



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

Comprehensive Design Plan

CDP-0502

Application	General Data
Project Name: Edwards Property (CVS Adelphi) Location: In the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of Riggs and Adelphi Roads, on the eastern side of Edwards Way. Applicant/Address: Zimmer Development Company 111 Princess Street Wilmington, NC 28042	Date Accepted: 02/16/2006
	Planning Board Action Limit: N/A
	Plan Acreage: 4.14
	Zone: L-A-C
	Dwelling Units: None
	Square Footage: 18,899
	Planning Area: 65
	Tier: Developed
	Council District: 01
	Municipality: N/A
	200-Scale Base Map: 211NE02

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates
Construction of a drugstore and a retail pad site	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: 11/23/2006 (CB-12-2003)
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed: 09/02/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: R. Grover, AICP	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
		X	

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0502
Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/15/06
Edwards Property (CVS Adelphi)

PUBLIC HEARING

In accordance with the comprehensive design plan provisions of Section 27-520 of the Prince George's County Code, a public hearing before the Prince George's County Planning Board has been advertised and noticed for October 2, 2008. The purpose of this hearing is to consider the comprehensive design plan for the Edwards Property (CVS Adelphi) Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0502.

INTRODUCTION

The Development Review Division of the Prince George's County Planning Department has coordinated the review of the subject application with all offices involved in 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

Staff recommends DISAPPROVAL of the comprehensive design plan, as stated in the recommendation section of this report.

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, which 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 CDZ 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 CDZs and conventional zones is that the CDZ includes a list of public benefit features and density or intensity increment factors. This development, however, does not propose to increase allowable commercial intensity (between .16 and .31 floor area ratio) by using public benefit features. In fact, the proposed development requests a .10 floor area ratio or a commercial intensity which is less than the base intensity included in the Zoning Ordinance for development of a neighborhood center, its classification, in the L-A-C Zone.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

This CDP was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

- A. Conformance with Basic Plan A-9954.
- B. The requirements of Section 27-495, Uses, of the Zoning Ordinance, the requirements of Section 27-496, Regulations, of the Zoning Ordinance in the Local Activity Center (L-A-C) Zone and the requirements of Section 27-521, Required Findings, for approval of a comprehensive design plan, including the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9.
- C. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- D. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

Based upon the analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design Section recommends the following findings:

- 1. **Request:** The CDP proposes a 13,013-square-foot CVS drugstore and a 5,886-square-foot pad site specified for retail/office on approximately 4.14 acres in the L-A-C Zone.
- 2. **Location:** The subject project is located on a triangular piece of land bounded by Riggs Road to the south, Edwards Way to the west, and Adelphi Road to the east.
- 3. **Surroundings:** The subject property is bounded on the south by a shopping center, Metzerott Plaza, on the northeast by a church and the George Washington Memorial Cemetery, and to the west by multifamily residential land use.
- 4. **Design Features:** The CDP proposes a 13,013-square-foot CVS drugstore and 5,886 square feet of retail and/or office commercial. The plan proposes two vehicular access points to the site, one from Adelphi Road and one from Riggs Road. Parking for the project is located on the northern end of the site, as well as along the project's Riggs Road and Adelphi Road frontages.

The application proposes a streetscape for the project that would vary depending on the portion of the site. Streetscape A is identified for either side of the community focal feature, further discussed below, located at the intersection of Riggs and Adelphi Roads, along Riggs Road to the vehicular entrance to the project and along Adelphi Road for approximately the same distance. Streetscape A is defined as including masonry piers, a knee wall with a fence on top of it and a linear hedge with perennial plantings. Streetscape D is identified for the project's Edwards Way road frontage. It is a vegetated buffer specified to include a diversity of plant types of seasonal interest. Streetscape B is specified from that point where Streetscape A ends then along Adelphi Road, extending to that point where a monument sign is indicated at the edge of the vehicular access to Adelphi Road. Streetscape B is defined to include a knee wall, benches and decorative light fixtures. The remainder of the Adelphi Road frontage (to its intersection with Edwards Way) and that portion of the frontage extending from the western side of the vehicular entrance to Riggs Road to the intersection of Riggs Road and Edwards Way are specified as Streetscape C, defined to include brick masonry piers (11 along Adelphi Road and 8 along Riggs Road) and a linear hedge. Approximately 21 decorative pedestrian scale light fixtures (eight along Adelphi Road, six along the Edwards Way frontage, and eight along the Riggs Road frontage),

four benches (one at the corner of Adelphi and Riggs Road, one to the south and two to the north of the vehicular entrance to the site from Adelphi Road) and two bus stops (one on the Riggs Road frontage and one on the Adelphi Road frontage) are provided as part of the streetscape.

The largely undifferentiated architecture of the CVS drugstore appears to be that of its standard prototypical building. It utilizes brick as the primary building material and exterior insulating finishing system (EIFS) and a red-colored aluminum product on the signage and door and window framework. The only visual relief offered on the monolithic building is some relief work in the brick and the signage, as the fenestration offered is utilitarian and minimal, concentrated primarily on the entrance corner of the building.

