



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

## Detailed Site Plan

**DSP-07011/01**

## Departure from Design Standards

**DDS-591**

Application	General Data
<b>Project Name:</b> Woodmore Towne Centre at Glenarden (Commercial)  <b>Location:</b> Northeast of the intersection of the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) and Landover Road (MD 202)  <b>Applicant/Address:</b> Petrie/ELG Inglewood, LLC 170 Jennifer Rd., Ste. 300 Annapolis, MD 21401	Date Accepted: 10/23/2008
	Planning Board Action Limit: 01/17/2009
	Plan Acreage: 141.8
	Zone: M-X-T
	Dwelling Units: 108
	Gross Floor Area: 791,208 sq. ft.
	Planning Area: 73
	Tier: Developing
	Council District: 05
	Municipality: Glenarden
	200-Scale Base Map: 204NE08

Purpose of Application	Notice Dates	
A detailed site plan and request for a departure from design standards for a 705,227-square-foot integrated shopping center with 108 multifamily dwellings and 24,854 square feet of office space.	Informational Mailing:	10/23/2008
	Acceptance Mailing:	10/07/2008
	Sign Posting Deadline:	12/16/2008

Staff Recommendation		Staff Reviewer: Lareuse	
APPROVAL	APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS	DISAPPROVAL	DISCUSSION
	X		

THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01  
Departure from Design Standards DDS-591  
Alternative Compliance AC-08036  
Woodmore Towne Centre at Glenarden, Commercial Section

The Urban Design staff has reviewed the detailed site plan and the departure request and presents the following evaluation and findings leading to a recommendation of APPROVAL with conditions.

EVALUATION

The detailed site plan was reviewed and evaluated for conformance with the following criteria:

- a. Conformance with the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone.
- b. Conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C.
- c. Conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006.
- d. Conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-06016.
- e. Conformance with Detailed Site Plan for infrastructure DSP-07011.
- f. Conformance to the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance.
- g. Conformance to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.
- h. Referrals.

## FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for 108 multifamily dwelling units, 705,227 square feet of retail, and 24,854 square feet of office space. Also included with this application is a departure from design standards requesting a reduction in the size of parking spaces for a portion of the property, and an application for alternative compliance for Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual.

### 2. Development Data Summary

	EXISTING	PROPOSED
Zone(s)	M-X-T	M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	Retail, Office, and Residential
Acreage	141.8	141.8
Lots	0	34
Units	0	108
Parcels	2	0
Square Footage/GFA DSP-07011/01 Multifamily Retail Office Total sq. ft.	0 0 0	61,127 705,227 <u>24,854</u> 791,208
Square Footage/GFA DSP-07057 Single family detached Townhouse Two-family Community Center Total sq. ft.	0 0 0 0	612,000 394,000 200,000 <u>3,500</u> 1,209,500
Total square footage for entire M-X-T Zone	0	2,000,708
Floor Area Ratio: Based on net tract area of the M-X-T Zone (238.67 acres)	0	0.19

3. **Location:** The site is in Planning Area 73, Council District 5. More specifically, the property is located on the north side of Landover Road (MD 202), approximately 550 feet northwest of its intersection with Saint Joseph's Drive, immediately adjacent to and east of the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). The commercial portion of the site, which includes 141 acres of the overall 244 acres of land, is located in the southern portion of the property.

4. **Surroundings and Uses:**

North: The overall property is bounded on the north by existing single-family detached subdivisions that are known as Glenarden Heights and La Dova Heights. Several existing streets terminate into the northern edge of the subject property; they are 7<sup>th</sup> Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Street, 10<sup>th</sup> Street, and 11<sup>th</sup> Street.

East: The overall property is bounded on the east by two portions of a new single-family detached subdivision that is known as Balk Hill, dissected by a new extension of Campus Way North that will terminate at the eastern edge of the subject property.

South: The property directly to the south is the Saint Joseph's Roman Catholic Parish Center. Also, along the southern edge of the subject property is the currently terminated Saint Joseph's Drive and vacant property in the M-X-T Zone.

West: The overall property is bounded to the west by Landover Road (MD 202) and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95).

5. **Previous Approvals:** On March 14, 1988, the District Council approved Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C, rezoning the subject property from the Rural Residential (R-R) to the M-X-T Zone, subject to 11 conditions.

On January 23, 2006, the District Council approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 which proposed 900–1,100 residential units, including single-family detached units, single-family attached units (townhouses), multifamily units, stacked condominiums (stacked townhouses), 400,000–1,000,000 square feet of retail, and 400,000–1,000,000 square feet of office, subject to 25 conditions and one consideration.

Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was approved subject to 40 conditions on October 26, 2006. The plan proposed 1,079 dwelling units, 750,000 square feet of commercial retail, 1,000,000 square feet of commercial office, a 360-room hotel, 375 residential lots, 39 commercial lots, and 17 parcels.

On September 24, 2007, the District Council reviewed and approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011 for infrastructure.

On September 25, 2008, a hearing was held before the Prince George's County Planning Board and they approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 for the residential portion of the project, including a community center and 204 single-family detached, 197 single-family attached, and 100 two-family dwelling units.

The subject property has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (20908-2003-02) valid through February 5, 2011.

6. **Design Features:** The detailed site plan is for an integrated shopping center with a small amount of office space and 108 apartments located above the retail components in and around the main street of the development. The retail center proposes 705,227 square feet, including two big box components that are separate from the main street and in-line retail stores of the development. The anticipated big box tenants, Costco and Wegmans, are proposed as one-story buildings on large pad sites, both of which will provide a destination point for shoppers independent of the other retail stores within the development.

The residential component is located on floors two through five above the retail with Building A, located along the two main streets within the development, Towne Centre Boulevard and Market Street. The multifamily component consists of 108 dwellings.

## ARCHITECTURE

The plans include architectural elevations for the following buildings:

The main retail center is composed of Buildings A–F, an independent pad located in the southwest corner of the intersection of Towne Centre Boulevard and Market Street identified as Building K, the Best Buy and associated in-line retail located with frontage on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, the Wegmans pad site, the Costco pad site, and the PNC Bank pad site. Architectural elevations for the residential component have also been included.

The general character of the architecture on the site will be set by those buildings located closest to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and those buildings located along the two main streets of the development, Towne Centre Boulevard and Market Street. A description of each of the buildings mentioned above is provided below.

The main retail center (Buildings A–F) includes the residential component, the parking structure, the community space, and a main anchor; the remaining buildings are shown as primarily in-line retail. The parking structure and loading facilities are located internal to the center. Building A is designed with the first floor as retail and floors two through five as residential units. The exterior elevations propose concrete masonry units (CMU) at the base of the retail with brick to the top of the windows in some locations and the full first floor in other locations. Above that, exterior walls are delineated as either stucco or brick. Floors two through five are primarily stucco (probably exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS)) and “thin brick.” The amount of brick relative to the overall exterior surface of Building A is small.

Behind Building A is the parking structure which appears to be fully enclosed by the façade and bulk of Building A. The east side of the main retail center block is occupied by Buildings B and C. Building B is proposed as a two-story structure that will provide in-line retail space at the first floor, space for the City of Glenarden Community Center, and possibly a commercial fitness center. The building’s exterior finish material is primarily brick at the first floor; brick and stucco (EIFS) are shown above the first floor in an alternating pattern. Behind Building B will be the five-story parking garage, the third through fifth stories of which will probably be visible above Building B.

Between Buildings B and C is a driveway that will serve the structured parking garage and the loading areas. Building C reflects the architectural design of the retail component of Building A as described above with CMU at the base and brick above, level with the windows. Above that area stucco is shown.

Building D is similar in design to Buildings A and C in regard to the exterior finish material, but appears to utilize less brick than the other elevations. Building E wraps around the southwest corner of the main retail center block and provides an interesting decorative two-story corner feature. Building F is the structured parking garage which will be visible over Building B from the east, as mentioned above, and will also be visible from the south between Buildings D and E until another anchor store is built behind those two buildings.

Best Buy is proposed as a big box retail pad site with frontage on Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. The east façade will be highly visible from Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and contains the only entrance into the building. The building is approximately 28 feet in height to the main parapet and the main entrance is approximately eight feet higher. The northwest corner of the building is designed as a taller decorative element topped by a cupola. The exterior finish of the building is brick at the base to approximately eight feet, with full brick piers that extend from the base to the roofline located approximately every 30 feet across the building. The area of the façade above the brick is proposed as EIFS. A large sign is proposed above the main entrance doors in the standard Best Buy colors of blue, yellow, and black. The corner element is proposed as brick up to approximately eight feet, with a stone veneer proposed above that to the asphalt-shingled roof.

Directly adjacent to and south of the Best Buy store is Building H which is a strip of in-line retail with frontage on Market Street. This retail reflects this same exterior design as the other in-line retail previously described in Building A, with CMU proposed at the base and brick above, level with the windows. Above that area materials are delineated as either stucco or brick.

Wegmans is proposed as an independent building on a pad site located southwest of the main retail center. The structure, which is approximately 36 feet in height and contains 140,000 square feet of space, is located at the end of Towne Centre Boulevard so it contributes to the main street system of the town center. The building includes an outdoor seating area/café along the Towne Centre Boulevard side of the building. The exterior finish materials of the building comprise CMU, stone veneer, and EIFS. The building features a clock tower at the main entrance into the building and a red standing-seam metal roof over parts of the first floor that acts as a shelter in the front of the building.

Costco is also proposed as an independent big box retail pad site located west of the main retail center at the western edge of the project. The structure is approximately 34 feet in height and is 146,000 square feet of space. The building is located with frontage on Evarts Street and is not integrated into the main street system of the town center. The exterior finish materials of the building comprise CMU, stone veneer, and EIFS.

PNC Bank is proposed as a pad site near the traffic circle within Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, located on the east side of the site. The building's exterior elevations are shown as a combination of brick, glass, and metal, and provide a simple and modern design with drive-up service included.

It should be noted that the anchor for the main retail center is not included in the set of architectural elevations. Other architectural elevations for footprints of buildings on the plans have not been submitted, so prior to issuance of any building permits for those buildings, the plans will be required to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Board.

The office component is proposed as a total of 24,854 square feet of space and is distributed in a number of buildings across the site, several of which are proposed as bank pad sites. A medical/dental office building is shown on the north side of Evarts Street. Also included in this mix is space shown as community center/management offices in unit 519, which is shown as 4,742 square feet. It should be noted that, at the time of use and occupancy permit for these proposed office sites, there is no requirement for them to be used as office space, as any commercial use permitted in the M-X-T Zone may legally occupy this space.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR A DETAILED SITE PLAN

7. **Zoning Ordinance Section 27-548:** M-X-T Zone regulations establish standards for the development in this zone. The detailed site plan'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;  
and**  
(2) **With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR.**

**Comment:** The applicant has proposed to use the optional method of development in this application by proposing a residential component as part of the overall development. This will potentially increase the floor area ratio (FAR) by 1.0 if more than 20 dwelling units are provided with the application. This DSP includes a total of 108 dwelling units and is eligible for this bonus.

