSSC/DER shall be shown on the CDP.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification, the CDP and TCP shall be revised to show the location of a potential regional stormwater lake proposed by WSSC/DER, or a copy of the Stormwater Concept Approval Letter and Plan shall be submitted before review can continue.

- 14. In order to address the compatibility of adjacent land uses, the CDP shall show a minimum 100-foot vegetated buffer on the Summerfield site where there is existing residential development adjacent to the boundary and a minimum of 50 foot buffers on Manor Farm where there are undeveloped adjacent residential properties. Existing vegetation will be supplemented where necessary.**

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification, the CDP and TCP shall be revised to show a minimum 100-foot-wide preserved buffer on the Summerfield site where there is existing residential development adjacent to the boundary, and a minimum 50-foot-wide buffers adjacent to the Manor Farm properties where there are undeveloped adjacent residential properties. Existing vegetation will be supplemented where necessary to create an effective buffer.

“Environmental Review

“As revisions are made to the plans submitted, the revision boxes on each plan sheet shall be used to describe what revisions were made, when, and by whom.

- “1. The Detailed Forest Stand Delineation (FSD) submitted to the Environmental Planning Section on March 24, 2003, was reviewed. A note on the FSD states that a letter from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources has been obtained regarding rare, threatened or endangered species. A copy of that letter was submitted with the review package of June 11, 2003. The soil K factors as indicated in the text are not shown on the plan as required. This information is necessary on the FSD so that the proper alignment of the PMA can be determined.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the CDP, the FSD plan shall be revised to show the soil K factors in the text and on the plan.

- “2. This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet; there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site; and there are no previously approved Tree Conservation Plans. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan is required.

“This 69.04-acre property in the L-A-C Zone has a 15 percent woodland conservation threshold of 8.97 acres. In addition, there is a ¼:1 replacement requirement of approximately 12.64 acres due to the proposed clearing of approximately 47.59 acres of existing woodland and a 1:1 replacement requirement of 0.74 acres due to the proposed clearing of forested floodplain. The 21.61-acre requirement is proposed to be satisfied by the preservation of 7.21 acres of priority woodlands plus 1.39 acres of reforestation with the remainder of the requirement, 12.98 acres, being off-site mitigation at a location to be determined prior to the issuance of any permits.

“There is a need to significantly revise the TCPI based on the newly submitted CDP. Locations of roads and uses have changed since the last version of the TCPI that was reviewed. The TCPI shall be revised to conform to the new layout prior to certification of the CDP.

“Recommended Conditions:

- “1. *Prior to certification of the CDP, TCPI/27/03 shall be revised as follows:*
- “a. *The layout of the site shall be revised to conform to the CDP, the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, and the approved conditions of the CDP.*
 - “b. *The worksheet shall be revised to reflect the correct amount of the gross tract area and to show the correct area of proposed woodland clearing based on the revised CDP.*
 - “c. *Revise the notes on the plan required exclusively for Type I Tree Conservation Plans. Fill in all the required information and revise the clearing penalty to read \$1.50 per square foot.*
 - “d. *Add the following notes to the TCPI in large bold type:*
 - “(1) *‘This TCPI is a conceptual plan associated with the Conceptual Design Plan only and does not approve the final locations of roads, lots or utilities.’*
 - “(2) *‘TCPI/27/03 shall be revised with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and the proposed PMA impacts will be further evaluated at that time. The PMA impacts shown on this plan are not considered approved with this plan.’*
 - “(3) *Conceptual grading, conceptual structure locations and a realistic limit of disturbance will be evaluated with the revised TCPI during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.’*
 - “e. *The revised plans shall be signed and dated by the Licensed Landscape Architect, Licensed Forester or other qualified professional who prepared the plan.*
- “2. *The Woodland Conservation Threshold portion of the requirement (8.97 acres) shall be satisfied as on-site preservation of priority woodlands. The balance of the requirements may be satisfied by additional on-site preservation, on-site reforestation, or at an approved off-site mitigation bank in the Developing Tier. If the project is phased, woodland on-site that will be cleared in the future can be used to meet the requirements until such time as the off-site mitigation requirement is applicable.*
- “3. *At time of Preliminary Plan submittal, a TCPI shall be submitted that includes the following:*
- “a. *Elimination of isolated woodland conservation areas by adjusting the layout and providing larger contiguous forest areas in the vicinity of the PMA and thus further minimizing proposed PMA impacts.*
 - “b. *The location of all sewer and water lines and stormwater outfalls including those connecting to existing facilities located outside the limits of this application.*

“c. Mitigation of any off-site clearing at a 1:1 ratio for all woodlands cleared as part of TCPI/27/03.