The architecture of the retail building differs from that of the CVS as it utilizes two-tone brick in horizontal striations to create visual interest. Five tenant bays are indicated in a “strip” shopping center design, with signage on each of the individual units. Periodic pilasters and decorative light fixtures provide a rhythm on the building’s front façade, which is largely glazed.

The application includes a community focal feature in the eastern portion of the site at the intersection of Riggs and Adelphi Roads that includes a “Welcome to Adelphi” masonry planter sign wall, an 18-inch knee wall with a decorative fence on top of it and periodic brick masonry piers, a trash receptacle, a bench and a trellis, landscaping including hedge plantings, a street light, together with the street trees and sidewalk that are characteristic of all portions of the streetscape. There is an additional monument sign (design unidentified) at each entrance to the development.

5. **Previous Approvals:** A stormwater management concept approval, dated April 2, 2008, for the project is attached and will expire on April 2, 2011. Basic Plan A-9954 was approved for the project on September 9, 2004. Each condition of that approval is listed in boldface type below, followed by staff comment.

- (1) **The Basic Plan shall be revised to show the following rights-of-way along the frontages of the subject property: MD 212 – 40 feet from center line (towards the ultimate right-of way of 80 feet); Adelphi Road – 50 feet from center line (toward the ultimate right-of way of 100 feet); Edwards Way – 35 feet from center line (in accordance with Zoning Ordinance requirements adjacent to a commercial zone).**

Comment: This condition was complied with at the time of the approval of the basic plan.

- (2) **The Applicant will provide a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound MD 212 at the approach to Adelphi Road. Timing of this improvement will be determined at the preliminary plan of subdivision.**

Comment: Applicant’s traffic study suggests and the State Highway Administration and the Transportation Planning Section support, the provision of a double left-turn lane as described above.

- (3) **Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the Applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. The applicant shall use a new 12-hour count and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic.**

Comment: Such traffic study was submitted using, as specified, a new 12-hour count, which analyzed signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic.

- (4) **During the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall provide more detailed operational analyses at the intersections of MD 212/Edwards Way and MD 212/site entrance. The scope of these analyses will be determined after approval of the proposed Basic Plan and in consideration of the permitted access to the site.**

Comment: Compliance with this condition is only required in the future, at the time of the approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision, but the applicant has included it in the submitted traffic study.

- (5) **Total commercial development of the subject 4.14 acre site shall be limited to a maximum of 40,000 square feet.**

Comment: The development proposed in the subject application is 18,899 square feet, which is well within the cap of 40,000 square feet specified in this condition.

- (6) **During the Comprehensive Design Plan and Subdivision review, the Applicant shall address the addition of public streets to accomplish access from Adelphi Road or obtain a variance from Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.**

Comment: Due to the size of the development and the creation of lease parcels as opposed to individual lots, the design for the project utilizes private driveways instead of public roads to access the project from Adelphi Road.

- (7) **Development of the subject property shall have a woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent. If off-site mitigation is proposed, the first priority for mitigation sites shall be within the Anacostia Watershed.**

Comment: Compliance with this condition shall be ensured at time of specific design plan approval, when a Type II tree conservation plan will be approved for the site.

- (8) **During the Comprehensive Design Plan and the Specific Design Plan review, the Applicant shall address the following issues:**

- A. **Architectural design shall be distinctive in order to create an image of quality and permanence.**

Comment: The proposed architecture for the project is to be completed largely in brick, but it does not meet this Basic Plan requirement. The architecture for the proposed CVS drugstore closely resembles the familiar prototype CVS building. It is simple and rectangular, and its design is not distinctive so as to create an image of quality and permanence, but rather much the same CVS building one sees in numerous suburban retail locations.

- B. **A build-to-line shall be considered in order to create an inviting streetscape.**

Comment: A build-to-line is not proposed in the subject design. The buildings sit centrally on the site with the parking areas surrounding them in a completely ordinary and predictable suburban

pad site arrangement.

- C. The streetscape shall create a pedestrian-friendly environment with consideration of the following elements:**

- (1) Street furniture including pedestrian lighting**
- (2) Trash receptacles**
- (3) Bike racks**
- (4) Pedestrian crosswalks should be a contrasting paving material**
- (5) Need for bus stop**

Comment: Streetscape elements include street lighting, benches, trash receptacles, bike racks and two bus stops. However, pedestrian crosswalks have not been included in a contrasting paving material.

- D. Massive surface parking facilities adjacent to either Riggs Road or Adelphi Road shall be prohibited.**

Comment: The parking facilities surround the two buildings which are located centrally on the site. Contrary to the intent of this condition, substantial surface parking is located adjacent to Riggs and Adelphi Roads.

- E. An architectural focal point and/or sculpture located within a green area shall be provided at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road.**

Comment: The applicant has included a small entry feature. It is proposed to contain a “Welcome to Adelphi” sign, a trellis, a brick pier on either side of the trellis and an evergreen hedge behind it.