The detailed site plans for the entire site propose the use of the optional method of development, but have a FAR below 1.4. The proposed FAR is as follows:

Uses	Square footage
<b>Approved with DSP-07057</b>	
Single-family detached	202 DUs = 612,000 SF
Single-family attached	203 DUs = 394,000 SF
Two-family dwellings	98 DUs = 200,000 SF
Residential Total	1,206,000 SF
Community Building	3,500 SF
DSP-07057 Total	1,209,500 SF
Site: 238.67 acres	<u>10,396,465.2 SF</u>
FAR	.12
<b>Proposed with DSP-0711/01</b>	
Multifamily	108 DUs = 61,127 SF
Retail	705,227 SF
Office	24,854 SF
DSP-07011/01 Total	791,208 SF
Site: 238.67 acres	<u>10,396,465.2 SF</u>
FAR	.08
<b>Total FAR</b>	<b>.20</b>

The FAR for this DSP is much lower than the allowable FAR. As more development is proposed on the site through the submission of detailed site plans for the remainder of the site, the FAR will increase.

- (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.**

**Comment:** The DSP proposes retail, residential, and office uses in a variety of buildings throughout the site and therefore complies with this requirement.

- (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.**

**Comment:** This requirement is applicable to this detailed site plan.

- (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 uses.**

**Comment:** See Finding 13 for a discussion of conformance to the Landscape Manual.

- (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.**

**Comment:** The floor area ratio calculations for the development do not include the parking structures.

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

**Comment:** The improvements for this project do not interfere with either the air space above or the below-ground public rights-of-way.

- (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.**

**Comment:** The site's compliance with this requirement was established at the time of the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision. The Subdivision Section has reviewed the



plans and determined that they need to be amended to clarify the number of lots, access, and the provision of public utility easements (PUE), which must be shown to comply with Subtitle 24.

- (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 eight hundred (1,800) square feet in size...**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan does not include the townhouse portion of the Woodmore Towne Centre development. The residential component of the development was reviewed for conformance with this requirement under DSP-07057.

## COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. **Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C:** The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C, which became effective September 5, 2007. The following conditions warrant discussion and relate to the review of the subject detailed site plan:

1. **Development within the retail town center should be oriented inward with access primarily from internal streets. Offices and hotels located along the site's frontage on the Capital Beltway and at its entrance from St. Joseph's Drive may be oriented toward the Capital Beltway and the project entrance, respectively. A connection shall be made from the single-family detached component to Glenarden Parkway. Individual building sites shall minimize access to Campus Way and St. Joseph's Drive. The Planning Board or District Council, as appropriate, shall approve access points onto these thoroughfares at the time of detailed site plan approval.**

**Comment:** This condition requires that development generally be oriented inward toward internal streets rather than toward Campus Way and St. Joseph's Drive. The overall development was planned at the conceptual and preliminary plans to have as little development as possible with access directly onto the primary streets traversing this site. The development proposed by the subject plan does not front onto either of these streets. Further, the subject plan of development for this site does not include the large office and hotel pad sites that were envisioned in the zoning map amendment and none of the proposed site uses will have access to Campus Way or St. Joseph's Drive. The access points have been reviewed by the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) as well as the Transportation Planning Section and have been found to be acceptable.

2. **Where possible, major stands of trees shall be preserved, especially along streams and where they serve as a buffer between the subject property and adjacent residentially zoned land.**

**Comment:** This condition has been addressed. A forest stand delineation was submitted and reviewed with CSP-03066. The commercial development that is the subject of the application is not in a portion of the overall development that is directly adjacent to any existing residentially zoned land. All streams within the limits of the application have a minimum 50-foot stream buffer with the exception of those areas that have been approved for impacts.

3. **Development of the site shall be in accordance with parameters provided in the approved Conceptual Site Plan (CSP-03006) (Exhibits 6(b) and 23 herein), as revised from time to time.**

**Comment:** Exhibits 6(b) and 23 are the order affirming the Planning Board's decision with modifications dated January 23, 2006, and the approved Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006, respectively. The detailed site plan is in conformance with both exhibits, as is demonstrated in Finding 9.

4. **All buildings shall be fully equipped with automatic fire suppression systems in accordance with applicable National Fire Protection Association standards and all applicable County laws.**

**Comment:** This condition is proposed to become a condition of the detailed site plan in order to ensure its enforcement.

5. **Each Detailed Site Plan shall include a status report identifying the amount of approved development and the status of corresponding required highway improvements, including the proposed bridge crossing the Capital Beltway. In approving a Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board shall find that the Plan conforms with approved staging requirements. The applicant shall design the highway improvements, in consultation with DPW&T, to minimize the addition of traffic loads onto Lottsford Road.**

**Comment:** This condition requires that a status report of the amount of approved development and the status of the corresponding transportation conditions be provided. Furthermore, it requires that the Planning Board find that each detailed site plan conforms to the staging requirements. Finally, it is required that roadway improvements be designed to minimize the site's traffic impact on Lottsford Road. The needed report has been provided. With the improvements being constructed, there is a stronger reliance on directing traffic toward the MD 202/St. Joseph's Drive intersection with less reliance upon the use of Lottsford Road to access the uses on this site.

6. **The District Council shall review for approval the Conceptual Site Plan, the Detailed Site Plans, and the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision for the subject property.**

**Comment:** The District Council will review this and all future detailed site plans. The District Council approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 on January 23, 2006. The Planning Board approved Preliminary Plan 4-06016 on October 26, 2006. The District Council approved the DSP for infrastructure, DSP-07011, on October 10, 2007. Pursuant to Maryland State law, it is not within the jurisdiction of the District Council to hear preliminary plans of subdivision.

9. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006:** The detailed site plan is in general conformance with Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 and the applicable conditions of approval. The following conditions are relevant to the review of the detailed site plan:

1. **Prior to certificate approval, the plans shall be revised as follows, or the indicated information shall be provided on the plan:**

**Approved development for CSP-03006 is subject to the following minimum-maximum ranges:**

**900 to 1,100 residential units**

**Comment:** The project is proposing 108 multifamily units. In DSP-07057, 202 single-family detached units, 203 townhouse units, and 98 two-family dwellings were approved. This brings the residential unit count to 611 units total for the overall site thus far in the detailed site plan process.

**400,000 to 1,000,000 square feet of retail**

**Comment:** The subject plan proposes 705,227 square feet of retail development, which is the entire retail development proposed overall for the entire area of the CSP.

**550,000 to 1,000,000 square feet of office (subject to waiver provisions in Condition 1.a. below)**

**400,000 square feet of retail and 550,000 square feet of office are required minimum amounts for the two uses. Applicant shall endeavor to achieve the permitted maximum amount of office use. No more than 2,000,000 square feet of retail and office combined are permitted.**

**Hotel uses consisting of 360 rooms and conference center between 6,000 and 45,000 square feet.**

**The square footage included in the construction of any hotel space and/or conference center may be credited against any minimum requirement of commercial office space.**

**In addition to these basic development parameters, all future development shall be in substantial conformance with the Illustrative Plan dated September 21, 2005, as to site layout, development pattern, and the intended relative amounts of development of different types and their relationships and design.**

- a. **Phasing lines and the phasing schedule shall be shown on the plan. A stipulation shall be added to the phasing schedule as follows:**

- i. **Prior to release of the 151st residential permit in Pod F, permits for 100,000 sq. ft. of retail space in Pod D shall have been issued. Of these 100,000 sq. ft. of retail space, at least one third shall be for tenants occupying space consisting of 30,000 sq. ft. or less.**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan encompasses the entire area shown on the conceptual site plan as Pod D. This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement.

- ii. **Prior to the release of the 301st residential permit in Pod F, permits for an additional 100,000 sq. ft. of retail space in Pod D shall have been issued.**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan encompasses the entire area shown on the conceptual site plan as Pod D. This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement.

- iii. **Of the first 500 residential permits, at least 108 shall be in Pod D.**

**Comment:** The subject detailed site plan encompasses the entire area shown on the conceptual site plan as Pod D. This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement.

- iv. **Prior to the release of the 701st residential permit, permits for an additional 150,000 sq. ft. of retail space in Pod D shall have been issued, and a permit shall have been issued for one of the hotel sites.**

**Comment:** This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

- v. **Permits for at least 150,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued, prior to release of the 500th residential permit.**

**Comment:** This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

- vii. **Permits for at least 400,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued, prior to release of the 900th residential permit.**

**Comment:** This condition should be carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

- b. **In order to expedite the construction of office uses, within 60 days from the final approval of the conceptual site plan by the District Council, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with a nationally recognized brokerage firm having expertise in the marketing of commercial office space. The applicant shall consult with and consider recommendations from local civic associations along the MD 202 corridor, as well as the City of Glenarden, in identifying and selecting this broker, although the final decision concerning which broker will be retained shall be exclusively a determination of the applicant. Once retained, the selected broker**

**shall focus on attracting quality office users to the project. The broker shall provide monthly progress reports to the Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation, the City of Glenarden, and the District Council. The applicant shall also meet monthly with an advisory panel comprised of up to four designated representatives from the City of Glenarden, as well as up to four designated representatives from the civic associations along the MD 202 corridor in order to provide progress reports on marketing efforts and solicit input and suggestions concerning office marketing strategies. The brokerage agreement, reporting requirement and monthly meeting requirement shall remain in force and effect until no less than 250,000 square feet of office space is purchased and/or leased by an office developer. In lieu of entering into a brokerage agreement, within sixty days from the final approval of the conceptual site plan by the District Council, the applicant may directly enter into an exclusive agreement with an office developer in order to provide for construction of office uses within the project.**

**Comment:** In a letter dated October 21, 2008, the applicant provided the following comments in regard to the condition above:

“On March 24, 2006, Petrie/Elg Inglewood LLC, the entity that owns the office and hotel component of Woodmore Towne Centre entered into an Exclusive Brokerage Agreement with Jones Lang LaSalle to market the one million square feet of office space available for development at Woodmore. [sic] Please note that this is within 60 days of the final decision of the District Council made on January 23, 2006 as dictated as part of this condition. As part of the their agreement, Jones Lang LaSalle was required to hold monthly office meeting updates with the City of Glenarden, local community groups, and members of St. Joseph's Parish. Said meetings occurred on a monthly basis alternating location between the City of Glenarden Town Hall and St. Joseph's Church. The purpose of the meetings was to brief the various members of the community as to the status of their marketing efforts. Jones Lang LaSalle remained under contract for well over two years at which time it was determined that their expertise was not in Prince George's County and that it was in the developer's best interest to terminate JLL and engage a broker with a greater extent of local knowledge. To that end, JLL has been replaced by Scheer Partners who is currently the exclusive office broker for Woodmore Towne Centre. The change to Scheer Partner was discussed with both the City of Glenarden and the Coalition for Central Prince George's County. To Date, two hundred thousand of the one millions square feet are under contract by an office developer and Scheer Partner's brokerage agreement remains in full force and effect.”

- c. This development shall be required to provide retail uses, office uses and residential uses. This requirement shall supersede the provisions of Section 27-547 (d) of the Zoning Ordinance which requires that at least two of the three categories listed therein be included in the development.**

**Comment:** This condition requires that all three of the uses above be developed within the project. This detailed site plan provides for all three of the uses required.

