The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Prince George's County Planning Department
Development Review Division
301-952-3530
*Note: Staff reports can be accessed at http://mncppc.iqm2.com/Citizens/Default.aspx*

# Conceptual Site Plan CSP-19001
# Marlboro Gateway

| REQUEST | STAFF RECOMMENDATION |
|---|---|
| Development of 100–265 multifamily dwelling units, 1,200–75,000 square feet of commercial/retail space. and 5,000–30,000 square feet of office space. | APPROVAL with conditions |

| | |
|---|---|
| **Location:** On the north side of MD 725 (Marlboro Pike) and the west side of US 301 (Robert Crain Highway). | |
| Gross Acreage: | 20.98 |
| Zone: | M-X-T |
| Dwelling Units: | 100–265 |
| Gross Floor Area: | N/A |
| Planning Area: | 79 |
| Council District: | 06 |
| Election District: | 03 |
| Municipality: | N/A |
| 200-Scale Base Map: | 206SE13 |
| **Applicant/Address:**<br>Green Century Partners, LLC.<br>7419 Baltimore Annapolis Boulevard<br>Glen Burnie, MD 21061 | |
| **Staff Reviewer:** Henry Zhang, AICP, LEED AP<br>**Phone Number:** 301-952-4151<br>**Email:** Henry.Zhang@ppd.mncppc.org | |


| | |
|---|---|
| Planning Board Date: | 07/23/2020 |
| Planning Board Action Limit: | 07/27/2020 |
| Staff Report Date: | 07/08/2020 |
| Date Accepted: | 05/18/2020 |
| Informational Mailing: | 03/27/2020 |
| Acceptance Mailing: | 05/15/2020 |
| Sign Posting Deadline: | 06/23/2020 |

# Table of Contents

EVALUATION CRITERIA ..... 3
FINDINGS ..... 3
1. Request ..... 3
2. Development Data Summary ..... 4
3. Location ..... 4
4. Surrounding Uses ..... 4
5. Previous Approvals ..... 4
6. Design Features ..... 4
COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA ..... 5
7. Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance ..... 5
8. Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance: ..... 16
9. Other site-related regulations ..... 17
10. Referral Comments ..... 17
RECOMMENDATION ..... 22

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Conceptual Site Plan CSP-19001
Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-011-2020
Marlboro Gateway

The Urban Design staff has completed the review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions, as described in the Recommendation section of this report.

## EVALUATION CRITERIA

This conceptual site plan application was reviewed and evaluated for compliance with the following criteria:

a. The requirements of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance in the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone and the site design guidelines;

b. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance;

c. The requirements of other site-related regulations; and

d. Referral comments.

## FINDINGS

Based upon the evaluation and analysis of the subject application, the Urban Design staff recommends the following findings:

**1. Request:** The subject application proposes a conceptual site plan (CSP) for development of 100–265 multifamily dwelling units, 1,200–75,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, and 5,000–30,000 square feet of office space.

**2. Development Data Summary:**

| | EXISTING | PROPOSED |
|---|---|---|
| Zone(s) | M-X-T | M-X-T |
| Use(s) | Vacant | Residential, Office, Commercial/Retail |
| Gross Acreage | 20.98 | 20.98 |
| Floodplain Acreage | 8.13 | 8.13 |
| Net Acreage | 12.85 | 12.85 |
| Total Gross Floor Area (GFA) (sq. ft.) | | 206,200–635,000 |
| Of which Commercial GFA | - | 1,200–75,000 |
| Residential GFA | - | 200,000–530,000 |
| Office GFA | - | 5,000–30,000 |
| Total Multifamily Dwelling Units | - | 100–265 |

**Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the M-X-T Zone**

| | |
|---|---|
| Base Density Allowed: | 0.40 FAR |
| Residential Optional Method: | 1.00 FAR |
| Total FAR Permitted: | 1.40 FAR* |
| Total FAR Proposed: | 0.37–1.13 FAR |

**Note:** *Maximum density allowed, in accordance with Section 27-545(b)(4) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, Optional method of development, for providing 20 or more residential units.

**3. Location:** The subject property is located on the north side of MD 725 (Marlboro Pike) and the west side of US 301 (Robert Crain Highway), in Planning Area 79, Council District 6.

**4. Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is located in the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of MD 725 and US 301. The subject site is bounded to the north by the approved Townes at Peerless project, which is a mixed-use development consisting of residential and commercial uses, and existing single-family detached homes in the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone; to the east, by the right-of-way (ROW) of US 301, an existing single-family detached home, and a gas station with a Dunkin Donuts store in the M-X-T Zone; to the south by the ROW of MD 725, and various commercial uses in the Light Industrial Zone beyond; to the west by existing single-family detached homes and an existing pond in the M-X-T Zone.