- F. No loading and/or dumpster areas shall be visible from adjacent roadways.**

Comment: With the site designed the way it is, it is highly likely that dumpster pads and loading will be visible especially from Edwards Way. The screening offered at that juncture is not sufficiently opaque so as to entirely screen the dumpster pads and the loading for the CVS pharmacy from view. A loading space for the retail building is not included on the illustrative amenity plan.

- G. The design plans shall address the entire property, so that the final development of the individual lots creates a visually cohesive development, compatible in regard to architectural treatment and site layout.**

Comment: Architectural style (ornamentation, massing and detail) is not similar between the buildings. The two buildings do not appear to be stylistically related or to jointly create a visually cohesive development.

9. Other conditions of approval:

- A. The leadership of the Buck Lodge Citizen’s Association, White Oak Manor Civic Association, and Hampton’s Association will each nominate two representatives and one alternate to participate with the developer of the subject property in regular meetings, scheduled by the developer, during**

each of the phases of development (including but not limited to the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, Comprehensive Design Plan, and Specific Design Plan) of the property.

Comment: Staff has not been provided a written summary regarding applicant's exact compliance with this condition, although staff believes that at least one additional meeting was held involving both the applicant and representatives from the civic associations. Urban Design staff has also recently been invited to a meeting organized by District Council staff for the district, to be held on September 15, 2008, with representatives of the above-mentioned civic associations.

Additionally, in a prior e-mail dated July 22, 2008, the President of the Buck Lodge Citizen's Association, Ken Morgan, said that all three civic associations worked closely with Councilman Dernoga's office as well as the property owner and the developer since the property was rezoned from residential to commercial. In that e-mail, Mr. Morgan stated further that Councilman Dernoga's office had sponsored a meeting at which representatives of the civic associations and the developer were present and that concerns had been expressed regarding parking and the placement of buildings and there were none regarding the landscaping and pedestrian-scale design aspects of the project.

- B. At the time of the Preliminary Plan application, the developer of the subject property shall include the intersection of Metzert Road and Riggs Road in its traffic study, to demonstrate the adequacy of transportation facilities in the surrounding area,**

Comment: Compliance with this requirement will be evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision approval.

- C. Any required widening and improvements to the public rights-of-way for Riggs Road, Adelphi Road, and Edwards Way shall include five-foot wide sidewalks, in accordance with applicable State and County standards.**

Comment: The trails coordinator's recommendation is that sidewalks along Riggs and Adelphi Roads measure eight feet in width and that those along Edwards Way measure five-feet wide.

- D. The developer of the subject property shall work with the Maryland State Highway Administration on the improvements to Riggs Road, Maryland Route 212, to provide a center turn lane to allow northbound traffic to make left turns into the subject property without impeding through traffic.**

Comment: In a letter dated August 18, 2008, the State Highway Administration (SHA) noted that the traffic consultant, in the submitted traffic study, proposed that eastbound MD 212 be widened to provide an exclusive left-turn lane, and that they were in general concurrence with the proposed improvements at the MD 212 - Site Access Drive/Metzerott Plaza Access Drive intersection. Roadway improvement plans they stated, however, would have to be submitted to them for review and comment because of the proximity of the MD 212/Adelphi Road signalized intersection. Therefore, it may be said that the developer of the subject property has worked with the SHA on the improvements to Riggs Road to provide a center -turn lane to allow northbound traffic to make left turns into the subject property without impeding through traffic.

- E. The developer of the subject property shall be responsible for payments for**

all road and intersection improvements necessary to mitigate any failing traffic condition caused by the on-site development. Such improvements will be determined at the time of Preliminary Plan Review.

Comment: Compliance with this condition shall be evaluated at the time of approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision for the project.

- F. The developer of the subject property shall work with the various transit authorities and agencies to maintain the locations of the existing bus stops along Riggs Road and Adelphi Road. The developer shall construct a bus pull-off area to allow the loading and unloading of passengers out of the travel lanes of the roadways, within the public rights-of-way.**

Comment: Two bus stops are indicated along the Adelphi Road and the Riggs Road frontage.

- G. The developer of the subject property shall work with the Prince George's County [sic] Department of the Environment, to utilize low impact stormwater management techniques to the degree practicable.**

Comment: Applicant has not, to date, offered any information regarding compliance with this requirement. Please see Finding 8, Environmental, for a further discussion of their non-compliance to date.

- H. The developer of the subject property shall take all reasonable actions to alleviate and reduce the possibility of crime occurring on or adjacent to the property.**

Comment: The developer has not submitted to staff any evidence of compliance with this condition.

- J. The developer shall keep clean all areas of the subject property, during and after development.**

Comment: The applicant has not submitted any plan nor obligated himself to keep the subject site clean during and after development.

- K. The developer shall incorporate trees, shrubs, open areas, flowers, walkways, and lighting into the site plan. The property shall be cleared of poorly lit or secluded areas, and adequate safety lighting shall be installed to improve visibility into the site and deter illegal activity.**

Comment: Trees, shrubs and lighting have been incorporated into the plans. Walkways and flowers have not.