- f. **Within the first phase of the development, the applicant will designate a sufficient land area to accommodate a 250,000 square foot office building and a sufficient land area to accommodate a hotel/conference center site. This land will be designated for a potential public/private venture between the applicant and Prince George's County ("County") whereby the County, if it so desires, will have the opportunity to market the land area for office development to a governmental and/or private sector developer. It is the intent of this public/private venture to facilitate and expedite the improvement of the designated land for commercial office use. The designated land will be made available for sale and/or construction at fair market value determined at the time of said sale and/or construction, as appropriate. The designated land area will remain available to the County for its marketing efforts for a period of two years from the date of the final approval of this conceptual site plan or until the applicant has secured another buyer and/or user for the subject land area, whichever occurs first. The applicant shall be entitled to all proceeds which may result from any sale or construction which occurs as a result of this public/private venture.**

**Comment:** The area of land was identified on the conceptual site plan as Pod B, Hotel and Conference Center. The timeframe in which the County has the opportunity to market the land area for development as an office use continues to be valid, if the applicant has not "secured another buyer and/or user for the subject land area."

The applicant provided the following discussion in the same letter referred to above, dated October 21, 2008:

"The current site plan for Woodmore shows a total of one million square feet of office space located in five building on three separate land parcels. In addition, there are two hotels on the current plan one of which contains a thirty-five thousand square foot conference center. I am pleased to report that both of the hotels and conference center are under contract with a local Prince George's County minority developer. In addition, Scheer Partner has been working directly with Ms. Pam Piper of County Executive Jack Johnson's office exploring the possibility of relocating several of the county agencies to new office space at Woodmore. Although the county has yet to execute any formal agreement, it is my understanding that Woodmore is currently being. Evaluated as a future home of the Prince George's County Board of Education headquarters.

"Attached to this letter you will find two lease plans that we use as a marketing tool for Woodmore. The dates represented on these plans further demonstrate our continued effort throughout the years to accommodate and market the hotel and office components. As you can see, although the plan has changed in many ways, these component were always a major part of the development program."

2. **Prior to or concurrent with the submission of any detailed site plan for any development parcel, the applicant and the applicants heirs, successors and/or assignees shall submit for approval by the Planning Board a detailed site plan for signage to provide the Planning Board and the community with a concrete idea of the exact quantity, location and appearance of all the signs in the development. This signage plan shall not be required to be submitted prior to or concurrent with a detailed site plan for infrastructure only. At the time of submitting said signage plan to staff of M-NCPPC, the applicant shall also submit a copy of said signage plan to the City of Glenarden and community stakeholders.**

**Comment:** The application only proposes signage for the subject site, not for the overall development contained in the CSP. The signage proposed for the site includes an extensive signage proposal for both the freestanding signage and the building-mounted signage.

In order to find conformance with the CSP condition above, a DSP for signage for the entire development should be submitted prior to certification of the subject DSP. The DSP should be reviewed by the City of Glenarden and community stakeholders, as well.

- 2(a) **At the time of submission of the first preliminary plan of subdivision for the project, the applicant and successors or assignees shall submit for approval a full traffic study, as required in the Planning Board's Adopted Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals. Staff and Planning Board shall thoroughly review the anticipated impacts of the project on major intersections within Glenarden. At the time of submission of the first detailed site plan, the applicant and successors or assignees shall submit for approval a study showing the effects of the proposed connection between the project and Glenarden Parkway, unless otherwise requested by the District Council.**

**Comment:** This condition requires that the applicant submit a full traffic study at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision. This study was done, and includes two major intersections within or adjacent to the City of Glenarden. Further work is required at the time of the initial detailed site plan to perform a study showing the effects of the proposed connection between the project and Glenarden Parkway. This study was submitted June 29, 2007, during review of DSP-07011, and the findings were acceptable and consistent with the findings made at the time of preliminary plan.

14. **At the time of detailed site plan, the following standards shall be observed:**
  - c. **Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design. Such fixtures shall be reviewed and approved by Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) and/or the City of Glenarden as appropriate prior to or by the time of approval of the appropriate detailed site plan.**

**Comment:** The lighting associated with this detailed site plan is not under the purview of DPW&T because none of the streets in this portion of the development are public roads. The details and specifications for public roads were approved with the DSP for infrastructure (DSP-07011). Staff requests that full cut-off light fixtures be used on the streets where the residential units are located to minimize nighttime light pollution.

- d. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate access areas, such as, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily development, and the office/retail development.**

**Comment:** The hardscape plans provide for what appear to be special paving areas within the town center. However, the graphics on the plans are not sufficiently legible to allow determination of which details are being utilized in the various locations. Therefore, staff recommends that a rendered plan indicating the special paving materials be submitted prior to the Planning Board hearing for review and presentation to the Board. Staff has transmitted this request to the applicant as of the writing of this report.

- g. The location of future pedestrian connections, crosswalks, and proposed locations for bus stops, shall be shown on the plans.**

**Comment:** Pedestrian connections are shown within the subject DSP, and staff has evaluated the internal connections (off the main infrastructure) in more detail, particularly with regard to pedestrian access through the major parking lots. Issues and concerns include the following:

- Complete the sidewalks along both sides of Market Street (Sheet 14 and Sheet 21).
- Provide sidewalks or pedestrian walkways and crosswalks through the main parking lots included on the site as shown on the staff exhibit for recommended pedestrian connections.
- Provide shade trees along all pedestrian walkways at an interval of 30 feet on center.
- Identify locations for bicycle parking.

The plan shows proposed bus stops along the first block within the town center along Towne Centre Boulevard from Ruby Lockhart Boulevard; however, no shelter has been provided on the plan. Prior to certification, the applicant should revise the DSP to show a bus shelter at the proposed bus stop on Towne Centre Boulevard equal or greater in quality to that of the DPW&T standard.

**16. The following transportation-related conditions shall be fulfilled:**

- a. The applicant and the applicant's heirs its successors and/or assignees, shall complete the following improvements:**



- i. **Construct Campus Way North extended from its current planned terminus at the boundary of the subject property through the site to the proposed Evarts Road bridge as a four lane divided highway, approximately 3,000 linear feet.**
- ii. **Add a fourth through lane along MD 202, from Lottsford Road to the northbound I-95 ramp, approximately 3,600 linear feet.**
- iii. **Add a fourth through lane along MD 202, from I-95 to Lottsford Road, approximately 3,600 linear feet.**
- iv. **Add a double left-turn lane along MD 202 to northbound St. Joseph's Drive, approximately 900 linear feet.**
- v. **Rebuild and install the traffic signal at the intersection of MD 202 and St. Joseph's Drive.**
- vi. **Reconstruct St. Joseph's Drive from MD 202 to Ruby Lockhart Drive to six lanes in width.**
- vii. **In addition to making the improvements set forth above, the applicant and the applicant's heirs its successors and/or assignees, shall pay a Road Club fee. The amount of this fee shall be determined at the time of the approval of the first preliminary subdivision plan filed for this property. This amount shall be determined at the time of the approval of the first preliminary subdivision plan filed for this property. This amount shall be paid at building permit on a pro rata basis. In determining this amount, the applicant shall receive a credit for any road improvements which it is making at its expense and which are part of the regional improvements identified in the MD 202 Corridor Study.**
- viii. **The timing for the construction of required transportation improvements shall be determined at the time of preliminary subdivision plan approval.**

**Comment:** This condition enumerates several conditions that were determined to be necessary for adequacy at the time of conceptual site plan review. Subcondition (vii) requires that the amount of the Road Club fee be determined at the time of preliminary plan. This is further discussed later in this report. Subcondition (viii) requires that the timing for the construction of the improvements in (i) through (vi) be determined at the time of preliminary plan. For the record, improvements (ii) through (vi) will be required at the time of building permit for Phase I, while improvement (i) was determined to be required with Phase II.

- 17. **In conformance with the Adopted and Approved Largo-Lottsford Master Plan, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide the following:**

- b. Provide the urban pedestrian walkways as indicated on the submitted CSP. The width of the sidewalk within these walkways should be no less than eight feet in areas of street trees, planters, or pedestrian amenities.**

**Comment:** Road cross sections for all internal roads have been approved through Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006. Standard or wide sidewalks are included along both sides of all roads except for a portion of Market Street, and the widths have been generally adhered to except where the sidewalks have been reduced in some areas along Towne Centre Boulevard. Further, the CSP approved cross sections have been changed with this application, but appear to be an improvement over the original design, except for the loss of street tree planting along some of the pedestrian corridors and sidewalks on the plans. In areas where sidewalks have not been provided, if sidewalks are added per staff recommendation, there is also a need for additional areas for street tree planting. Roads designated as “boulevards” have wide sidewalks and in some cases designated bike lanes. Staff recommends additional shade tree planting within the parking compound areas and sidewalks, so that tree canopy is provided approximately 35 feet on center.

- c. Provide sidewalks or wide sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads.**

**Comment:** Road cross sections for all internal roads have been approved through Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006. Standard or wide sidewalks are generally included along both sides of all roads; however, conditions of approval are recommended in order to provide a continuous pedestrian system along the two main streets within the development and to provide additional connections within the site to accommodate pedestrian movement.

- e. A more specific analysis of all trail and sidewalk connections will be made at the time of detailed site plan. Additional segments of trail or sidewalk may be recommended at that time.**

**Comment:** Sidewalk facilities have been further evaluated during the review of the subject site plan in order to provide a safe and recognizable pedestrian system throughout the site. Conditions regarding sidewalk widths in the subject application are provided in the recommendation section of this report and Staff Exhibit A, Pedestrian Access, has been prepared to address this issue.

- 23. Prior to the approval of building permits, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of residential structures within the 65 dBA Ldn noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.**

**Comment:** High-density residential dwellings are proposed on-site; however, it is unclear whether the residential uses are located within the limits of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. A determination for the need of a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis cannot be made until the plan shows the unmitigated and mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contours.

**Comment:** The mitigated and unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contours should be shown on the plans and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards should be demonstrated. This condition will be implemented at time of permit review.

- 24. At time of preliminary plan, the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area or expanded stream buffer shall be minimized to the greatest extent possible, and any required variation requests or letters of justification shall be submitted.**

**Comment:** During the review of the preliminary plan, this condition was addressed and the resulting design was approved by the Planning Board. The design and related conditions require the use of bridges for the two stream crossings; however, this design has now changed. Comments in response to Condition 27 of the preliminary plan below address this issue in full detail.

**Detailed Site Plan Consideration:**

**Prior to submission of any future applications, applicant will continue to study and will not foreclose the option of providing additional sleeved perimeter block development of retail shops with second-level office/residential use around a 50,000- to 125,000-square-foot retail tenant at the core or in close proximity of the town center main street.**

**Comment:** The applicant provided the following response to this consideration in a letter dated October 22, 2008:

“The applicant has taken this consideration into account and accomplished this goal along Market Street and Towne Centre Boulevard by adding multi-family residential above the first floor retail in the town center. Additionally, sleeved perimeter retail has been added around the approximately 112,000 square foot retail anchor. These design modifications meet and/or exceed the intent of the above identified DSP consideration.”