**5. Previous Approvals:** The subject property was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone as part of Change Number 4 of the 2013 *Approved Subregion 6 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA).

**6. Design Features:** The subject site is irregular in shape and is predominantly wooded with regulated environmental features and a manmade pond in the northwest part of the site. The subject site has frontages on both MD 725 to the south and US 301 to the east. There are five single-family detached residences fronting along MD 725 that will be demolished and an outdoor advertising/billboard sign, which is currently pending Certification as a

Nonconforming Use (CNU-32866-2019). The gross floor area information of the existing buildings should be provided on the plan. A condition requiring this has been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

Two development envelopes are identified on the CSP. The larger one for multifamily and/or commercial development has frontages on both MD 725 and US 301, with an access point from each of the roadways. In accordance with the illustrative plan, there are three buildings shown in this envelope with surface parking lots. One building is fronting on MD 725, one building is oriented north-south with a side fronting onto US 301, the third building is located in the northwest corner of the envelope, adjacent to woodlands to be preserved. The smaller envelope for commercial uses, with one building, is fronting on MD 725 and located to the western end of the property, adjacent to an existing single-family detached house.

According to the applicant, the project will be developed in two phases. The larger envelope will be developed in Phase 1, and the smaller envelope will be developed in Phase 2. However, no tract size information has been provided. A condition to require the applicant to provide the acreage for each development envelope has been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

Given the scale and multiple phases of the proposed development, there are plenty of opportunities for the application of sustainable site and green building techniques in the development. The applicant should apply those techniques, as practical, at time of the detailed site plan (DSP). A condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the applicant to provide sustainable site and green building techniques that will be used in this development with the submittal of the DSP.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

**7. Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject CSP has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site design guidelines of the Zoning Ordinance.

a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547, Use Permitted, of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in all mixed-use zones, as follows:

(1) The proposed multifamily residential, commercial/retail, and office uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone. Per Footnote 7 of the Table of Uses, the maximum number and type of dwelling units should be determined at the time of CSP approval. Therefore, development of this property would be limited to the numbers and types, as proposed in this CSP that cannot exceed 265 multifamily dwelling units.

(2) Section 27-547(d) provides standards for the required mix of uses for sites in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

**(d) At least two (2) of the following three (3) categories shall be included on the Conceptual Site Plan and ultimately present in every development in the M-X-T Zone. In a Transit District Overlay Zone, a Conceptual Site Plan may include only one of the following categories, provided that, in conjunction with an existing use on abutting property in the M-X-T Zone, the requirement for two (2) out of three (3) categories is fulfilled. The Site Plan shall show the location of the existing use and the way that it will be integrated in terms of access and design with the proposed development. The amount of square footage devoted to each use shall be in sufficient quantity to serve the purposes of the zone:**

**(1) Retail businesses;**
**(2) Office, research, or industrial uses;**
**(3) Dwellings, hotel, or motel.**

This CSP proposes three types of uses, as required, including residential, commercial/retail, and office uses. These proposed uses, in the amount shown, satisfy the mixed-use requirement of Section 27-547(d).

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

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

**(1) Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR**

**(2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR**

A floor area ratio (FAR) range of 0.37–1.13 is proposed in this CSP. However, this project can be developed up to the maximum allowed 1.40 FAR, in accordance with Section 27-545(b)(4), Optional Method of Development, of the Zoning Ordinance, which allows an additional FAR of 1.0 on top of the base 0.4 FAR to be permitted where 20 or more dwelling units are proposed. In this CSP, a total of 265 dwelling units are proposed.

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

The applicant proposes to include the uses on the M-X-T-zoned property in multiple buildings on more than one lot, as permitted.

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

This requirement is not applicable since this application is for a CSP. Subsequent DSP approvals will provide regulations for development on this property.

**(d) Landscaping, screening, and buffering of development in the M-X-T Zone shall be provided pursuant to the provisions of the Landscape Manual. Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining or interior incompatible land use.**

The development is subject to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). Additional buffering and screening may be required to satisfy the purposes of the M-X-T Zone, and to protect the character of the M-X-T Zone from adjoining and interior incompatible land uses, at the time of DSP.

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

The FAR for the proposed CSP is 1.13. This will be refined further at the time of DSP, relative to the final proposed gross floor area of the buildings, in conformance with this requirement.

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

There are no private structures within the air space above, or in the ground below public rights-of-way as part of this project.

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

The proposed two development envelopes are accessed from the public streets of MD 725 and US 301. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS), appropriate frontage and vehicular access for all lots and parcels will be properly addressed.