- 10. The developer shall make its best efforts to include a restaurant as an ancillary tenant on the subject property.**

Comment: The developer has proffered no evidence that he has made any efforts to include a restaurant as an ancillary tenant on the subject property.

6. Development Data—

Zone	L-A-C
Gross Tract Area	4.14 acres
Area within the 100-year floodplain	None
Net tract area	4.14 acres

7. **The Prince George's Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance**—The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet and there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site. The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed a Type I tree conservation plan and suggested certain revisions that would be required by condition should the subject application be approved as recommended. Therefore, it may be said that the subject application is in conformance at this time with the requirements of the Prince George's Woodland Conservation Ordinance.
8. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

Historic Preservation—In comments dated July 10, 2008, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the subject project would have no effect on historic resources.

Archaeology—In a memorandum dated July 17, 2008, the staff archeologist stated that a Phase I identification archeological survey was completed on the 4.14-acre Edwards property in September 2006. Further, she stated that four copies of the final report, A Phase I Archeological Survey of the Edwards Property: A 4-Acre +/- Parcel Located at the Intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Roads in Adelphi, Prince George's County, Maryland (Development Case No. CDP-0502), was received and accepted by Historic Preservation staff on May 19, 2008. One archeological site, 18PR841, an early- to mid-20th century sanitarium park or garden, was identified on the property. The site did not contain intact cultural deposits or significant historical information and no further work was recommended. Historic Preservation staff concurs that no further archeological work is necessary on the Edwards property. She stated, however, that pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, state or federal agencies review may be required to have an archeological survey performed. Section 106 review, she then clarified, requires Federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties and sites when federal monies, federal properties, or federal permits are required for a project.

Community Planning—In a memorandum dated July 24, 2008, the Community Planning Division stated that the subject application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier. Further, they stated that the application conforms to the land use recommendation of the 1989 *Approved Master Plan for the Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67* for a village activity center. It also conforms to the recommendation of the corresponding sectional map amendment for the development of the property through a comprehensive design zone. They also stated that it appeared that the proposal does not conform to all of the conditions of approval for its rezoning to the L-A-C Zone (A-9954-C). More particularly, they stated:

“In adopting the Sectional Map Amendment, the District Council addressed this property in the following statements in CR-39-1990 (page 224 of the master plan):

“SECTION 2, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the District Council considers the

Comprehensive Design Zone process the appropriate way to address concerns related to the approximately 4.1 –acre Edwards property bounded by Adelphi Road, Riggs Road, and Edwards Way, although the Sectional Map Amendment retains R-R zoning for this property. The District Council is specifically concerned about preservation, to the greatest possible extent, of the existing woodland and the control of access to the property. A sensitive approach to site development is warranted and should be facilitated through the CDZ process. Accordingly, the SMA text should incorporate this expression of intent and the SMA map should be annotated to reflect the potential for a Comprehensive Design Zone.”

Further, they pointed to Conditions 7, 8, 9 and 10 and stated that the developer only addressed Conditions 1–8 in their site plan attachments and failed to address Conditions 9 and 10 that were also required. They said that they felt the CDP conforms to many of the conditions listed, but does not conform to all of the conditions required for approval for the rezoning of the Edwards property and therefore, they opined that the submitted plans did not seem to meet the intent of the District Council for seeking a sensitive approach to site development and the high-quality development of the site.

Transportation—In a memorandum dated September 11, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section offered the following:

The vacant 4.14 acre, L-A-C zoned property is located on the north side Riggs Road (MD212), east of Edwards Way and west of Adelphi Road. The property has street frontage on all three roadways. The proposed plan shows a full movement access driveway along Riggs Road, and a limited access driveway allowing only right-in and right-out on Adelphi Road.

Background

On July 30, 2004, the County Council of Prince George’s County, sitting as the District Council, approved a Basic Plan A-9954-C, which rezoned the subject site from R-R to the L-A-C/Comprehensive Design Zone. Pursuant to the Zoning Ordinance No. 10-2004, the following transportation-related conditions must be addressed at the time of Comprehensive Design Plan review:

Total commercial development of the subject site shall be limited to a maximum of 40,000 square feet.

The applicant is proposing to develop the site with 18,899 square feet of commercial development (a 13,013-square-foot CVS retail store, and a 5,886-square-foot retail/office building. The total proposed square footage is substantially less than the upper limit set by the condition.

During the Comprehensive Design plan and Subdivision review, the applicant shall address the addition of public streets to accomplish access from Adelphi Road or obtain a variance from section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.

The proposed plan shows limited access driveway onto Adelphi Road. Since Adelphi Road is planned arterial facility, during the subdivision review the applicant would be required to obtain a variation from Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.