- 10. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016:** The detailed site plan is in conformance with Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 and the applicable conditions of approval. On September 21, 2006, the Planning Board approved the preliminary plan with conditions found in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was approved for the creation of 375 residential lots, 34 commercial lots, and 17 parcels. That approval remains valid until September 21, 2012, or until a final plat is approved. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/13/05, was included in the approval of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 and underwent an -01 revision during the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016.

While the mix of uses may vary from the approved preliminary plan within the trip cap established, the applicant cannot increase the number of lots and parcels approved by the Planning Board in the review of the preliminary plan. The mix of uses was proposed as follows:

Zone	EXISTING M-X-T	PROPOSED M-X-T
Use(s)	Vacant	1,079 Dwelling Units 750,000 SF Retail Commercial 1,000,000 SF Office Commercial 360-room Hotel
Acreage	244.67	244.67
Lots	0	375 Residential 34 Commercial
Parcels	1	17
Public Safety Mitigation Fee		No
Dwelling Units		
Multifamily	0	450
Single Family Attached	0	162
Single Family Detached	0	208
Mid-rise Condos	0	108
Townhouse Condos	0	53
2-over-2 Condos	0	98
<b>Total</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,079</b>

The following conditions of approval of the preliminary plan relate to this review:

4. **At the time of submittal of the initial detailed site plan within the subject property (not to include a detailed site plan for infrastructure), the applicant shall submit an acceptable study of traffic control and lane usage as well as a traffic signal warrant analysis to the transportation planning staff and DPW&T for the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. The applicant should utilize a new 12-hour count, and should analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the operating agencies. If a traffic signal is warranted and approved, or if other traffic control improvements (a roundabout) deemed warranted, the applicant shall bond the improvement with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits (other than permits to construct infrastructure) within the subject property. The improvement shall be installed/constructed at a time when directed by that agency. The recommended improvement(s) shall be made a part of the recommendation for the initial detailed site plan (not including a detailed site plan for infrastructure) within the subject property.**

**Comment:** This condition requires a traffic signal warrant study along with needed studies of lane usage and control for the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. This condition is to be accomplished prior to submittal of the initial detailed site plan within the subject site. Through discussions with the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), it has been determined that the needed

studies have been submitted. Rather than a roundabout, DPW&T has determined that a signalized intersection is appropriate at this location. The following lane configurations will be required to be constructed by DPW&T:

- The south leg (northbound St. Joseph's Drive approach) shall have a minimum of four approach lanes, including dual left-turn lanes, and three receiving lanes.
  - The north leg (southbound St. Joseph's Drive approach) shall have a minimum of three approach lanes and two receiving lanes.
  - The west leg (eastbound Ruby Lockhart Boulevard approach) shall have a minimum of three approach lanes and three receiving lanes.
  - The east leg (westbound Ruby Lockhart Boulevard approach) shall have a minimum of two approach lanes and two receiving lanes.
- 6. The two crossings of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard over the environmental features on the site, as shown on the preliminary subdivision plan, shall provide for four travel lanes, five-foot bike lanes in each direction, and a five-foot sidewalk on each side. This shall be confirmed at the time of detailed site plan, and the right-of-way for Ruby Lockhart Boulevard shall be adjusted accordingly if necessary.**

**Comment:** The road cross section for the bridges was approved by DPW&T as part of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011. They were revised by DPW&T to include a twelve-foot-wide sidewalk/sidepath for bicycles and pedestrians, as opposed to designated bike lanes.

- 7. At the time of final plat approval, the applicant shall dedicate right-of-way along Campus Way, the extension of Evarts Street, and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, except as may be adjusted by means of Condition 6 above, as shown on the submitted plan.**

**Comment:** See Plan Comments below.

- 8. Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 3,112 AM and 3,789 PM peak-hour vehicle trips, with trip generation determined in a consistent manner with the March 2006 traffic study. Any development generating an impact greater than that identified hereinabove shall require a new preliminary plan of subdivision with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.**

**Comment:** This condition establishes an overall trip cap for the subject property of 3,112 AM and 3,789 PM peak-hour trips. The trips associated with the current plan plus past approvals is summarized in a discussion below. However, it is noted that development is within the overall trip cap, and for the purpose of the phasing of transportation improvements, development is within Phase II.

A total of 705,227 square feet of retail space, 24,854 square feet of office space, and 108 residences are proposed by this plan. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 proposed 204 single-family detached residences, and 197 single-family attached and two-family

residences, which was approved by the Planning Board. The table below is taken directly from the Preliminary Plan 4-06016 findings. It is adjusted to indicate the numbers associated with the current proposal and the previously-approved site plan. Internal and pass-by numbers are adjusted for differences between the plan as it stands if approved today and the ultimate proposal. Rows are added to indicate the overall trip cap and the Phase I cap. It is noted that the hotel component is yet to be realized along with the great majority of the office space. Also, approximately 40 percent of the residential component has yet to be proposed via a detailed site plan.

**Summary of Trip Generation for Current Plan (DSP-07011/01) and  
Prior Approved Plans (DSP-07057)**

	AM Peak Hour			PM Peak Hour		
	In	Out	Total	In	Out	Total
<b><i>Retail</i></b>	<b><i>705,227 Square feet</i></b>					
Total Trips	308	197	505	1,125	1,125	2,250
Pass-By	-107	-66	-173	-380	-364	-744
Internal	-9	-13	-22	-22	-47	-69
New Trips	<b>192</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>310</b>	<b>723</b>	<b>714</b>	<b>1,437</b>
<b><i>Office</i></b>	<b><i>24,854 Square feet</i></b>					
Total Trips	45	5	50	9	37	46
Internal	-0	-0	-0	-1	-1	-2
New Trips	<b>45</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>44</b>
<b><i>Hotel</i></b>	<b><i>0 Rooms</i></b>					
Total Trips	0	0	0	0	0	0
Internal	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0	-0
New Trips	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b><i>Residential</i></b>	<b><i>609 residences</i></b>					
Single-Family Det.	31	122	153	120	63	183
Townhouse	42	166	208	155	83	238
Condo/Multi-Family	11	45	56	42	23	65
Internal	-8	-13	-21	-60	-40	-100
New Trips	<b>76</b>	<b>320</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>357</b>	<b>129</b>	<b>486</b>
<b><i>Total Site</i></b>	<b>313</b>	<b>443</b>	<b>756</b>	<b>1,088</b>	<b>879</b>	<b>1,967</b>
<b><i>Overall Trip Cap</i></b>			<b>3,112</b>			<b>3,789</b>
<b><i>Phase I Trip Cap</i></b>			<b>876</b>			<b>1,397</b>

It is noted herein for the record that, in conjunction with a review of Condition 16(a)(vii) of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006, the improvements required of the applicant, and the overall MD 202 corridor requirements, it was determined that the off-site transportation improvements required of this applicant were a sufficient contribution to the overall road program in the MD 202 corridor, exclusive of any additional pro rata fees.

Condition 16(a)(vii) allowed the road club fee to be offset by the improvements established by Conditions 16(a)(i) through 16(a)(vi). The preliminary plan analysis on

pages 37 and 38 of PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212 finds that the value of the proffered improvements exceeds the value of the pro rata fees that would have been collected. Therefore, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 recommends no pro rata payment for this overall site in conjunction with the satisfaction of the preliminary plan conditions.

**9. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved at the time of approval of the DSP.**

**Comment:** Submittal of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 included a Type II tree conservation plan to address this condition. Revisions to the TCPII are outlined under the additional comments and revisions section below.

**10. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 20908-2003-02, and any subsequent revisions.**

**Comment:** The current plan submittal included the stormwater management concept approval letter issued February 5, 2008. No further information pertaining to stormwater management is required.

**25. The applicant shall make a monetary contribution of \$250,000 in 2006 dollars toward the reconstruction of athletic fields at Glenarden Community Center Park. The applicant shall make a first installment of \$60,000 for design, engineering and permit fees prior to February 1, 2008. The remaining balance of \$190,000 (or more if adjusted for inflation) shall be paid prior to October 1, 2008 or prior to issuance of 50% of residential building permits, whichever comes first. If payments are not made according to the schedule above, no additional permits shall be issued. Beginning from the date of the first payment (\$60,000) the remaining balance due shall be evaluated and adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Prior to issuance of the first building permit (other than a permit for infrastructure construction) for any residential lot or parcel, if received prior to February 1, 2008, the applicant shall either post an irrevocable letter of credit or a surety bond in the amount of \$250,000.00 in order to guarantee the payment for the reconstruction of athletic fields at Glenarden Community Center Park.**

**Comment:** The Department of Parks and Recreation, in a letter dated December 4, 2008, indicated that the entire payment has been received.

**27. All bridges constructed on this site that cross streams shall be designed using piers to reduce impacts. The DSP shall include a detail showing the proposed design, including side views and areas of disturbance needed for construction.**

**Comment:** The TCPI associated with the preliminary plan approved for this site showed the provision of bridges for the two stream crossings. The requirement for the bridges was a negotiated agreement based on the sensitivity of the resources in question and an increase in the proposed impacts from the design approved with the CSP. On the CSP, the alignment of Evarts Street was situated to avoid the stream and wetland system in this area. At the time of preliminary plan review, the road alignment was shifted to the north, resulting in considerably more impacts to the regulated areas than were approved by the

CSP. As a trade off for the increase in the impacts to the northern stream system, both roads were proffered to be constructed as bridges because a bridge would preserve more of the physical and ecological characteristics of the stream.

The rights-of-way associated with the stream crossings are public roads which will be maintained by the Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). In meetings and discussions subsequent to the approval of the DSP for infrastructure, DPW&T clearly stated that they would not agree to the construction of the bridges, primarily because of the expense and maintenance requirements necessary to keep the bridge stable and functional. In a letter dated December 9, 2008, stamped as received on December 23, 2008, Mr. Edward J. Binseel, P.E., an Associate Director with DPW&T stated:

"In simplest terms, the County can not afford to operate and maintain structures in perpetuity when other, less costly alternatives are available when life cycle costs are considered.

"We also employ mostly concrete structures designed to minimize long term maintenance costs, and we employ bottomless culverts to the maximum extent practicable."

The current application now shows the provision of box culverts at both crossings.

The impacts for the proposed culverts at the stream crossings were not approved by the Planning Board with the preliminary plan or the DSP for infrastructure, and it is in conflict with Condition 24 of the CSP, Condition 27 of the preliminary plan, and Conditions 1, 2, and 5 of the DSP for rough grading. In an exhibit date stamped as received on December 17, 2008, a profile of the proposed crossing indicates that 14,365 square feet of the primary management area (PMA), in addition to 37,414 square feet that was approved with the preliminary plan, will be permanently impacted; however, the justification statement approved with the preliminary plan shows an impact area of 30,000 square feet. The newly proposed impact area would result in proposed additional impacts of 21,779 square feet, by staff's calculations.