**(h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least one thousand two hundred (1,200) square feet in size, and shall have at least sixty percent (60%) of the full front facades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco. In addition, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. The minimum lot size, maximum number of units per building group and percentages of such building groups, and building width requirements and restrictions shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half (½) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000. In no event shall there be more than ten (10) dwelling units in a building group and no more than two (2) building groups containing ten (10) dwelling units. For purposes of this section, a building group shall be considered a separate building group (even though attached) when the angle formed by the front walls of two (2) adjoining rows of units is greater than forty-five degrees (45°). Except that, in the case of a Mixed-Use Planned Community, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except when the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be**

**eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. Garages may not dominate the streetscape. Garages that are attached or incorporated into the dwelling shall be set back a minimum of four (4) feet from the front façade and there shall not be more than a single garage, not to exceed ten (10) feet wide, along the front façade of any individual unit. Garages may be incorporated into the rear of the building or freestanding in the rear yard and accessed by an alley. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all public and private streets and parking lots. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve a request to substitute townhouses, proposed for development as condominiums, in place of multifamily dwellings that were approved in a Conceptual Site Plan approved prior to April 1, 2004. Such substitution shall not require a revision to any previous plan approvals. Further, at the time of Detailed Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Planned Community, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve modifications to these regulations so long as the modifications conform to the applicable regulations for the particular development.**

The subject CSP proposes no townhouses.

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

The height limit will be further evaluated with the DSP for the proposed multifamily buildings.

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

The subject property was placed in the M-X-T Zone through the sectional map amendment of the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA approved after October 1, 2006. However, no specific design guidelines were approved with the master plan for this property. As discussed below, the master plan has a specific vision for this property that is consistent with the proposed development of this CSP.

c. The subject application has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546(d) of the Zoning Ordinance, which requires additional findings for the Prince George's County Planning Board to approve a CSP in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

**(1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division:**

The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes of the M-X-T Zone. For example, one purpose of the M-X-T Zone is to promote orderly development of land in the vicinity of major intersections to enhance the economic status of Prince George's County. The proposed development, consisting of residential, office, and retail uses, will provide increased economic activity proximate to the intersection of MD 725 and US 301. It also allows for the reduction of the number and distance of automobile trips by constructing residential and nonresidential uses near each other. This CSP, in general, promotes the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and contributes to the orderly implementation of the *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan*. However, one of the purposes of the M-X-T Zone is to create compact, mixed-use, and walkable communities that emphasize pedestrian experience with active street fronts. The CSP shows a small commercial/retail area in an isolated smaller envelope; but is unclear in the provision of commercial/retail uses along the larger envelope's frontage onto MD 725, adjacent to other existing commercial uses. Commercial/retail uses should be provided, at least at the street level, in the building fronting MD 725 in the larger development envelope, to create an active street front that can synergize with the existing commercial/retail uses across MD 725. Given the nature of this review, the applicant is encouraged to address the noted deficiencies in creating active street fronts at the time of DSP. A condition has been included in the Recommendation section of this report requiring the applicant to create active street fronts for the larger development envelope along the MD 725 frontage at the time of DSP.

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

The subject site was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone through the Sectional Map Amendment of the Subregion 6 Master Plan, which does not specifically provide design guidelines for the subject property; however, the master plan

identified the subject site within a mixed-use area and a gateway to the Town of Upper Marlboro, as follows:

The Future Land Use Map designates a mixed-use area in this quadrant north of MD 725 and west of US 301. This area represents an opportunity to promote new development in close proximity to the interchange of MD 4 and US 301. The proposed CSP development would provide an attractive gateway as well as new retail, office, and residential uses. This new development would also serve the increased demand generated from the new residential developments north of Upper Marlboro in Beechtree, Balmoral, and Locust Hill.

This property is identified as part of Development Bay 5 (page 203), which is located directly behind (to the north and west of ) the existing Dunkin' Donuts store. As an adjunct to that property, its proximity to US 301 and the gateway of the US 301/MD 725 intersection, the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA states that this parcel would best be served by extending the existing commercial development into it. Preliminary studies suggest that two outparcels appropriate for restaurants (one adjacent to US 301 and the other to MD 725) could be developed with an interior retail building of approximately 26,000 square feet.

This CSP is one step further to implementing the vision of the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA; however, the placement of commercial uses along US 301 and MD 725 are critical to remain in conformance with the development concepts recommended by the master plan.

**(3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;**

The proposed development will be outward oriented. Multifamily residential and commercial buildings will be oriented toward the site's frontage along MD 725. However, as discussed above, Urban Design staff believes that active street fronts should be achieved by locating the commercial/retail uses close to MD 725 and by providing active storefronts at ground level in the Phase I development envelope, in order to allow synergy among different commercial/retail uses. How buildings relate to the street and other urban design considerations must be addressed at the time of DSP to ensure continued conformance with this requirement.