- “3. This site is located at the headwaters of Southwest Branch, a tributary to the Patuxent River. The Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA) is defined by Section 24-101 of the Subdivision Ordinance to include streams, a 50-foot stream buffer, wetlands, a 25-foot wetland buffer, the 100-year floodplain, steep slopes (15 to 25 percent) with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes of 25 percent or greater. Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Ordinance mandates that these features be preserved to the fullest extent possible.

“The location of the PMA has been evaluated during the review of this application on a conceptual level that will be further expanded during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision. At that time the plans will be prepared at a scale of 1" = 100' or larger to clearly identify each component of the PMA and the ultimate limit of the PMA. In addition, a Letter of Justification shall be submitted to address each of the proposed PMA impacts and to provide justification for those proposed impacts. It should be noted that PMA impacts associated with the infrastructure necessary to develop a site are generally supported, while impacts shown for the grading of lots for building construction are not supported.

“Recommended Conditions:

“1. The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision shall be designed to preserve the PMA to the fullest extent possible. If impacts are proposed a Letter of Justification shall be submitted with the Preliminary Plan application. It shall include a description and justification of each proposed area of impact. The impacts to each feature of the PMA shall be quantified and shown on 8½- x 11-inch sheets.

“2. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits which impact the Waters of the U.S., nontidal wetlands, or the 25-foot wetland buffer, a copy of all appropriate federal and/or state permits shall be submitted.

“3. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan and the Type I Tree Conservation Plan the following note shall be placed on both plans in large bold type.

“This plan provides a conceptual layout for the proposed development of this site that has not considered the presence of Marlboro clay. The location and characteristics of this clay could significantly reduce the developable area of this site resulting in a loss of residential and/or commercial density.”

- “4. Soils found on this site (Mixed alluvial land, Adelphia sandy loams, and Sunnyside loams) have limitations with respect to impeded drainage, high water tables or slopes. These limitations will not affect the proposed development layout or infrastructure, but may have an impact during the construction phase of the project.

“Discussion: During the design phase of this project special consideration should be given to areas with impeded drainage and high water tables because many residences in this area and throughout the county experience basement flooding during the winter

months and during storm events of extended duration. The plans should account for natural drainage away from the residences and for backup systems.

- “5. The plans as submitted do not show the conceptual locations of stormwater management facilities. These features can occupy a significant portion of the site and must be considered, especially during the Preliminary Plan stage of review. The concept plan and approval letter shall be submitted as part of the Preliminary Plan application so that the layout can be evaluated with these features located. During future reviews, coordination with the Department of Environmental Resources is essential to ensuring that the final layout and design respect the limits of disturbance shown on the Tree Conservation Plans.

“Recommended Condition: As part of the submission package for the Preliminary Plan, a copy of the approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and letter shall be submitted.

“Recommended Condition: Prior to the acceptance of the Specific Design Plan and prior to submittal of the technical Stormwater Management Plans, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting with the Department of Environmental Resources, Stormwater Management Review Section, and M-NCPPC, Environmental Planning Section, to discuss the constraints of the site and to ensure a coordinated review during the last phase of review.

“SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS

“The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CDP-0301 and TCPI/27/03 subject to the following conditions:

- “1. Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and TCPI shall be revised to:
- “a. Avoid impacts to the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and slopes of 25 percent or greater except where road crossings, sewer connections, and storm drain outfalls are required. Where crossings are required they shall be placed at the point of least impact as determined by the Environmental Planning Section.
 - “b. Show the centerline of the stream, the 50-foot stream buffer, the 100-year floodplain, the nontidal wetlands, the 25-foot wetland buffer, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes. The maximum limit of these features shall be delineated and labeled as the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA). Wetland and 100-year floodplain studies shall be submitted for review with the revised plans.
 - “c. Minimize or eliminate any and all impacts to the PMA except those necessary for road construction and the installation of utilities.
 - “d. Show the location of a potential regional stormwater lake proposed by WSSC/DER, or a copy of the Stormwater Concept Approval Letter and Plan shall be submitted before review can continue.
 - “e. Show a minimum 100 foot-wide preserved buffer on the Summerfield site where there is existing residential development adjacent to the boundary and a

minimum 50-foot-wide buffers adjacent to the Manor Farm properties where there are undeveloped adjacent residential properties. Existing vegetation will be supplemented where necessary to create an effective buffer.