The previously approved impacts for the bridge designs were temporary in nature, consisting of grading and temporary construction access within the stream channel, adjacent wetland, and floodplain for the installation of bridge piers. An exhibit detailing the proposed culvert design, date stamped as received on December 22, 2008, has been submitted. The exhibit shows what appear to be retaining walls spanning the entire crossing on both the upstream and downstream sides. The cross section shows the elevation of the top of the walls, but not the bottom of the walls. The proposed grading for the crossing and associated structures are not shown on the exhibit. At the scale indicated on the exhibit, the limits of disturbance from the proposed wall are not realistic with regard to constructing the wall.

The additional impacts for the construction of retaining walls and a culvert in the stream channel are permanent in nature and consist of grading within the channel, adjacent wetland, and floodplain for the installation of the permanent retaining walls and the culvert structure. A culvert, by design, directs the flow of a naturally meandering stream through the man-made structure, thus restricting the flow path and possibly obstructing the passage of spawning fish in the channel. Another consequence of altering the stream channel flow is the alteration of the existing hydrology within the stream system which



commonly results in a shift in the location of the post construction floodplain and the location of the associated wetlands. Alterations to stream system hydrology generally results in a shift of species composition and adds undue stress on the local flora and fauna.

Because DPW&T is not allowing a bridge design, the plans were revised to show box culverts without giving consideration to other alternatives that would result in fewer impacts to the stream channel, such as bottomless culverts. While it is possible that the impacts associated with constructing the culvert have been minimized to be consistent with Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations for the proposed design, at this time, staff cannot fully evaluate the submitted information to ensure it has been minimized to the fullest extent possible because the information submitted is insufficient. Specifically, the proposed grading is not shown on the plan, and the proposed crossings as shown on the TCPII are not consistent with what is on the DSP.

The possibility of stream restoration to compensate for the proposed additional PMA impacts was discussed. As a result of the discussion, the applicant proffered to provide additional wetland credits above what is necessary to meet the requirements of the state and federal wetland permit.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to certification of the DSP and TCPII, the plans and all relevant information shall be evaluated to ensure that the design of the stream crossings have been minimized to the fullest extent possible. The use of bottomless arched culverts shall be considered prior to certification of the plans. Additional information to evaluate the crossings shall be submitted as necessary.

**Recommended Condition:** Prior to issuance of the first building permit associated with this detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide evidence that wetland mitigation credits, above that required by all state and federal permits, have been secured. The wetland credits shall cover a minimum of 21,779 square feet and be for wetlands within Prince George's County.

- 28. At time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain and severe slopes within the Primary Management Area (PMA) and the expanded buffer, except for areas of approved disturbance, and shall be reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section prior to approval of the final plat. The following note shall be placed on the plat:**

**“Conservation easements described on this plat are areas where the installation of structures and roads and the removal of vegetation are prohibited without prior written consent from the M-NCPPC Planning Director or designee. The removal of hazardous trees, limbs, branches, or trunks is allowed.”**

**Comment:** This condition will be addressed at time of final plat.

- 29. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional 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.**

**Comment:** This condition will be addressed at time of permit review.

- 30. All future tree conservation plans shall show woodland conservation on-site to be no less than 10 percent of the net tract area.**

**Comment:** This condition is addressed in the current TCPII worksheet because the site has a net tract area of 231.71 acres and the proposed on-site tree preservation is 24.18 acres, or slightly more than the required ten percent.

- 32. Development of this subdivision shall be in conformance with an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/013/05-01). The following note shall be placed on the Final Plat of Subdivision:**

**“This development is subject to restrictions shown on the approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/013/05-01), or as modified by the Type II Tree Conservation Plan, and precludes any disturbance or installation of any structure within specific areas. Failure to comply will mean a violation of an approved Tree Conservation Plan and will make the owner subject to mitigation under the Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance. This property is subject to the notification provisions of CB-60-2005.”**

**Comment:** This condition will be addressed at time of final plat.

- 33. Prior to acceptance of the first detailed site plan, the package shall be inspected to ensure that it includes a revised Phase II noise study that reflects the proposed building and grading locations shown on the DSP. A separate sheet within the DSP shall show all unmitigated noise contours and mitigated contours at a scale that clearly shows the noise mitigation measures proposed.**

**Comment:** The noise study submitted for DSP-07057 for the residential portion of the property, north of the subject DSP, indicates that a portion of the property is located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Because residential dwellings are proposed off-site, and because the Phase I noise study indicated that noise mitigation would be provided on this portion of the overall property in the form of shielding from proposed buildings as well as retaining walls acting as fixed barriers, a revised noise study is needed for the overall site and the mitigation measures must be shown and accounted for on this plan. The plan must show the unmitigated and mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour as well as the mitigation measures.

**Recommended Condition:** A Phase II noise study that has been signed and dated by the engineer who prepared it shall be submitted. This study must address the specific site features of the current DSP application. The TCPII and a separate sheet within the DSP shall show the mitigated and unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards. The layout of the features on the DSP must match those used in the noise study.

- 34. Prior to the approval of building permits for residential buildings and the hotel, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in**

**acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits stating that building shells of structures within prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA (Ldn) or less.**

**Comment:** High-density residential dwellings are proposed on-site and lower-density residential is proposed off-site to the north. It is unclear whether the residential uses are located within the limits of the 45 dBA Ldn noise contour. A determination for the need of a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis cannot be made until the plan shows the unmitigated and mitigated 45 dBA Ldn noise contours.

**Recommended Condition:** Show the mitigated and unmitigated 45 dBA Ldn noise contour and demonstrate the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards.

**36. The DSP and TCPII shall show all required landscape buffers between stormwater management ponds as required in the stormwater concept approval.**

**Comment:** Required landscaping between stormwater management ponds should be shown on the DSP and TCPII.

**Recommended Condition:** Show the stormwater management pond landscaping on the DSP and the TCPII.

**Private Access Easements**

Finding 14 of the PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212 (File 4-06016) addresses access issues which were associated with the applicant's proposal. Specifically, Section 24-128(a) of the Subdivision Regulations generally requires all lots and parcels created in a preliminary plan to have frontage on and direct vehicular access to a public street. In addition, Section 27-548(g) of the Zoning Ordinance requires lots in the M-X-T Zone to have frontage on a public street. There are numerous exceptions to that requirement, with private roads and access easements permitted in certain circumstances. In this case, the applicant is proposing to utilize private roads and cross easements in the commercial side of the development. Most of the commercial lots have access provided through pipe stems to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard; however, six lots in Block C (Lots 2, 6, 8, 9, 10, and 13) do not. With the approval of the preliminary plan, a variation to Section 24-128(a) of the Subdivision Regulations and a variance to Section 27-548(g) of the Zoning Ordinance were approved by the Planning Board for the above-referenced lots to be served by private access easements.

It appears that the DSP is proposing to serve a greater number of lots via private access easements than were permitted by the preliminary plan. However, at the time of the approval of the preliminary plan, it appears that it was not clear if the development was an "integrated shopping center" as defined by Section 27-107.01(208) of the Zoning Ordinance. An integrated shopping center is defined as a group of three or more retail stores planned and developed under a uniform development scheme and served by common immediate off-street parking and loading facilities. As an integrated shopping center, Section 24-128(b) of the Subdivision Regulations allows the use of private easements subject to the following:

**(15) For Use as Part of an Integrated Shopping Center:**

- (A) For land in the C-S-C, M-A-C, M-X-C, or M-X-T Zones, the Planning Board may approve a subdivision with a private right-of-way or easement, provided that:**
- (i) Such right-of-way or easement shall have a minimum right-of-way width of twenty-two (22) feet connecting the lots to a public road;**
  - (ii) Such authorization shall be based on a written finding that the private right-of-way or easement is adequate to serve the extent of the development proposed and shall not result in any adverse impact on the access and use of other lots or parcels within the Integrated Shopping Center; and**
  - (iii) The development shall comply with all other applicable requirements of this Code.**
- (B) Approval of the right-of-way or easement per this subsection shall be deemed the creation of a driveway in accordance with Part 11 of Subtitle 27.**

**Plan Comments from the Subdivision Section**

- a. The ten-foot PUEs must be provided free and clear of any obstructions along both sides of all public rights-of-way and approved access easements. The applicant should provide a clear exhibit of the required and existing easements on the property, including the 50-foot-wide water main right-of-way (ROW), which appears to be outside of the ten-foot PUE along the Capital Beltway. The easement locations and extent should be verified by the appropriate utility company prior to approval of the DSP.
- b. The site plan should be revised to label all public and private rights-of-way, the center line, and ultimate ROW dedication. The preliminary plan indicated that right-of-way dedication would be to either the Town of Glenarden or DPW&T. That distinction should be made on the plan if appropriate.
- c. Each sheet of the site plan should be revised to label each parcel and lot as approved with the preliminary plan of subdivision. For example, on Sheet 19, the land to be dedicated to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) should be labeled and the parcel designation with total acreage indicated on each sheet that the land extends onto. In order to determine conformance with the preliminary plan, the applicant should demonstrate that the proposed lotting/parcel pattern does not exceed the approved number. Access easements and the required ten-foot PUEs should be clearly shown on the DSP.
- d. It is not clear how many lots the applicant is proposing within the commercial development. The plan does not provide for all of Lot 2 and 4, which appear to extend to the east.

- e. Prior to signature approval, the applicant should revise the detailed site plan to demonstrate conformance with the lotting and access approved with the preliminary plan and ensure an appropriate lotting pattern to accommodate the development proposed. The number of lots approved shall not exceed the number of lots approved with the preliminary plan for commercial development, and should be demonstrated.

11. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011:** The subject detailed site plan is in conformance with the previously approved detailed site plan for infrastructure that was approved by the District Council on October 10, 2007. The following conditions of approval warrant discussion:

- 2. **Prior to the approval of any future detailed site plans, impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area and expanded buffers other than those conceptually approved by the Planning Board with Preliminary Plan 4-06016, shall require a revised preliminary plan application.**

**Comment:** As previously discussed, the current application shows the use of a series of culverts to provide the road crossing for Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and a single culvert for the crossing of Evarts Street; however, the proposed grading necessary for the development is not shown. The net impacts for these culverts are significantly more than what was approved on the preliminary plan. As discussed earlier, the design results in an additional 21,779 square feet of impacts to the PMA. Because the change in design is a result of DPW&T's desire to have the crossings as culverts and not as bridges, the crossings should be fully evaluated to be consistent with Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations, in minimizing the impacts to the fullest extent possible, prior to certifying the detailed site plan. See Condition 27 of the preliminary plan above for discussion and recommended conditions related to this issue.

- 5. **Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the DSP and TCPII shall be revised to include a detail of the proposed bridges clarifying the areas of disturbance needed for construction.**

**Comment:** This condition has been addressed, but the exhibit shows a detail for the crossings with culverts. The information provided was insufficient for review.