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

The proposed development is the first mixed-use development at this location since the approval of the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA that rezoned the general vicinity of the site to the M-X-T Zone. The surrounding areas are developed with various auto-oriented, commercial, and residential uses that are older. The proposed development will improve the general appearance of the area and will set a high standard for future developments

in the vicinity. The design of the large building along MD 725 should include landmark elements that will be further reviewed at time of DSP.

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

The mix of uses, arrangement of buildings, and other improvements and amenities produce a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability, except for creating active storefronts for the larger development envelope. The proposed development concept includes a mix of residential, office and commercial/retail uses and associated on-site improvements. Indoor amenities will be provided in the multifamily building(s).

**(6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;**

A phasing plan consisting of two phases is presented with this CSP, as described in Finding 6 above. Each phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases. The phasing plan is acceptable.

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

This requirement will be evaluated in detail at the time of PPS and DSP. The illustrative plan submitted with the CSP shows sidewalks, adjacent to roadways, connecting to each part of the development. An additional conceptual pedestrian connection should also be provided, as required by the trails planner, and conditioned herein.

**(8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and**

The above finding is not applicable because the subject application is a CSP. Further attention should be paid to the design of pedestrian and public spaces at the time of DSP.

**(9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated**

**Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club), or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.**

The subject property was placed in the M-X-T Zone through the sectional map amendment of the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA. The applicant submitted a traffic impact study (TIS) dated March 31, 2020 with this CSP. The Transportation Planning Section has reviewed and analyzed the TIS, in accordance with Transportation Review Guidelines, Part 1 (Guidelines). In a memorandum dated June 22, 2020 (Burton to Zhang), the Transportation Planning Section concluded that adequate transportation facilities will be available to support the proposed development, subject to certain conditions. The table below shows the intersections deemed to be critical, as well as the levels of service (LOS) representing existing conditions:

| **EXISTING CONDITIONS** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **AM** | **PM** |
| | (LOS/CLV) | (LOS/CLV) |
| MD 725 @ MD 202 | A/801 | B/1145 |
| **US 301 @ MD 725** | C/1189 | **E/1512** |

Background traffic has been developed for the study area using four approved but un-built/partially built developments within the study area. A 1.0 percent annual growth rate for a period of six years has been assumed for through movements along the primary routes. The TIS also assumed improvements along US 301, which are listed as 100 percent full funding in the current capital improvement program (CIP) for the County. The critical intersections, when analyzed with background traffic and CIP-funded lane configurations, operate as follows:

| **BACKGROUND CONDITIONS** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **AM** | **PM** |
| | (LOS/CLV) | (LOS/CLV) |
| MD 725 @ MD 202 | A/863 | C/1236 |
| **US 301 @ MD 725**<br>***With CIP improvements*** | D/1306<br>*A/909* | **F/1642**<br>*B/1052* |

While the applicant's statement of justification (SOJ) proposed a range of uses and densities, the TIS assumed specific density based on applicable rates from the Guidelines, as shown:

| Trip Generation Summary | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Land Use** | **AM Peak Hour** | | | **PM Peak Hour** | | |
| | In | Out | Total | In | Out | Total |
| 254 garden apartments | 26 | 106 | 132 | 99 | 53 | 152 |
| 1,500 square feet retail (ITE-820) | 1 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 12 | 24 |
| *Less pass-by* | *-1* | *0* | *-1* | *-7* | *-7* | *-14* |
| Total new trips | 26 | 106 | 132 | 104 | 58 | 162 |

Under total traffic, the following critical intersections identified above, when analyzed with the programmed improvements and total future traffic, as developed using the Guidelines, including the site trip generation as described above, operate as follows:

| **TOTAL CONDITIONS** | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **AM** | **PM** |
| | (LOS/CLV) | (LOS/CLV) |
| MD 725 @ MD 202 | A/884 | C/1263 |
| **US 301 @ MD 725**<br>***With CIP improvements*** | D/1328<br>*A/927* | **F/1663**<br>*B/1070* |
| **MD 725 @ main site access (residential) ***<br>***Tier 3 – CLV Test*** | 74.1 seconds<br>*B/1110* | 99.9 seconds<br>*<100*** |
| **MD 725 @ secondary site access (retail) *** | 0.0 seconds | 31.7 seconds |
| *Unsignalized intersections are analyzed using the Highway Capacity Software. The results show the intersection delay measured in seconds/vehicle. A maximum delay of 50 seconds/car is deemed acceptable. if delay exceeds 50 seconds and at least one approach volume exceeds 100, the CLV is computed. A two-part process is employed for all-way stop-controlled intersections: (a) vehicle delay is computed in all movements using the Highway Capacity Manual (Transportation Research Board) procedure; (b) if delay exceeds 50 seconds, the CLV is computed. If the CLV falls below 1,150 for either type of intersection, this is deemed to be an acceptable operating condition. ** The approach volume is projected to be 54 PM peak trips. | | |

The results of the analyses show that all of the intersections will operate adequately under total traffic. The analyses for the MD 725/US 301 intersection were predicated on funded improvements in the County's CIP. However, there is a provision in the CIP that the funding will consist of monetary contributions from the development community. To that end, at the time of the PPS phase of this development, the applicant's share of that funding will be determined.