- “f. Show the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and along the Metro line as appropriate.
- “g. Place on both plans in large bold type the following note:

“‘This plan provides a conceptual layout for the proposed development of this site that has not considered the presence of Marlboro clay. The location and characteristics of this clay could significantly reduce the developable area of this site resulting in a loss of residential and/or commercial density.’
- “2. Prior to certification of the CDP, the FSD plan shall be revised to show the soil K factors in the text and on the plan.
- “3. Prior to certification of the CDP, TCPI/27/03 shall be revised as follows:
 - “a. The layout of the site shall be revised to conform to the CDP, the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, and the approved conditions of the CDP.
 - “b. The worksheet shall be revised to reflect the correct amount of the gross tract area and to show the correct area of proposed woodland clearing based on the revised CDP.
 - “c. Revise the notes on the plan required exclusively for Type I Tree Conservation Plans. Fill in all the required information and revise the clearing penalty to read \$1.50 per square foot.
 - “d. Add the following notes to the TCPI in large bold type:
 - “(1) ‘This TCPI is a conceptual plan associated with the Conceptual Design Plan only and does not approve the final locations of roads, lots or utilities.’
 - “(2) ‘TCPI/27/03 shall be revised with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and the proposed PMA impacts will be further evaluated at that time. The PMA impacts shown on this plan are not considered approved with this plan.’
 - “(3) Conceptual grading, conceptual structure locations and a realistic limit of disturbance will be evaluated with the revised TCPI during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.’
 - “e. The revised plans shall be signed and dated by the licensed landscape architect, licensed forester or other qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- “4. The Woodland Conservation Threshold portion of the requirement (8.97 acres) shall be satisfied as on-site preservation of priority woodlands. The balance of the requirements

may be satisfied by additional on-site preservation, on-site reforestation, or at an approved off-site mitigation bank in the Developing Tier. If the project is phased, woodland on-site that will be cleared in the future can be used to meet the requirements until such time as the off-site mitigation requirement is applicable.

- “5. At time of Preliminary Plan submittal, a TCPI shall be submitted that includes the following:
 - “a. Elimination of isolated woodland conservation areas by adjusting the layout and providing larger contiguous forest areas in the vicinity of the PMA and thus further minimizing proposed PMA impacts.
 - “b. The location of all sewer and water lines and stormwater outfalls including those connecting to existing facilities located outside the limits of this application.
 - “c. Mitigation of any off-site clearing at a 1:1 ratio for all woodlands cleared as part of TCPI/27/03.
 - “6. The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision shall be designed to preserve the PMA to the fullest extent possible. If impacts are proposed a Letter of Justification shall be submitted with the Preliminary Plan application. It shall include a description and justification of each proposed area of impact. The impacts to each feature of the PMA shall be quantified and shown on 8½- x 11-inch sheets.
 - “7. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits which impact the Waters of the U.S., nontidal wetlands, or the 25-foot wetland buffer, a copy of all appropriate federal and/or state permits shall be submitted.
 - “8. As part of the submission package for the Preliminary Plan, a copy of the currently approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and letter shall be included.
 - “9. Prior to the acceptance of the Specific Design Plan and prior to submittal of the technical Stormwater Management Plans, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting with the Department of Environmental Resources, Stormwater Management Review Section, and M-NCPPC, Environmental Planning Section, to discuss the constraints of the site and to ensure a coordinated review during the last phase of review.”
14. The Historic Preservation and Public Facilities Planning Section (Harrell to Srinivas, July 9, 2003) has concluded that the proposed Comprehensive Design Plan will meet the required findings for adequate public facilities subject to the following condition:
- The section has recommended a condition requiring that the applicant shall provide an approved fire suppression system or other fire suppression systems acceptable to the Prince George’s County Fire Department to be installed in all structures.
15. The Department of Parks and Recreation (Asan to Srinivas, July 15, 2003) has recommended approval of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0301 with conditions of approval requiring private recreational facilities to be submitted to the Urban Design Review Section. Extension of the road in the western portion of the development to the park property line for the future access to the Hill Road Community Park is also required.

16. The subject Comprehensive Design Plan is in general conformance with the Basic Plan because it includes the land use mix approved by the Basic Plan. However, the Comprehensive Design Plan has the following inadequacies:

- It does not provide adequate vehicular connections to establish interconnectivity with the various development pods of the subject property.
- It does not integrate the proposed land uses with the existing natural features.
- The development areas encroach into the wetland and floodplain buffers.