**Comment:** A condition for a review with all necessary information has been recommended.

- 7. **Prior to acceptance of a DSP for residential buildings impacted by the unmitigated 65 DBA noise contour (as reconfigured as a result of grading and construction of retaining walls as approved in this DSP for infrastructure), the package shall include a revised Phase II noise study that reflects the proposed building location and grading shown on the DSP. A separate sheet within the DSP shall show all unmitigated noise contours and mitigated contours at a scale that clearly shows the noise mitigation measures proposed for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas in order to meet the State noise standards.**

**Comment:** The previously reviewed noise study indicates that a portion of the review area for this DSP is located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Because residential dwellings are proposed on-site, and because the report indicated that noise mitigation

would be provided on this portion of the property in the form of shielding from proposed buildings as well as retaining walls acting as fixed barriers, the mitigation measures must be shown and accounted for on this plan. The plan must show the unmitigated and mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour as well as the mitigation measures.

**Recommended Condition:** A Phase II noise study that has been signed and dated by the engineer who prepared it shall be submitted. This study must address the specific site features of the current DSP application. The TCPII and a separate sheet within the DSP shall show the mitigated and unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards. The layout of the features on the DSP must match those used in the noise study.

8. **At the time of DSP for any portion of the site including stormwater management ponds, the DSP and TCPII shall show all required landscaping around the stormwater management ponds that are required as part of the stormwater concept/technical approval.**

**Comment:** The plans should be revised to show stormwater management pond landscaping on the DSP and the TCPII.

9. **Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011, the TCPII shall be revised to show Prince George's County phased worksheet with phase one representing the proposed grading and infrastructure improvements in DSP-07011. The revised worksheet cannot show a shortage regarding how the site's woodland conservation requirement will be addressed and the phased worksheet shall show the correct fee-in-lieu. The first phase in the revised worksheet shall be represented by the subject DSP and TCPII and include all proposed on and off-site clearing.**

**Comment:** The TCPII shows a phased worksheet that has been updated to reflect the information pertaining to the current DSP; however, the design concept shows more clearing for the construction of the bridges than was previously approved. See below for required revisions.

26. **At the time of each subsequent detailed site plan, the applicant shall report on their progress toward replacement of the temporary advertising sign with attractive permanent signage, as soon as is feasible. The temporary sign (applicant's Exhibit 3) will be mounted on 61 foot high poles.**

**Comment:** In a letter dated October 22, 2008, the applicant provided the following update of the temporary signage proposed for the subject site:

"As you are aware, based on its size (61 feet tall posts) and location on the Capital Beltway the temporary advertising sign that was approved under DSP-07011 was the subject of major discussion by the Planning Board, the City of Glenarden, and various community members. Based on these facts, the developers, Petrie/Elg Inglewood, LLC, decided it was in the best interest of the community at large to wait until we complete the clearing of the site to determine whether or not the sign needs to be built to the maximum size currently approved. As such the sign construction is currently on hold until the point in time when we can determine the exact size necessary to be an effective marketing while minimizing its impact on the surrounding area."

12. **Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance because it has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/013/05-01, and an approved Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07-01.

The woodland conservation threshold (WCT) for this 244.63-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area or 34.76 acres. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing proposed is 84.14 acres. This requirement is proposed to be satisfied with 24.52 acres of on-site preservation, 16.65 acres of off-site mitigation, and 43.38 acres of fee-in-lieu. The off-site mitigation has been met and the fee-in-lieu has been paid as part of the rough grading and infrastructure permit approval.

The current plan has been reviewed and numerous revisions are necessary. It is important to show the locations of all existing and proposed utilities and their associated easements because the location of utilities may affect woodland conservation. The TCPII currently shows clearing for utilities in locations that were previously approved as part of the DSP for rough grading and infrastructure; however, the current DSP shows revised utility locations. The TCPII must be revised to show the proposed locations of all utilities as shown on the current DSP. The limit of disturbance (LOD) must be revised to account for the revised utility locations. The woodland conservation worksheet must be revised to account for any additional woodland clearing incurred as a result of the revised utility locations.

All specimen tree critical root zones need to be shown and tree protection fence and signs need to be shown for the trees that are to remain (Trees 1, 16, and 18), as previously approved. Several sheets within the TCPII set have woodland conservation areas that are not labeled. The identification of all woodland conservation areas needs to be clearly shown on each sheet. Several sheets within the TCPII set show existing and proposed roads that are not labeled. Labels for all existing and proposed roads are needed.

The TCPII, as submitted, shows the location of culverts, retaining walls, and rip-rap where bridges were previously approved. On the DSP, as submitted, angled headwalls are shown for the newly proposed culverts. Both the TCPII and the DSP need to show the same proposed culvert design and minimize site disturbance for installation.

For clarity, the sheet index located on the coversheet needs to be revised to indicate the TCPII plan sheet numbers that are associated with the various DSP approvals. On the key map sheet, the plan needs to be shaded or hatched to indicate the area covered by the current DSP and the area covered by previous DSPs (similar to DSP Sheet 2). TCPII Sheet 20 previously showed a water line crossing the stream below the road crossing. The previously approved TCPII indicated the use of the jack and bore installation method for the water line. Sheet 20 needs to be revised to show the water line crossing and to provide the previously approved note regarding the installation method. The detail sheet needs to be revised. When the -01 revision to the TCPII receives signature approval, the TCPII approval block needs to be updated to include this signature information. After all of the revisions listed in Condition 14 have been made, the qualified professional who prepared the plan should sign and date it.

13. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** The detailed site plan is subject to the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. Alternative compliance is requested from Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* along the south side of Evarts Street, where a minimum ten-foot-wide landscaped strip planted

with a minimum of one shade tree and ten shrubs per 35 linear feet of frontage is required to be planted. The applicant is requesting alternative compliance to this requirement because the application does not provide shade trees within the required ten-foot-wide landscape strip due to a retaining wall and the proposed construction techniques.

REQUIRED: 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, south side of Evarts Street

Linear feet of street frontage (not excluding driveway entrances)	540 feet
Option selected (1, 2, or 3)	1
Shade trees required	16
Shrubs required	154

PROVIDED: 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip

Linear feet of street frontage (not excluding driveway entrances)	540 feet
Option selected (1, 2, or 3)	1
Shade trees provided	0
Ornamental trees provided (within the right-of-way)	19
Shrubs provided	513

The applicant does not meet the strict requirements of Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, along the south side of Evarts Street. A retaining wall is located one-foot off of the right-of-way line of Evarts Street. The proposed Costco building is placed 15 feet from the retaining wall. The 12-foot-high retaining wall requires ten feet of geo-grid to be laid behind the wall extending toward the Costco building which does not leave enough room for shade tree planting. The applicant is proposing to install 490 feet of six-foot-high sight-tight fencing along the top of the retaining wall, starting at the rear of the Costco building. Ornamental trees have been provided at the base of the exterior face of the wall, which is within the right-of-way, as a substitute for shade trees within the planting strip. Although the entire width of the required landscape strip is provided, no required shade trees are provided within the landscape strip. The applicant is proposing to install 513 shrubs in the required buffer strip at the top of the wall. The combination of both ornamental trees and shrubs will provide 94 percent more plant units than what is required by the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*. A six-foot-high sight-tight fence is proposed to be installed along the top of the retaining wall behind Costco starting at the rear of the building and running northeast, approximately 490 feet, until it terminates at a handicap ramp located along the northeast corner of the building. However, the Alternative Compliance Committee feels that the cascading shrubs at the highest areas of the wall would be more attractive and recommends that the sight-tight fence be replaced with a visually permeable railing. The Committee feels that the proposed combination of planting, within the right-of-way and landscape strip, makes this proposal equal to or better than normal compliance with the requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

The Alternative Compliance Committee and the Planning Director recommend approval of alternative compliance pursuant to Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* along the south side of Evarts Street, with the following conditions:



- a. The sight-tight fencing along the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a visually permeable railing so that the plant materials at the top of the wall will be visible from Evarts Street.
- b. A portion of the 369 cherry laurels proposed at the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a low maintenance weeping shrub that will cascade over the edge of the retaining wall, where appropriate.

14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was referred to the following agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

- a. **Transportation Planning Section**—Access to the site and circulation within the site are acceptable. A parking analysis, performed consistently with Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, is a part of the subject plan. The information in the analysis has been reviewed and it is determined to be generally reasonable. It is noted that the uses proposed would require 3,866 parking spaces if computed in accordance with Section 27-568. The analysis considers the fluctuation of demand during the day for parking, and computes a base requirement in accordance with Section 27-574 of 3,672 spaces. Reductions of a total of 271 spaces were considered to account for the following:

- The likelihood of multipurpose trips (one vehicle accessing multiple commercial uses).
- The likelihood of residents within the residential component of the use to not use automobiles to access nearby uses.
- The likelihood of commercial patrons to arrive by means of transit via a shuttle bus from the Largo Town Center Station.

With the reductions, the total required parking would be 3,401 spaces. The applicant proposes the provision of 3,509 spaces. Given that the number of spaces provided is a reduction from the base requirement as well as the requirements of a strict by-use application of Section 27-568 of the Zoning Ordinance, it is determined that the parking shown on the plan is acceptable and in accordance with the general intent of the use of the mixed-use zone.

The subject property was the subject of a 2005 traffic study, and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2006 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016. Given that the basis for the preliminary plan finding is still valid and the preliminary plan finding was made less than six years prior, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this report, transportation staff finds that the subject property complies with the necessary findings for a detailed site plan as those findings may relate to transportation, and that this plan furthermore complies with the needed transportation findings identified in Condition 7 of Zoning Ordinance 13-1988 approving Zoning Map Amendment A-9613.

- b. **Environmental Planning Section**—The Environmental Planning Section has reviewed Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 submitted for Woodmore Towne Centre and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/053/07-02, stamped as received on December 3, 2008. Revised TCPII Sheets 1–4, 6, and 16–22, stamped as received on December 17, 2008, were also included in the review. The Environmental Planning Section recommends

approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/053/07-02, subject to conditions proposed below.

The Environmental Planning Section previously reviewed Zoning Map Amendment A-9613-C, which was approved with conditions by the District Council on March 14, 1988. The Planning Board approved Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 on September 29, 2005. The Board's conditions of approval are found in PGCPB Resolution No. 05-205. The Notice of Final Decision of the District Council for CSP-03006 is dated February 15, 2006. Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 was reviewed for the creation of 375 lots for single-family attached and detached dwellings, multifamily attached dwelling units, and the commercial portion where 39 lots were proposed. On September 21, 2006, the Planning Board approved the preliminary plan with conditions found in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/13/05, was included in the approval of CSP-03006 and underwent an -01 revision during the review of Preliminary Plan 4-06016. The Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011 on July 19, 2007, for rough grading and infrastructure. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07, was included in the approval of DSP-07011. The Board's conditions of approval are found in PGCPB Resolution No. 07-144. The Notice of Final Decision of the District Council for DSP-07011 is dated October 2, 2007. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 was approved for the development of the residential section of Woodmore Towne Centre with 204 single-family dwellings, 197 townhouses, and 100 two-family dwellings. An -01 revision to Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/053/07-01 was included in the approval of DSP-07057.

The detailed site plan currently under review proposes the development of the commercial section of Woodmore Towne Centre, approximately 141.8-acres zoned M-X-T, for mixed-use development that consists of commercial/retail, high density residential and office space. As required, an -02 revision to the TCPII Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07-02, was submitted with DSP-07011-01 to show the development proposed.