**(10) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club).**

The above finding is not applicable because the subject application is a CSP. This requirement will be evaluated at the time of DSP for this project.

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

The subject property measures 20.98 acres and does not meet the above acreage requirement. Furthermore, this CSP does not propose development of a mixed-use planned community. Therefore, this requirement is not applicable.

d. The CSP is in conformance with the applicable site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274 of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed development concept provides a mix of new multifamily housing, office, and commercial/retail uses designed to front on roadways. A connected circulation system for vehicles and pedestrians is proposed. In addition, the CSP notes that architecture for residential, office, and commercial buildings will provide a variety of architectural elements to convey the individuality of units, while providing for a cohesive design. Detailed designs of all buildings, site infrastructure, features, and amenities will be further reviewed at the time of DSP.

Specifically, the CSP anticipates and aims to achieve the following design options:

- The parking lot has been designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site;
- Parking spaces have been designed to be located near the use that it serves;
- Parking aisles have been oriented and designed to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians;
- Plant materials will be added to the parking lot for the commercial use to avoid large expanses of pavement;
- The loading space(s) will be located to avoid conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians;

- The loading area will be clearly marked and separated from parking areas;
- Light fixtures will be designed to enhance the site's design character by using full cut-off light fixtures throughout the development;
- Luminosity and location of exterior fixtures will enhance user safety and minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts;
- Lighting will be designed to enhance building entrances and pedestrian pathways;
- The pattern of light pooling will be directed to the site to ensure that no excessive lighting spills over to the adjacent properties;
- The site landscaping will comply with all requirements of the Landscape Manual, and native species will be used throughout the development; and
- Public amenities including outdoor seating, bike racks, benches, etc. will be proposed.

In addition, all buildings will be designed to provide a modern, clean, and strong presence along road frontages. The proposed site and streetscape amenities in this project will contribute to an attractive, coordinated development. The CSP envisions attractive site fixtures that will be made from durable, high-quality materials and will enhance the site for future residents and patrons. The CSP includes some possible examples of site fixtures and streetscape amenities. Conformance with site design guidelines will be further reviewed at time of DSP when all required information is available.

e. In accordance with Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, the number of parking spaces required in the M-X-T Zone is to be calculated by the applicant and submitted for Planning Board approval at the time of DSP. Detailed information regarding the methodology and procedures to be used in determining the parking ratio is outlined in Section 27-574(b). At the time of DSP review, demonstration of adequacy of proposed parking, including visitor parking and loading configurations, will be required for development.

**8. Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** The property is subject to the provisions of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. As required by Section 25-119(a)(2)(A) of the WCO, Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-011-2020 was included with the CSP.

a. A Natural Resources Inventory, NRI-093-2018, was approved on August 3, 2018, and provided with this application. The site contains 100-year floodplain, a stream, wetlands, and their associated buffers which comprise the primary management area (PMA). A long stream system is located in a large valley formation in the southern portion of the site. This stream has been shown as ephemeral on the NRI

and TCP1 and is therefore not considered a regulated environmental feature at this time; however, further discussion regarding this stream is provided in Finding 10e. The on-site floodplain area is associated with Collington Branch to the west. There are 50 specimen trees scattered throughout the property. The TCP1 and the CSP show all the required information correctly, in conformance with the NRI.

b. Based on the TCP1 submitted with this application, the site's gross area is 20.98 acres, it contains 10.95 acres of woodland in the net tract, 3.68 acres of wooded floodplain, and has a woodland conservation threshold of 1.93 acres (15 percent). The Woodland Conservation Worksheet proposes the removal of 5.46 acres of woodland in the net tract area for a woodland conservation requirement of 3.29 acres. According to the TCP1 worksheet, the requirement is proposed to be met with 5.20 acres of woodland preservation on-site. The forest stand delineation has identified 50 specimen trees on-site. This application proposes the removal of 10 specimen trees that will be reviewed at the time of PPS.