Conditions of approval have been added to address these inadequacies. Staff is, therefore, recommending approval of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0301 with conditions.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the preceding evaluation, the Urban Design Review Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE CDP-0301 and TCPI/27/03 for Balk Hill, with the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the Comprehensive Design Plan, the Comprehensive Design Plan drawings and text shall be revised to incorporate the following or the indicated information shall be provided:
 - a. The net area available for development in the four quadrants to the north and south of the Metro Station and the east and west sides of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard.
 - b. Notes demonstrating the degree of compliance of the subject Comprehensive Design Plan with the 2002 General Plan development pattern policies for the Developed Tier and regional center designation for the Morgan Boulevard Metro Station.
 - c. A continuous minimum eight-foot wide sidewalk or trail along the subject site's entire road frontage on the west side of Morgan Boulevard to complement the existing trail on the east side of Morgan Boulevard
 - d. A trail connection from the end of Willow Hill Drive to Morgan Boulevard, from the end of Willow Hill Drive to Metro, from Morgan Boulevard, through the East Village, and to the existing trails in the adjoining Summerfield community
2. Prior to certification of the CDP, the CDP and TCPI shall be revised to:
 - a. Avoid impacts to the 100-year floodplain, nontidal wetlands, and slopes of 25 percent or greater except where road crossings, sewer connections, and storm drain outfalls are required. Where crossings are required they shall be placed at the point of least impact as determined by the Environmental Planning Section.
 - b. Show the centerline of the stream, the 50-foot stream buffer, the 100-year floodplain, the nontidal wetlands, the 25-foot wetland buffer, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes. The maximum limit of these features shall be delineated and labeled as the Patuxent River Primary Management Area (PMA). Wetland and 100-year floodplain studies shall be submitted for review with the revised plans.

- c. Minimize or eliminate any and all impacts to the PMA except those necessary for road construction and the installation of utilities.
 - d. Show the location of a potential regional stormwater lake proposed by WSSC/DER, or a copy of the Stormwater Concept Approval Letter and Plan shall be submitted before review can continue.
 - e. Show a minimum 100 foot-wide preserved buffer on the Summerfield site where there is existing residential development adjacent to the boundary and a minimum 50-foot-wide buffers adjacent to the Manor Farm properties where there are undeveloped adjacent residential properties. Existing vegetation will be supplemented where necessary to create an effective buffer.
 - f. Show the location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and along the Metro line as appropriate.
 - g. Place on both plans in large bold type the following note:

‘This plan provides a conceptual layout for the proposed development of this site that has not considered the presence of Marlboro clay. The location and characteristics of this clay could significantly reduce the developable area of this site resulting in a loss of residential and/or commercial density.’
3. Prior to certification of the CDP, the FSD plan shall be revised to show the soil K factors in the text and on the plan.
4. Prior to certification of the CDP, TCPI/27/03 shall be revised as follows:
- a. The layout of the site shall be revised to conform to the CDP, the Woodland Conservation Ordinance, and the approved conditions of the CDP.
 - b. The worksheet shall be revised to reflect the correct amount of the gross tract area and to show the correct area of proposed woodland clearing based on the revised CDP.
 - c. Revise the notes on the plan required exclusively for Type I Tree Conservation Plans. Fill in all the required information and revise the clearing penalty to read \$1.50 per square foot.
 - d. Add the following notes to the TCPI in large bold type:
 - (1) ‘This TCPI is a conceptual plan associated with the Conceptual Design Plan only and does not approve the final locations of roads, lots or utilities.’
 - (2) ‘TCPI/27/03 shall be revised with the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and the proposed PMA impacts will be further evaluated at that time. The PMA impacts shown on this plan are not considered approved with this plan.’
 - (3) Conceptual grading, conceptual structure locations and a realistic limit of disturbance will be evaluated with the revised TCPI during the review of the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision.’