During the Comprehensive Design plan and Specific Design Plan Review, the

applicant shall address the following issues:

The streetscape shall create a pedestrian-friendly environment with consideration of the following elements:

- **Bike Racks**
- **Pedestrian crosswalks should be contrasting paving material**
- **Need for bus stop**

The proposed plan and the submitted supportive justification statement do not address these items in any detail. Therefore they would need to be addressed fully by the applicant during the Specific Design Plan review.

Traffic Study Analysis

Staff is in receipt of a June, 2008 traffic study in support of the Comprehensive Design Plan phase of the subject property. The study identified the following link and intersections as the ones on which the proposed development would have the most impact:

EXISTING CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD212 @ Metzerott Road	B/1111	D/1359
MD 212 @ Adelphi Road	D/1345	E/1472
Adelphi Road @ Edwards Way**	F/108 seconds	F/165 seconds
MD212 @ Edwards Way **	C/17.5 seconds	E/36.3 seconds
MD212 @ Metzerott Plaza and the proposed site access**	B/11 seconds	C/18.6 seconds
**Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level-of-service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A level-of-service "E" which is deemed acceptable corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i>.		

Within the agreed study area, there are no developments that have been approved, but not built that would have impact on the above listed intersections. Therefore the background conditions only include application of a regional growth rate of 1.5 percent to the through traffic. An analysis of the background conditions revealed the following results:

BACKGROUND CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD212 @ Metzert Road	B/1143	D/1398
MD 212 @ Adelphi Road	D/1368	E/1518
Adelphi Road @ Edwards Way**	F/131 seconds	F/204 seconds
MD212 @ Edwards Way **	C/21 seconds	E/36 seconds
MD212 @ Metzert Plaza and the proposed site access**	C/18 seconds	E/39 seconds
**Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level-of-service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A level-of-service “E” which is deemed acceptable corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i>		

Using the “Guidelines For The Analysis Of The Traffic Impact Of Development Proposals,” the submitted traffic study concluded that the proposed 18,899 square feet commercial retail development would generate 20 (12 in, and 8 out) AM peak-hour trips and 226 (113 in, 113 out) PM peak-hour trips at the time of full build-out. Applying the recommended 50 percent reduction to account for pass-by trips, the net new trips that would be added to the area road network is calculated to be only 10 (6 in, and 4 out) AM peak-hour trips and 114 (57 in, 57 out) PM peak-hour trips at the time of full build-out. An analysis of the total traffic conditions which include the background trips and site-generated new trips revealed the following results:

TOTAL CONDITIONS		
Intersection	AM	PM
	(LOS/CLV)	(LOS/CLV)
MD212 @ Metzerott Road	B/1145	D/1414
MD 212 @ Adelphi Road	D/1391	E/1530
Adelphi Road @ Edwards Way**	F/138 seconds	F/258 seconds
MD212 @ Edwards Way **	C/25 seconds	E/38 seconds
MD212 @ Metzerott Plaza and the proposed site access**	C/18 seconds	E/44 seconds
**Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the level-of-service and the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A level-of-service “E” which is deemed acceptable corresponds to a maximum delay of 50 seconds/car. For signalized intersections, a CLV of 1450 or less is deemed acceptable as per the <i>Guidelines</i>.		

Based on the results shown in the aforementioned table, the traffic study concluded that the proposed development will satisfy the county’s APF requirements, provided the unsignalized intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way is improved with traffic signal. The signal warrant study included in the traffic study shows the traffic signal is warranted under both the existing and future conditions. This finding has led the traffic study to conclude that the applicant should not be held responsible for the installation of the needed traffic signal, the position which staff does not concur. The traffic study also proposed to widen both approaches of MD 212 at the proposed site access to provide for exclusive left-turn lanes on these approaches.

Staff Review and Comments

Upon review of the applicant’s traffic study, staff concurs with its findings as they pertained to the analyses of the various intersections. In addition to the planning staff, the study was reviewed by two other agencies, the State Highway Administration (SHA) and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). In an August 19, 2008 memorandum to staff (Issayans to Mokhtari), the DPW&T appears to be in general agreement with the study conclusions. It did however, made some recommendations, most of which affect traffic operations. Some of those recommendations are as follows:

- The developer should be required to widen east bound Adelphi Road at its intersection with MD212 to provide for an exclusive left-turn lane.
- The applicant should be required to provide for a crosswalk with modification to existing signal to include pedestrian indications across MD212 at its intersection with Adelphi Road.

- Due to high left-turning volume, the applicant should also be required to provide for double left-turn lane along southbound MD 212 at its approach with Adelphi Road.

In an August 18, 2008 memorandum to staff (Foster to Mokhtari) the SHA also expressed its concurrence with all of the traffic study findings regarding adequacy. SHA noted however, the following additional comments:

As part of the proposed improvements recommended at MD 212 and proposed site access the applicant is required to submit to SHA roadway improvement plans including specific pavement marking plan, and traffic a detailed queuing analyses to ensure the proposed site access onto MD 212, as proposed approximately 400 feet from the signalized intersection of MD 212 and Adelphi Road, would not create additional operational difficulties.

Transportation Staff Conclusions

The Transportation Planning Section concludes that the staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities as required by Section 27-521 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved with certain conditions.