**9. Other site-related regulations:** Additional regulations are applicable to site plan review that usually require detailed information, which can only be provided at the time of DSP. The discussion provided below is for information only.

a. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual**—This development in the M-X-T Zone will be subject to the requirements of the Landscape Manual at the time of DSP. Specifically, the site is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Landscape Manual.

b. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**—Subtitle 25, Division 3, of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading permit. Properties zoned M-X-T are required to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area covered by tree canopy. The subject site is 20.98 acres in size and the required TCC is 2.098 acres. Conformance with the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance will be ensured at the time of DSP.

**10. Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are adopted herein by reference and main points are summarized, as follows:

a. **Historic Preservation**—In a memorandum dated June 3, 2020 (Stabler, Smith to Zhang), the Historic Preservation Section concluded that a Phase I archeology survey is recommended because the subject property was once part of the Compton Bassett or Woodland plantation. This plantation was established on the Patuxent River by the Hill family in 1699 and remained in the family until the Compton Bassett Historic Site (79-063-10) was purchased by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) in 2010.

The subject property also contains five single-family residences situated on the north side of MD 725. The applicant proposes to demolish all of the existing structures on the subject property. Therefore, prior to the demolition of these structures, the buildings should be thoroughly documented on a Maryland Inventory of Historic Properties form. These twentieth century houses were part of an African American community that settled in the area shortly after the Civil War. Background historic research should attempt to establish which families built and occupied these structures.

Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations, according to the Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review* (May 2005), shall be conducted on the above-referenced property to determine if any cultural resources are present. Evidence of M-NCPPC concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required, prior to signature approval of the PPS.

Upon receipt of the report by the Planning Department, if it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of a DSP, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

(1) Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or

(2) Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.

If a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner, prior to any ground disturbance or the approval of any grading permits.

Depending upon the significance of the findings (at Phase I, II, or III level), the applicant shall provide interpretive signage. The location and wording of the signage shall be provided at the time of DSP and shall be subject to approval by the staff archeologist. The installation of the signage and the implementation of public outreach measures shall occur, prior to issuance of the final building permit for the development.

b. **Community Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 16, 2020 (White to Zhang), the Community Planning Section stated that, pursuant to Part 3, Division 9, Subdivision 2, of the Zoning Ordinance, master plan conformance is not required for this application. Master Plan recommendations are discussed in Finding 7 above and compliance to those will be required at the time of PPS.

c. **Transportation Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 22, 2020 (Burton to Zhang), the Transportation Planning Section's comments are summarized, as follows:

The property is in an area where the development policies are governed by the Subregion 6 Master Plan and SMA, as well as the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. The subject property currently fronts on US 301, which is designated as a master plan arterial road (A-61). The future upgrade will be contained within the existing ROW. The property also fronts on MD 725, which is a

master plan primary residential road (P-608), and no additional ROW will be required for either road.

The plan proposes two points of access on MD 725; one access will serve the development pod towards the westernmost end of the site, while the second and primary access, will be located to the east and closer to the intersection with US 301. The location where the primary access is being proposed, represents a section of MD 725 where the road transitions from two to one westbound lane. Furthermore, the primary access location is not in alignment with any existing driveways on the south side of MD 725. Staff recommends that the proposed main entrance driveway be shifted further to the west, where it can be in alignment with an existing driveway on the south side of MD 725, and beyond the merge lane. This relocation to the west is also being recommended by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA). Staff also shares SHA's recommendation that the stand-alone driveway for the proposed retail component should be consolidated with the rest of the development, given the limited trip generation of this component.

With the recommended relocation of the access point, the overall site may have to be redesigned to facilitate better on-site circulation. This issue will have to be demonstrated at the time of PPS.

d. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated June 22, 2020 (Ryan to Zhang), the trails planner provided a comprehensive review of this application and concluded that this CSP meets the necessary findings and approval criteria, from the perspective of nonmotorized transportation. Details regarding pedestrian, bicyclist, and transit improvements will be addressed at the time of PPS and DSP review.

The trails planner recommends that the applicant provide a conceptual pedestrian crossing of MD 725, conceptual pedestrian access between the development pods on the site, and to adjacent properties along MD 725, as well as conceptual pedestrian access along both sides of the internal driveways or roads, and between the buildings and parking lots on the subject site. The trails planner's recommendations have been included in this report.

e. **Environmental Planning**—In a memorandum dated June 22, 2020 (Schneider to Zhang), the Environmental Planning Section provided the following summarized comments on the subject application:

**Specimen Trees**

Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the WCO requires that "Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree's condition and the species' ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual."