- e. The revised plans shall be signed and dated by the licensed landscape architect, licensed forester or other qualified professional who prepared the plan.
- 5. The Woodland Conservation Threshold portion of the requirement (8.97 acres) shall be satisfied as on-site preservation of priority woodlands. The balance of the requirements may be satisfied by additional on-site preservation, on-site reforestation, or at an approved off-site mitigation bank in the Developing Tier. If the project is phased, woodland on-site that will be cleared in the future can be used to meet the requirements until such time as the off-site mitigation requirement is applicable.
- 6. No residential development shall be proposed to the south of the Metro station until a minimum of 50,000 square feet of commercial uses are built to the south of the Metro station on the property encompassed by the subject CDP.
- 7. The last 300 residential units proposed to the north of the Metro Station shall not be built until at least 5,000 square feet of commercial/retail uses are constructed to the north of the Metro Station.
- 8. The applicant, his successors, and/or assigns, shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.
- 9. The improvements at Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at East Village/West Village access shall include modification of the intersection to provide left-turn bays at the median break to serve the site accesses.
- 10. The plan shall be revised to provide a public street of Type B as identified in the Comprehensive Design Plan between Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and the western property line at MNCPPC Parcel 14.
- 11. The two narrow commercial parcels on the west side of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and on the southernmost side of the Metro station shall be developed only in conjunction with and as closely integrated portions of a larger mixed-use development encompassing a significant aggregation of the parcels northwest of the intersection of Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard and Central Avenue (MD 214).
- 12. The applicant shall provide an approved fire suppression system or other fire suppression system acceptable to the Prince George's County Fire Department to be installed in all structures.
- 13. At time of Preliminary Plan submittal, a TCPI shall be submitted that includes the following:
 - a. Elimination of isolated woodland conservation areas by adjusting the layout and providing larger contiguous forest areas in the vicinity of the PMA and thus further minimizing proposed PMA impacts.
 - b. The location of all sewer and water lines and stormwater outfalls including those connecting to existing facilities located outside the limits of this application.
 - c. Mitigation of any off-site clearing at a 1:1 ratio for all woodlands cleared as part of TCPI/27/03.

14. The Preliminary Plan of Subdivision shall be designed to preserve the PMA to the fullest extent possible. If impacts are proposed a Letter of Justification shall be submitted with the Preliminary Plan application. It shall include a description and justification of each proposed area of impact. The impacts to each feature of the PMA shall be quantified and shown on 8½- x 11-inch sheets.
15. As part of the submission package for the Preliminary Plan, a copy of the currently approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan and letter shall be included.
16. Prior to the acceptance of the Specific Design Plan and prior to submittal of the technical Stormwater Management Plans, the applicant shall coordinate a meeting with the Department of Environmental Resources, Stormwater Management Review Section, and M-NCPPC, Environmental Planning Section, to discuss the constraints of the site and to ensure a coordinated review during the last phase of review.
17. At the time of the Specific Design Plan, the following shall be shown on the Specific Design Plan drawings:
 - a. A continuous minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk or trail along the subject site's entire road frontage on the west side of Morgan Boulevard to complement the existing trail on the east side of Morgan Boulevard and allow for safe pedestrian travel to and from the Metro and Fedex Field.
 - b. A trail connection from the end of Willow Hill Drive to Morgan Boulevard. In areas where the trail connection is located along planned roadways, an eight-foot wide sidewalk can be substituted for the trail.
 - c. A trail connection from the end of Willow Hill Drive to Metro to link the existing communities and the subject site to Metro immediately to the south. In areas where the trail connection is located along planned roadways, an eight-foot wide sidewalk can be substituted for the trail.
 - d. A trail connection from Morgan Boulevard, through the East Village, and to the existing trails in the adjoining Summerfield community.
 - e. Standard sidewalks along both sides of all roads.
 - f. Comprehensive trail and sidewalk map showing the proposed location of all master plan trails, feeder trail connections and sidewalks.
 - g. HOA feeder trails a minimum of six feet wide and asphalted.
 - h. Appropriate pedestrian safety measures such as well marked crosswalks, signage, adequate lighting and curb bump outs.
 - i. Appropriate in-road bicycle facilities along some internal roads on the subject site in keeping with the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.
 - j. Location of private recreational facilities. The location and adequacy of the private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section.
18. Prior to approval of a Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall:

- a. Submit acceptable signal studies to DPW&T for the modification of the signal at Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Metrorail access/site access (to be installed by others) and the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access.
 - b. Submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T at Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Ridgefield/site access. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by DPW&T at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T. The improvements at this location shall include the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access.
 - c. Submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T at Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard at Fieldstone/site access (during review of the preliminary plan, the need for this study and resulting signal installation may be waived by DPW&T upon review of traffic operations along Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard). The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by DPW&T at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T. The improvements at this location shall include the modification of the intersection to provide a left-turn bay to serve the site access.
19. Prior to the issuance of any grading permits which impact the Waters of the U.S., nontidal wetlands, or the 25-foot wetland buffer, a copy of all appropriate federal and/or state permits shall be submitted.
20. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements shall have full financial assurances, have been permitted for construction, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with SHA/DPW&T:
 - a. At the MD 214/Ritchie Road/Garrett A. Morgan Boulevard intersection, construction of a second westbound left-turn lane along the MD 214 approach.