Trails—In a memorandum dated August 4, 2008, the senior trails planner offered as background information on the portions of Condition 8 of the relevant Basic Plan relating to trails. Specifically, he quoted Condition 8(C) of Basic Plan A-9954 (PGCPB Resolution No. 02-102) as stating: “During the Comprehensive Design Plan and the Specific Design Plan review, the applicant shall address the following issues...The streetscape shall create a pedestrian-friendly environment with consideration of the following elements...street furniture including pedestrian lighting, trash receptacles, bike racks, pedestrian cross walks should be a contrasting paving material and the need for a bus stop.” Further, he stated:

“The adopted and approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt master plan recommends master plan trails along both Riggs Road and Adelphi Road (Master Plan, pages 151 and 155). Currently, the subject site includes no sidewalks along any frontage. Where the master plan trail has been implemented along Adelphi Road (MD 193 to Metzert Road), it has been constructed as an eight-foot wide concrete sidewalk. Staff recommends this same treatment along the subject site’s frontages of both Adelphi Road and Riggs Road. This will require widening the proposed sidewalks along these roads from five to eight feet. These wide sidewalks should be separated from the curb with a grass or landscaped strip. In addition to improving the appearance of the streetscape, this landscape strip will also improve the conditions for pedestrians by providing a buffer between the sidewalk and the street and moving the sidewalk out of the “splash zone” of automobiles.”

Parks —A referral request, sent to the Department of Parks and Recreation on July 3, 2008, was returned with a statement of “no comment” dated July 10, 2008.

Public Facilities —In a memorandum received July 17, 2008, the Public Facilities Planning Section stated that the staging of development would not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities. More specifically, they stated that the proposed plan is within the required response time for fire and rescue and that police facilities are adequate for the development.

Environmental Planning—In a memorandum dated April 11, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section stated, that, with respect to compliance with environmentally-related basic plan condition

No. 7 (that development of the subject property have a woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent and that any off-site mitigation proposed be located within the Anacostia Watershed), that a threshold calculation of 20 percent was utilized in the submitted TCPI and that the TCPII submitted at time of specific design plan approval would address the location of the off-site mitigation.

It is notable because the applicant claims that the slopes were too steep to design a park along the Edwards Way frontage that the Environmental Planning Section characterized the terrain of the site as gradually sloping toward the north of the property. Further, they noted that the dominant soil types on the site are Manor and Chillum, which generally exhibit only moderate limitations to development when associated with steep slopes. They did mention, however that there were some areas of severe slopes and steep slopes with highly erodible soils, noting that this condition was not compounded by the presence of wetlands and 100-year floodplain.

Further, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following “Environmental Review”:

1. The Comprehensive Design Plan, CDP-0502, application has a signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/063/05) dated August 26, 2005 that was included with the application package. The NRI shows a stream labeled as “Unnamed Perennial Stream Class IV (Recreational Trout Waters).” The TCPI does not show this feature on the plan.

Comment: No additional information required with regard to the NRI.

2. The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George’s County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet and there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site.

The current zoning (L-A-C) of the subject property has a woodland conservation threshold of 15 percent. The zoning condition sets the required threshold at 20 percent as reflected in the computation worksheet. A revised Type I tree conservation plan was submitted for review and was found to require revisions. The computation worksheet needs to be revised to reflect correctly the existing woodland on site.

Further, in an e-mail received September 23, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section stated:

“The Prince George’s County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) is the agency that is currently responsible for review and approval of stormwater quality and quality control. No information was submitted indicating if the applicant and the County have met to discuss the use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques on this site.

Copies of the approved stormwater management concept letter and plan have been submitted; however, low impact development is not addressed. While the developable area of the site limits the use of certain LID techniques, there are several available options, such as the use of green roofs and cisterns that should be considered. The incorporation of techniques such as these should be explored at the time of preliminary plan.”

Zoning—In a response to a referral request sent out July 3, 2008, the Zoning Section indicated that they no major issues regarding the project. In previous comments, dated March 16, 2006, the

Zoning Section had stated that the applicant should demonstrate compliance with conditions 9(A) through (K) of the relevant Basic Plan. Please see Finding 5 for a detailed discussion of the the applicant's compliance with the requirements of that approval.

Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—In a memorandum dated May 8, 2006, the DPW&T stated that Adelphi Road and Edwards Way, two of the roads that flank the site, are county-maintained and therefore subject to their jurisdiction. Further they stated that:

- Right of way dedication and roadway improvements for Adelphi Road would have to be in accordance with DPW&T's coarterial roadway standards and that rights-of-way dedication and roadway improvements for Edwards Way would have to be in accordance with DPW&T's collector roadway standards.
- All improvements within the public rights-of-way as dedicated to the County are to be in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T's Specifications and Standards and the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- The property frontages along Adelphi Road and Edwards Way are improved but any required widening and the replacement of any deteriorated concrete curb and gutter, sidewalks and commercial entrances must be completed in accordance with DPW&T's Specifications and Standards.
- Mill and overlay of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way is required along the property frontages in accordance with DPW&T's Specifications and Standards.
- All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be in accordance with DPW&T's and the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) requirements.
- Conformance with street tree and street lighting standards is required.
- Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments. Coordination with the various utility companies is required.
- An access study shall be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access point(s) and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.