The site contains 50 specimen trees with the ratings of good (Specimen Trees 2, 6, 43, and 47), fair (Specimen Trees 1, 5, 7, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, and 48), and poor (Specimen Trees 3, 4, 8, 17, 20, 21, 32, 33, 34, 36, 38, 44, 49, and 50). The current

design proposes to remove 10 specimen trees throughout the project area. A full evaluation of the need to remove specimen trees has not been completed with the current CSP application. This should be provided at a later stage of development review when more detail with regard to the necessary infrastructure to develop the site can be provided, such as building locations and location of stormwater management (SWM) facilities, as well as an evaluation of any soils restrictions that may be necessary due to the presence of Marlboro clay.

Since no variance to remove specimen trees was provided, prior to certification, the TCP1 shall be revised to show all specimen trees being saved in the specimen tree table and legend.

**Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area (PMA)**

The site contains regulated environmental features. According to the applicant, no impacts to the PMA are proposed for a road crossing, utility extensions, or for SWM outfalls. A further review of the TCP1 shows that there is a proposed water line impacting the PMA, adjacent to US 301. No SOJ has been received for the proposed impact. The site design is conceptual in nature, but the proposed development envelope has been shown abutting the PMA limits. There are several retaining walls adjacent to the PMA shown on the TCP1. These wall structures are required to be installed 10 feet away from the PMA. No PMA impacts are being approved with this TCP1 and CSP. More detailed information is required to be submitted during the PPS process, when the PMA impacts can be reviewed in more detail.

The southern portion of the site has a valley with a water course starting from an outfall structure near US 301 and draining in an easterly direction, until it is slowed by a flat wetland and floodplain system associated with Collington Branch. This swale has been identified as an ephemeral stream channel by the applicant. The stream system appears to change hydrology features throughout the watercourse. The applicant was requested to provide verification from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) regarding the stream classification (intermittent or ephemeral) of the stream. On June 15, 2020, the applicant provided a more in-depth study of the stream section and still identifies the stream system as an ephemeral channel. Staff has reviewed the additional stream information and still believes that there are portions of the stream that exhibit intermittent stream characteristics. A stream determination must be done by MDE.

**Soils**

The predominant soils found to occur on-site according to the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service, Web Soil Survey are Adelphia-Holmdel complex, Collington-Wist complex, Collington-Wist-Urban land complex, Marr-Dodon complex, Udorthents-Urban land complex and Widewater-Issue soils. Christiana clays do not occur on or in the vicinity of this site, but Marlboro clay has been identified throughout the eastern half of the project area.

Marlboro clay is known to be an unstable, problematic geologic formation. The presence of this formation raises concerns about slope stability and the potential for constructing buildings on unsafe land. A geotechnical report is required for the subject property, in order to evaluate the areas of the site that are unsuitable for development without mitigation.

Because a detailed structure configuration and grading studies are not required with this phase of the development process, it is not practical to discuss specific details with respect to grading, or the placement of structures, infrastructure, and SWM devices at this time. A geotechnical soils report dated September 18, 2017 was submitted for review on June 15, 2020. This report has been provided to the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE) for further review and comments. DPIE released a techno-gram entitled "Geotechnical Guidelines for Soil Investigations and Reports" for site/road grading permits in, near, or over consolidated clays for guidance on how to evaluate and work within Marlboro clay. No DPIE comments about the presence of Marlboro clay or the report have been received at this time.

**Stormwater Management**

An unapproved SWM Concept Plan, 2715-2020, was submitted with the subject application and is under review by DPIE. Proposed SWM features include one grass swale, pervious pavers and 14 micro-bioretention facilities. Submittal of an approved SWM concept plan and approval letter showing the proposed buildings, interior roads, and surface parking will be required with the PPS.

The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of CSP-19001 and TCP1-011-2020 with six conditions that have been included in the Recommendation section of this report.

f. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR**)—In a memorandum dated June 29, 2020 (Sun to Zhang), DPR stated that since the development contains a residential component, mandatory dedication of parkland will be required at the time of PPS. The current analysis by DPR staff indicates that this development is subject to a mandatory dedication requirement of 2.79 acres of parkland.

DPR staff has no objection to the approval of this CSP with the understanding that the final determination of mandatory dedication of parkland, private on-site recreational facilities, or fee-in-lieu will be determined at the time of the PPS approval.

g. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—In a memorandum dated June 5, 2020 (Giles to Zhang), DPIE stated their normal requirements for a project like this, including new sidewalks along the road frontages, private roads to be 22 feet in width, and conformance with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation's utility policy, SWM facilities, and drainage system specifications and standards. The site layout and impervious area is consistent with Site Development Concept Plan 2715-2020, which is currently under review. DPIE also requires a 100-year

floodplain delineation and soil investigation report, among other requirements, which will be enforced through later review processes.