The 141.8 acres covered on DSP-07011/01 is part of a larger 244.63-acre site in the M-X-T Zone, which is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202), and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). The entire site is approximately 94 percent wooded. Regulated environmental features are associated with the site including: streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and severe slopes. Landover Road (MD 202), future Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, a planned arterial road, and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) have been identified as transportation-related noise generators and noise impacts are anticipated. Nine soil series are found to occur at the site according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*. These soils include: Adelphia, Bibb, Collington, Monmouth, Ochlochnee, Shrewsbury, Silty, Clayey Land, and Sunnyside. Although some of these soils have limitations with respect to drainage and infiltration, those limitations will have the greatest significance during the construction phase of any development on this property and will not impact the layout of the proposed uses. Based on available information, Marlboro clay is not found at this location. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the site. According to available information from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, rare, threatened, and endangered species are not found in vicinity of the site. According to the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, the site is not within the designated network. The site is located in the headwaters of Beaverdam Creek in the Anacostia River Basin; and also in the Bald Hill Branch and

Southwestern Branch watersheds of the Patuxent River Basin. The site is also in the Largo-Lottsford planning area and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*.

- c. **Department of Parks and Recreation**—The Department of Parks and Recreation has reviewed the submitted plans and finds that the following conditions of previous approvals are applicable to the above application:

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006, Condition 18 states:

- i. **Construction of the park shall be completed prior to 50 percent of the residential building permits.**

The subject DSP-07011/01 for this mixed-use development includes three mid-rise buildings including 108 multifamily dwelling units. At the time of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006 approval, DPR staff recommended Condition 18(i) with the intention that the park should be completed prior to issuance of 50 percent of residential dwelling units. According to building permit procedures, only three building permits will be issued for 108 multifamily dwelling units. DPR staff would like to clarify that the park should be completed prior to issuance of building permits for 50 percent of residential dwelling units including single-family and multifamily dwellings on the entire site (Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006).

Preliminary Plan 4-06016, Condition 25 states:

**The applicant shall make a monetary contribution of \$250,000 in 2006 dollars toward the reconstruction of athletic fields at Glenarden Community Center Park. The applicant shall make a first installment of \$60,000 for design, engineering and permit fees prior to February 1, 2008. The remaining balance of \$190,000 (or more if adjusted for inflation) shall be paid prior to October 1, 2008, or prior to issuance of 50% of residential building permits, whichever comes first. If payments are not made according to the schedule above, no additional permits shall be issued. Beginning from the date of the first payment (\$60,000), the remaining balance due shall be evaluated and adjusted for inflation on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). Prior to issuance of the first building permit (other than a permit for infrastructure construction) for any residential lot or parcel, if received prior to February 1, 2008, the applicant shall either post an irrevocable letter of credit or a surety bond in the amount of \$250,000 in order to guarantee the payment for reconstruction of athletic fields at Glenarden Community Center Park.**

The applicant made the full payment of \$250,000 to M-NCPPC.

In summary, the Department of Parks and Recreation recommends that approval of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 be subject to the completion of the construction of the park prior to issuance of building permits for 50 percent of residential dwelling units including single-family and multifamily dwelling units on the entire site.

**Comment:** For ease of administration, staff recommends that the condition be modified to address the actual number of permits, which is 306 residential permits.

- d. **Community Planning Division**—The Community Planning Division reviewed the detailed site plan and offered the following comments.

The application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern Policies for the Developing Tier. The application is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* for mixed-use transportation-oriented development at this site.

The application is generally in conformance with the master plan recommendations for land use. The proposed street grid eliminates the industrial road (I-1) shown on the master plan, but we see no negative master plan impacts resulting from this change. The Community Planning Division is concerned that the development proposal does not contain a commitment to ensure that the applicant either builds the planned Evarts Street overpass across the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) or contributes funds toward the building of this critically needed master plan facility. The applicant should also coordinate with the Prince George's County Department of Public Works & Transportation (DPW&T) and the Department of Environmental Resources (DER) to ensure the adequacy of the public infrastructure network, and to ensure that significant environmental features on the site are preserved.

- e. **Urban Design**—The Urban Design Section has reviewed the plans and has a number of concerns relating to planting areas, pedestrian lighting fixtures and poles, signage, and architecture. It should be noted that the site plan covers the entire land area associated with the commercial portion of this project; however, the structures that are proposed to be built pursuant to this site plan are only those for which architectural elevations have been provided. Many of the footprints shown on the site plan and the associated parking facilities are not accompanied by architectural elevations. Those areas of the plan must be resubmitted to the Planning Board at a later date for review of the architectural elevations and the surrounding site plan for that immediate area.

#### **Shade Trees**

The plans could be improved through additional attention to the elements that enhance the pedestrian experience such as streetscape, special paving areas accenting corners and crosswalks, additional vegetation such as shade or ornamental trees, where appropriate, and the addition of focal points. In previous discussion, staff has addressed the issue of adding additional pedestrian connections throughout the site and an exhibit has been prepared and is included in the back-up. Staff discussion has also included the need for additional shade trees in the parking areas provided in both linear planting beds and in additional planting islands within the parking lots. Provisions for these additional shade trees will impact parking spaces and may actually reduce the number of parking spaces ultimately provided on the site. Staff recommends that a minimum five-foot-wide continuous linear planting bed be provided parallel to the sidewalks along Towne Centre Boulevard, Market Street, and any other major drive on the site, where parking and/or a drive aisle is located directly on both sides of the sidewalk.

#### **Lighting Fixtures**

The proposed pedestrian lighting fixtures for the development should be upgraded to a more decorative pole type than is proposed. The specifications show a plain pole in white that should be upgraded to a more decorative pole type.

### **Signage**

The signage for the site is proposed as both building-mounted and freestanding. The freestanding signage is proposed as follows:

1. A four-sided, 75-foot-high by 30-foot-wide pylon sign located on the west side of the development near the Capital Beltway.
2. A four-sided, 60-foot-high by 25-foot-wide pylon sign located on the east side of the development near the Capital Beltway.
3. Four project identification clock tower entry features, 23 feet high by 12 feet wide, located within the three traffic circles on Ruby Lockhart Drive and the circle at Towne Centre Boulevard and Campus Way North.
4. Two identification vertical project entry features, 12 feet high by 4 feet wide.
5. A monument sign, 4 feet high and 7.5 feet wide, located at the entrance of the project at the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard.
6. Other vehicular directional, parking identification, pedestrian directory, light pole banners, street names, service court identification, and directional and regulatory signage.

The signage proposed for the site appears to be of good quality. None of the freestanding signage proposes exposed poles, and the height of the signage appears to be in keeping with the height of other signage for similar projects along the Capital Beltway.

### **Architecture**

As of the writing of this report, staff continues to evaluate the architectural elevations for the project. A staff recommendation in regard to proposed enhancements of the architecture will be provided prior to the Planning Board hearing in an addendum to the staff report.

- f. **The City of Glenarden**—As of the writing of this report, the City of Glenarden has not yet provided comment on the plans.
15. **Departure from Design Standards DDS-591:** Concurrent with the subject detailed site plan, the applicant has submitted a request for a departure from design standards to Section 27-558(a) of the Zoning Ordinance in order to allow the sizes of parking spaces to be reduced below the minimum 9.5 feet by 19 feet required for standard spaces. Pursuant to Section 27-239.01(b)(7)(A), in order for the Planning Board to approve a departure from design standards, it must make the following findings:

- i. **The purposes of this Subtitle will be equally well or better served by the applicant's proposal;**

**Comment:** The departure originally requested was for a modification of the parking space sizes surrounding only one of the anchor stores. However, the applicant has subsequently clarified the DDS request indicating that space sizes desired are as shown on the most recently submitted site plan. These plans show 10-foot-wide by 20-foot-long

spaces in the area serving the Costco building (no departure required), 9-foot-wide by 18-foot-long perpendicular spaces for all other surface parking, except the angled spaces where 9.5 by 18 feet is proposed, and spaces in the parking garage shown at the standard 9.5 feet wide by 19 feet long. A departure is required, then, for a 0.5-foot reduction in the width of all surface spaces (except angled spaces and those serving Costco) and a one-foot reduction in the length of all surface spaces (except those serving Costco).

The following findings lead to a recommendation of approval of the departure request:

**ii. The departure is the minimum necessary, given the specific circumstances of the request;**

**Comment:** The applicant is asking for approval of spaces that are 0.5 feet narrower and one foot shorter than a standard size space in the locations specified above. All spaces proposed with dimensions smaller than a standard space size qualify as compact spaces, as defined by the Zoning Ordinance. Compact spaces are allowed for up to one-third of the total spaces required for the site. The total number of spaces required for the site as proposed is 3,508 spaces. Compact spaces are allowed for 1,169 spaces. The applicant is essentially asking for relief for a total of 747 spaces above the allowed number of compact spaces, or 56 percent of the total spaces provided for the site. However, the applicant has also provided for wider aisles in many of the locations on the site. The wider the aisle width provided, the more room there is for vehicle maneuvering on the site. For example, the applicant has provided aisles with greater than the minimum 22-foot-wide width for the Wegmans site, where the space size is proposed as 9-foot-wide by 18-foot-long. The aisle width is proposed as 25 feet with 30-foot-wide aisles in another location. The following chart demonstrates not only the size of spaces associated with the specific tenants, but also the proposed aisle width.

**Departure Areas For Parking Sizes**  
Woodmore Towne Centre

Location	Size (WxLxD)	# of Spaces
Best Buy	9x19x22	205
Anchor C	9x18x22	436
500 Block	9x18x24	324
Towne Centre Blvd.	9.5x18x13 (angled)	98
Wegmans (NE)	9x18x25	683
Wegmans (SW)	9x18x30	83
300 Block	9x18x24	85
Med Ctr (714 & 716)	8x16.5x22	54
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,968</b>

The applicant has proposed a parking space size that is a typical size endorsed in The Dimensions of Parking published by the Urban Land Institute (ULI) and the National Parking Association (NPA) (Fourth Edition, 2000).

These standards support a parking space width of 8.9 to 9 feet for standard size spaces in a setting with moderate to higher turnover parking, as is anticipated for this project. In addition, the publication recommends minimum module dimensions for a 90-degree

parking space of 18 feet long with a 24-foot-wide aisle. This is similar to the Zoning Ordinance requirements for the minimum standard size space for 90-degree parking, which is a 19-foot-long space and a minimum 22-foot-wide aisle. There is only one area of the site where the applicant is proposing to provide space sizes less than these ULI and NPA minimum recommendations, which is the area associated with the Anchor C (unidentified tenant) which accounts for approximately 436 spaces.

The ULI and NPA dimensions for a 45-degree parking space are 17.8 feet and an aisle width of 12.8 feet. The applicant's proposal exceeds the size of the recommended minimum dimensions for angled parking as the angled parking is proposed as 9.5 feet by 18 feet with a 13-foot-wide aisle.

The reduced size of parallel parking spaces on Market Street is larger than the compact size for parallel parking spaces in the Zoning Ordinance.