Please note that DPW&T's requirements are enforced separately, through their own permitting process.

Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—In a memorandum dated February 24, 2006, WSSC stated that:

- “• a sewer extension may be required.
- water is available to the site.
- an on-site plan review package should be submitted.
- the proposed sewer on-site pipeline to the 5,886 square feet of retail space may be impacted by the proposed retaining wall.
- additional rights-of-way may be required as the location of an existing 60 inch water main in Adelphi Road and other mains are not clear on the tree conservation plan.

- that water connection locations were not shown.
- the applicant to contact them regarding issues connected with the project and other requirements that could potentially impact the proposed bus shelter, storm drain and the public utility easement.
- the sewer pipeline would have to be realigned outside the public utility easement.”

Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—In response to a referral request, SHA indicated that they had no comment on the subject project as access is from a county maintained road. However, in a subsequent communication from SHA regarding the project, dated August 18, 2008, they offered their review of the Updated Traffic Impact Study Report and Traffic Signal Warrant Study Report prepared by Traffic Concepts dated June 2008 that was prepared for the proposed Edwards Property project. Specifically, they stated:

- Access to the 18,899-square-foot Shopping Center is proposed from one (1) full movement access on MD 212 (across from the existing Metzerott Plaza Site Access Drive) and one (1) right-in/right-out access driveway on Adelphi Road. The traffic consultant proposed to widen eastbound MD 212 to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and widen westbound MD 212 from the existing 1 left through lane to one left-turn lane and one through right lane at MD 212 at Site Access Drive/Metzerott Plaza Access Drive intersection. SHA also recommends that the proposed right-in/right-out access driveway on the County-maintained Adelphi road include acceleration and deceleration lane area to minimize impacts of site related traffic activity along Adelphi road.
- The traffic consultant determined that the proposed development would not cause any studied intersection to exceed the congestion standard established by M-NCPPC for developments inside the Beltway (CLV less than or equal to 1,600).
- The developer’s traffic consultant conducted a Traffic Signal Warrant Study at the Adelphi Road/Edwards Way intersection for Existing conditions and Future Conditions with the proposed development. It was revealed that the following traffic signal warrants would be met for both Existing Conditions and future conditions with the proposed development:
 - Warrant No.1B – Interruption of Continuous Traffic
 - Warrant No. 2 – Four-Hour Vehicular Volume
 - Warrant No. 3 – Peak-Hour Volume
- Since the same Traffic Signal Warrants would be met at Adelphi Road/Edwards Way intersection for both Existing Traffic Conditions (without the proposed development) and Future Traffic Conditions (with the proposed development), the developer’s traffic consultant did not feel that the Edwards Property should be responsible for the installation of a traffic signal at the Adelphi Road/Edwards Way intersection.

SHA concurs that the proposed development will not cause any studied intersection to exceed the congestion standard threshold for properties inside the capital beltway as established by M-NCPPC. The SHA policy regarding intersection LOS requires that all intersections function at a level of service “D” or better in the design year with full build-out of the given project. Given that the Prince George’s County policy differs from that of SHA regarding the need for mitigation at off-site intersections, the SHA will defer to the local criteria. However, any proposed mitigating roadway improvements impacting a State-controlled roadway must be reviewed and

approved by the SHA.

SHA is in general concurrence with the proposed improvements at the MS 212 at Site Access Drive/Metzerott Plaza Access Drive intersection. However, roadway improvement plans (with a specific pavement marking plan) should be submitted to SHA for our review and comment. The proposed full-movement Site Access Drive on MD 212 is only approximately 400 feet from the Md 212/Adelphi Road signalized intersection. Therefore, traffic queuing analyses should also be prepared to insure that the proposed Site Access Drive will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding intersections.

In closing, SHA stated that they would defer comment on the installation of a traffic signal at the County-Maintained Adelphi Roads/Edwards Way intersection.

The City of College Park—In an e-mail received August 1, 2006, the City of College Park stated that they would not be providing comments on the Edwards proposal at the intersection of Riggs and Adelphi Road. Plans were recirculated in July 2008, but elicited no response.

Buck Lodge, White Oak Manor and the Hamptons Civic Associations— A representative of the Buck Lodge Citizen's Association, Ken Morgan, President, in an e-mail dated July 22, 2008, said that all three civic associations worked closely with Councilman Dernoga's office as well as the property owner and the developer since the property was rezoned from residential to commercial. Most recently, Mr. Morgan stated further, Councilman Dernoga's office had sponsored a meeting at which representatives of the civic associations and the developer were present. As per Mr. Ken Morgan, President of the Buck Lodge Citizens' Association, there were some concerns about parking and the placement of the buildings but none concerning the landscaping and pedestrian-scale design aspects of the project.