i. **Prince George's County Police Department**—In a memorandum dated May 28, 2020 (Contic to Zhang), the Police Department did not have comments on the subject application.

j. **Prince George's County Health Department**—In a memorandum dated June 17, 2020 (Adepoju to Zhang), the Health Department provided several comments on this proposal. Those comments have been transmitted to the applicant who is aware of the health-related requirements. Comments on creating a high-quality pedestrian environment have been reflected in the conditions requiring the applicant to create an active street frontage along MD 725 at the time of DSP. Other comments, such as an increase of impervious surface, fine particulate air pollution, and noise related to traffic, will be further evaluated at the time of PPS and DSP, when detailed information on the site will be available.

k. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, SHA did not offer separate comments on the subject application.

l. **Town of Upper Marlboro**—At the time of the writing of this technical staff report, the Town of Upper Marlboro did not offer comments on the subject application.

**11.** As required by Section 27-276(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, if approved with the conditions below, the CSP represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

**12.** Section 27-276(b)(4), for approval of a CSP, requires that the regulated environmental features on-site have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirements of Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations. According to the review by the Environmental Planning Section (Schneider to Zhang, June 22, 2020), no impacts are proposed with this application. The regulated environmental features on the subject property have been preserved to the fullest extent possible, based on the limits of disturbance shown on the TCP1-011-2020.

## RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Conceptual Site Plan CSP-19001 and Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-011-2020 for Marlboro Gateway, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan, the following revisions shall be made, or information shall be provided:

   a. Provide the acreage information of each development envelope in the site development data table.

b. Provide the existing gross floor area and net acreage on the plan.

c. Revise the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1), as follows:

(1) Add the assigned plan number, TCP1-011-2020, to the approval block, woodland conservation worksheet, and all appropriate areas where the TCP1 is listed.

(2) Revise the approval block on both sheets to be slightly larger for a readable signature.

(3) Revise the legend to remove label and symbol "cleared (woodlands cleared)."

(4) Revise the legend wording from "specimen tree to be retained" to "specimen tree proposed for removal-not with this CSP/TCP1."

(5) Revise the legend and plan view to show a bright colored symbol for "Marlboro Clay."

(6) Add a label for "north" and "south" bound US 301 (Robert Crain Highway).

(7) Revise the stream buffer to stop at the wetland buffer.

(8) Revise the limits of disturbance and specimen tree table to show all specimen trees as saved.

(9) Add a revision date to the TCP1 and have the revised plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it.

d. Provide a conceptual pedestrian crossing of MD 725 (Marlboro Pike) using a rectangular rapid flashing beacon originating at the entrance of the proposed development.

e. Provide a conceptual pedestrian access between all pods on the site, and to adjacent properties along MD 725 (Marlboro Pike).

f. Provide conceptual pedestrian access along both sides of the internal driveways and roads, and between the buildings and the parking lots on the subject site.

2. Prior to acceptance of the preliminary plan of subdivision for this site, the applicant shall:

a. Submit an approved stormwater management concept plan and approval letter.

b. Submit a geotechnical report for review and approval by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement to confirm the elevation of the Marlboro clay and determine the slope stability factor.

c. Revise the Type 1 tree conservation plan to include the limits of the Marlboro clay and the 1.5 factor of safety line, if any, as determined by an approved evaluation by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement.

d. Provide a written determination from the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) regarding the stream classification (intermittent or ephemeral) for the channel located along the southern boundary of the subject property. Should the stream classification change based on MDE's determination, any required stream buffers shall be shown on a revised Natural Resources Inventory and all associated plans.

e. Submit an approved Phase I archeology report, in accordance with the Prince George's County Planning Board's *Guidelines for Archeological Review* (May 2005), on the above-referenced property to determine if any cultural resources are present.

f. Consider relocating the eastern access driveway to MD 725 (Marlboro Pike) to the west, beyond the termination of the merge lane.

3. At the time of detailed site plan, the applicant shall:

a. Submit a list of sustainable site and green building techniques that will be used in this development.

b. Provide commercial/retail, office uses, and/or other public-oriented functions at the street level fronting MD 725 (Marlboro Pike) to activate the street.

4. Prior to the approval of any building permits within the subject property, unless modified at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, pursuant to Section 27-546(d)(9) of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, the following road improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

<u>US 301 @ MD 725 intersection</u>

a. Provide three through lanes, a double left-turn lane, and a right turn lane, at the northbound approach.

b. Provide four through lanes, a left-turn lane, and a right-turn lane, at the southbound approach.

c. Provide two through lanes, a right turn, and a left-turn lane, at the westbound approach.

d. Provide two left-turn lanes, a shared left-through lane, and a right-turn lane, at the eastbound approach.

5. Prior to issuance of any permits, which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.