If the applicant is proposing parking space sizes that are consistent with the module sizes recommended by the ULI and NPA for each of the requested departures, staff contends that reduced parking space sizes will be the smallest practical size that these authorities recommend for functionality reasons, and that therefore, the departure is the minimum necessary.

**iii. The departure is necessary in order to alleviate circumstances which are unique to the site or prevalent in areas of the County developed prior to November 29, 1949;**

**Comment:** The departure request does not reference pre-1949 impacts; however, it is reflective of the prevailing best practice in the design of parking spaces as it is closer to the universal standard (as defined by the Urban Land Institute) of nine feet wide by 18 feet long. However, too often large vehicles will try to fit into compact spaces, thereby causing conflicts within parking areas. It seems appropriate that larger vehicles should be accommodated in the Costco parking lot, as this store's customers will often be maneuvering shopping carts and loading bulky sacks into automobiles. The applicant's requested departure does not apply to the spaces serving Costco; in fact, the plans provide slightly wider standard parking spaces (10 by 20) throughout the Costco parking lot.

**iv. The departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.**

**Comment:** There will be no adverse impacts on the surrounding residential areas. The parking needs for the site will be handled completely within the subject property. The requested departure is for spaces within the commercial portion of the development only. The sizes of parking spaces and drive aisles recommended for approval are within the normal range of sizes commonly used in commercial areas. Therefore, this departure will not impair the visual, functional, or environmental quality or integrity of the site or of the surrounding neighborhood.

16. As required by Section 27-285(b) of the Zoning Ordinance, the detailed site plan, if approved in accordance with conditions proposed below, will represent a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines of Subtitle 27, Part 3, Division 9 of the Prince George's County Code without requiring unreasonable cost and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

## RECOMMENDATION FOR DETAILED SITE PLAN

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01, Alternative Compliance AC-08036, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/053/07-02, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional 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.
2. Enhanced landscaping shall be shown around the stormwater management ponds. The applicant shall propose enhanced landscaping and fencing (with safety considerations) around the stormwater management ponds to DPW&T for their review and approval. Prior to submission to DPW&T, the applicant shall review the enhanced landscaping and fencing proposal with the Urban Design Section.
3. All buildings shall be fully equipped with automatic fire suppression systems in accordance with applicable National Fire Protection Association standards and all applicable County laws.
4. The following phasing schedule shall apply to the development of the subject site:
  - a. Prior to the release of the 151<sup>st</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for 100,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued. Of this 100,000 square feet of retail space, at least one-third shall be for tenants occupying space consisting of 30,000 square feet or less.
  - b. Prior to the release of the 301<sup>st</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for an additional 100,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued.
  - c. Prior to the release of the 392<sup>nd</sup> residential building permit for Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 or the 500<sup>th</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), a minimum of 108 residential building units located within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued.
  - d. Prior to the release of the 701<sup>st</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for an additional 150,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued, and a permit shall have been issued for one of the hotel sites.
  - e. Prior to the release of the 500<sup>th</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for at least 150,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued.



- f. Prior to the release of the 900<sup>th</sup> residential building permit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for at least 400,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued.

Conditions (e) and (f) above, requiring building permits for office use at certain thresholds, may be waived or modified if the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board and District Council that insufficient market demand exists for said office use. If the applicant demonstrates that it has graded pad sites for 150,000 square feet of office space, stubbed utilities to those pad sites, has continuously, in good faith, marketed those pad sites for a period of one hundred and eighty days through an exclusive listing agent, and has been unable to obtain a user, said effort shall constitute a satisfactory demonstration to justify waiver or modification of said office permitting requirements. The Planning Board and District Council's waiver of the office space permitting requirements will not be unreasonably withheld, conditioned, or delayed.

This waiver provision is intended solely to provide an opportunity for the applicant to proceed with the construction of residential units based upon satisfying the above criteria. It does not authorize the applicant to convert commercial office space to residential use. At no time may the minimum and/or maximum office space ranges or the hotel space allocations of 360 rooms be converted to residential uses.

5. Prior to signature approval of this detailed site plan, the following revisions shall be made:
- a. Special paving materials shall be provided for the sidewalks at the corners associated with the traffic circles within the development.
  - b. Shade trees shall be provided along the sidewalks adjacent to the retail areas of Towne Centre Boulevard and Market Street and shall be placed 35 feet on center in a continuous planting strip no less than four feet wide. Columnar varieties shall be used where necessary.
  - c. Shade trees shall be added within parking compounds along all pedestrian routes. A minimum five-foot-wide continuous linear planting bed shall be provided parallel to the sidewalks along Towne Centre Boulevard, Market Street, and any other major drive on the site, where parking and/or a drive aisle is located directly on both sides of the sidewalk.
  - d. Sidewalks and crosswalks, as shown on Staff Exhibit A, shall be added to the plans as follows:
    - (1) Provide continuous sidewalks along both sides of the entire length of Market Street.
    - (2) Provide a sidewalk/pedestrian walkway through the parking lot immediately to the southeast of Costco connecting to the Wegmans store.
    - (3) Provide a sidewalk through the parking lot immediately to the east of the main commercial core.
    - (4) Provide a sidewalk along the south and west side of the drive aisles across from the multifamily site and the Costco parking lot on the parcel of the Costco gas station.

- (5) Mark and label the locations for bicycle parking throughout the retail component of the Woodmore Towne Centre.
  - (6) All crosswalks, as shown on Staff Exhibit A, shall be colored concrete pavers.
  - e. All retaining wall details shall be revised to reflect the details and specifications shown on Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011.
  - f. The lighting fixtures shown on the plan shall be reviewed and approved by the City of Glenarden and the Urban Design Section. The lighting plan shall indicate the use of full cut-off light fixtures to minimize light pollution.
  - g. The ten-foot public utility easements (PUE) shall be provided free and clear of any obstructions along both sides of all public rights-of-way and approved access easements. The applicant shall provide a clear exhibit of the required and existing easements on the property, including the 50-foot-wide water main right-of-way which appears to be outside of the ten-foot PUE along the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). Public utility easement locations and extent shall be verified by the appropriate utility company prior to certification of the DSP.
  - h. Revise the detailed site plan to demonstrate conformance with the lotting and access approved with the preliminary plan, and ensure an appropriate lotting pattern to accommodate the development proposed. The number of lots approved shall not exceed the number of lots approved with the preliminary plan for commercial development.
  - i. Label all public and private rights-of-way, the center line, and the ultimate right-of-way.
  - j. Label each parcel and lot with ownership and acreage indicated on each sheet that the land extends onto.
  - k. The sight-tight fencing along the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a visually permeable railing so that the plant materials at the top of the wall will be visible from Evarts Street.
  - l. A portion of the 369 cherry laurels proposed at the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a low maintenance weeping shrub that will cascade over the edge of the retaining wall, where appropriate.
  - m. The plans shall be revised to incorporate a vegetative screen along the rear of the Wegmans pad site and an eight-foot-high, opaque, natural color, non-wood fence around the loading area associated with the Costco pad site in order to screen the loading areas from the views from the Capital Beltway.
6. Prior to certificate approval of the plans, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit for approval by the City of Glenarden and the Planning Board (or its designee) a detailed site plan for signage to provide the exact quantity, location, and appearance of all signs in the development. At the time of submitting said signage plan to M-NCPPC, the applicant shall also submit a copy of said signage plan to the City of Glenarden and community stakeholders.

7. Prior to signature approval of the DSP, a Phase II noise study for the overall site of the Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006, which has been signed and dated by the engineer who prepared it shall be submitted. This study shall address the specific site features of the current DSP application.
8. Prior to signature approval of the DSP, the TCPII and a separate sheet within the DSP shall show the mitigated and unmitigated 45 and 65 dBA Ldn noise contour and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards. The layout of the features on the subject DSP and the noise study shall be consistent.
9. Prior to the release of building permits for residential buildings located within the 45 dBA Ldn noise contour, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permit stating that building shells of structures within the prescribed noise corridor have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
10. Prior to certification of the DSP and TCPII, the plans and all relevant information shall be evaluated to ensure that the design of the stream crossings has been minimized to the fullest extent possible. The use of bottomless culverts shall be considered. Additional information to evaluate both crossings and each alternative shall be submitted as determined necessary by the Environmental Planning Section.
11. Prior to issuance of the first building permit associated with this detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide evidence that wetland mitigation credits, above that required by all state and federal permits, have been secured. The wetland credits shall cover a minimum of 21,779 square feet and be for wetlands within Prince George's County.
12. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011/01, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Show all existing and proposed utilities and associated easements, including, but not limited to, stormwater management, stormdrain, and water and sewer structures.
  - b. Revise the LOD to account for utility installation and all newly proposed impacts.
  - c. Revise all woodland conservation areas to account for additional clearing due to proposed utility installation and all newly proposed impacts.
  - d. Revise the worksheet as necessary to reflect revisions to woodland conservation areas due to the proposed location of utilities and all newly proposed impacts.
  - e. Show critical root zones for all specimen trees and tree protection fence/signs for the trees slated to remain (Trees 1, 16, and 18).
  - f. Clearly identify and label all woodland conservation areas on each sheet.
  - g. Provide labels on each sheet for all existing and proposed roads.
  - h. Show all proposed grading and infrastructure necessary for culvert installation consistently on both the TCPII and the DSP.

- i. On the coversheet, list the TCPII sheet numbers associated with the various DSP plan approvals for the site by providing the following additional information under the sheet index heading:
    - (1) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07011/01
    - (2) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07011 (the park property)
    - (3) TCPII detail sheet numbers
    - (4) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07057
  - j. On the key map sheet provide shading or hatching to indicate the area covered by current and previous detailed site plans (similar to DSP Sheet 2).
  - k. On Sheet 20, show the proposed water line where it crosses the stream and provide the following note as previously approved:

“Water line to be installed using trenchless Jack and Bore construction. No disturbance outside of LOD shall occur.”
  - l. On the detail sheet(s), provide the following:
    - (1) Specimen tree preservation sign detail
    - (2) Tunneling detail (state manual figure D:15)
    - (3) Edge management notes
  - m. When the -01 revision to TCPII/053/07 receives signature approval, the approval information shall be typed-in on the TCPII approval block.
  - n. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and update the revision box with a summary of the revision.
13. Prior to the issuance of the 306<sup>th</sup> residential building permit for the entire site, construction of the park shall be completed.

## RECOMMENDATION FOR DEPARTURE FROM DESIGN STANDARDS

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Departure from Design Standards DDS-591, subject to the following minimum size parking spaces and aisle widths:

### **Departure Areas For Parking Sizes** Woodmore Towne Centre

<b>Location</b>	<b>Size (WxLxDrive)</b>	<b># of Spaces</b>
Best Buy	9x19x22	205
Anchor C	9x18x22	436
500 Block	9x18x24	324
Towne Centre Blvd.	9.5x18x13 (angled)	98
Wegmans (NE)	9x18x25	683
Wegmans (SW)	9x18x30	83
300 Block	9x18x24	85
Med Ctr (714 & 716)	8x16.5x22	54
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,968</b>

\*The total required number of parking spaces for the site is 3,487. The allowable compact spaces are 1,162. Therefore, 806 spaces are granted as the departure for DDS-591.