Adelphi Hills—In an e-mail dated July 22, 2008, a representative of the Adelphi Hills neighborhood stated that she would like to see better use of the Edwards Property than a CVS drugstore. Further, she stated that a CVS across the street from a Rite Aide drugstore is a duplication of services and could cause the further decline of Metzerott Plaza.

9. **Sec. 27-521. Required findings for approval.**

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

- (1) **The plan is in conformance with the Basic Plan approved by application per Section 27-195; or when the property was placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment per Section 27-223, was approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;**

Comment: The proposed plan does not conform to the requirements of the approved Basic Plan. More specifically, the application does not conform to the following Basic Plan conditions:

- The requirements of Condition No. 8 regarding architectural, site and streetscape design,

the inclusion of an architectural focal point and/or sculpture located within a green area at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road and the creation of a cohesive development, compatible in regard to architectural treatment and site layout.

- The requirements of Condition No. 9 concerning the holding of regular meetings, scheduled by the developer through each of the phases of development; the requirement that the developer utilize low impact stormwater management techniques; the developer to take all reasonable actions to alleviate and reduce the possibility of crime occurring on or adjacent to the property; the developer to keep the site clean during and after the development; and the developer to incorporate trees, shrubs, open areas, flowers, walkways, and lighting into the site plan
- The requirements of Condition No. 10 that the developer make its best efforts to include a restaurant as an ancillary tenant on the subject property.

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

Comment: The proposed plan would not result in a development that creates a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations. As stated in the conclusion of Community Planning's July 24, 2008 memorandum on the project: "The submitted plans would not seem to meet the intent of the district council for seeking a sensitive approach to site development and the high-quality of development of this site." The main features of the site design and the architecture are indistinguishable from much contemporary development in standard conventional zones such as the C-S-C.

(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;

Comment: Approval is not 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 project only in a minimal way attempts to create the enhanced environment envisioned by the District Council at the time of rezoning. The design of the project, facilities, architecture and amenities offered by the project are much the same as any other drugstore and strip center not developed in a Comprehensive Design Zone.

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

Comment: The project is not necessarily incompatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings, but has the above-identified drawbacks nonetheless including, but not limited to, noncompliance with conditions of approval of the Basic Plan.

(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; and
(C) Circulation access points;

Comment: While the building coverage and open space appear to be compatible with each other,

parking areas are not sufficiently set back from Adelphi and Riggs Road, as specified in Condition 8(D) of A-9954-C. The Transportation Planning Section and the Department of Public Works and Transportation did not object to the placement of the access points as shown on the comprehensive design plan.

- (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;**

Comment: This requirement is inapplicable as the project is planned to be constructed in a single phase.

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

Comment: In a memorandum dated September 11, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section concluded that the staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available transportation facilities as required by Section 27-521 of the Prince George's County Code if the application is approved subject to certain conditions. Additionally, in a memorandum dated July 17, 2008, the Countywide Planning division stated that the staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities. Therefore, it may be said that the staging of proposed development would not create an unreasonable burden on available public facilities.

- (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;**

Comment: Since the subject project does not include the adaptive use of a historic site, this requirement is inapplicable.

- (9) The Plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle, and except as provided in Section 27-521(a)(11), 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);**

Comment: The project does not conform to some of the applicable guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to parking, loading and circulation, views, green area, site and streetscape amenities, service areas, and architecture.

The subject project is at variance with the design guidelines with respect to their expressed goals

as follows:

- Minimizing the visual impact of surface parking by locating parking lots to the rear or sides of structures.
- Making loading areas visually unobtrusive and locating them to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians.
- Utilizing site design techniques to preserve, create, or emphasize views from public areas.
- Designing on-site green areas to complement other site activity areas and make them appropriate in size, shape, location and design to fulfill their intended use.
- Designing site and streetscape amenities to contribute to an attractive, coordinated development that will enhance the use and enjoyment of the site.
- Designing service areas to be accessible but unobtrusive.
- Providing architecture that offers a variety of building forms, with a unified, harmonious use of materials and style.

(10) The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan;

Comment: In their memorandum dated August 11, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of Type I TCPI/15/06, with conditions. The proposed plan is in conformance with a tree conservation plan that could be approved subject to certain conditions if considered independently of the comprehensive design plan, which is not recommended for approval.

(11) Notwithstanding Section 27-521(a)(9), property placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone pursuant to Section 27-226(f)(4), shall follow the guidelines set forth in Section 27-480(g)(1) and (2);

Comment: The subject project does not fit within the narrow parameters of this requirement.

(12) For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies the requirements for the use in Section 27-508(a)(1) and Section 27-508(a)(2) of this Code.

Comment: Since the subject comprehensive design plan is not for a Regional Urban Community, this requirement is not applicable to the subject project.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the preceding evaluation, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report, and DISAPPROVE Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0502 and Type I Tree Conservation Plan TCPI/15/06 for the Edwards Property.