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

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

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066 (Remanded)

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: Harmony Place **Location:** In the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of Collington Road (MD 197) and Northview Drive. **Applicant/Address:** Harmony Place Assoc., LLC 124 Slade Avenue, Suite 200 Baltimore, MD 21208	Planning Board Hearing Date:	10/21/10
	Staff Report Date:	10/14/10
	Date Accepted:	02/07/08
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	15.44
	Zone:	R-18/R-80
	Dwelling Units:	286
	Square Footage:	N/A
	Planning Area:	71B
	Tier:	Developing
	Council District:	04
	Municipality:	Bowie
	200-Scale Base Map:	206NE13

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
286 multifamily residential dwelling units Additional review required by the District Council's Order of Remand	Adjoining Property Owners Previous Parties of Record Registered Associations: (CB-12-2003)	11/13/07
	Sign(s) Posted on Site and Notice of Hearing Mailed:	09/21/10

Staff Recommendation			**Staff Reviewer:** Ruth Grover, AICP **Phone Number:** 301-952-4317 **E-mail:** Ruth.Grover@ppd.mncppc.org
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-07066
Harmony Place
(Remanded to the Planning Board for an evidentiary hearing pursuant to an Order of Remand from the Prince George's County District Council dated October 30, 2008)

BACKGROUND

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066, Harmony Place, was accepted for review by the Development Review Division on February 7, 2008. The Development Review Division coordinated a review of the application with all offices having any planning activities that might be affected by the proposed development. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066 was approved by the Planning Board on April 17, 2008, and PGCPB Resolution No. 08-60 was adopted on May 15, 2008.

On June 2, 2008, the District Council elected to review this case. On October 27, 2008, the District Council voted to remand the case to the Planning Board in accordance with Section 27-290 of the Zoning Ordinance. The Order of Remand states:

> **Remand to the Planning Board, for appropriate revisions to the site plan, and for a new review by the Planning Commission staff and the Planning Board as follows:**
>
> **A. The applicant, staff, and Planning Board have given insufficient attention to recommendations in the text of the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, approved in 2006. The Master Plan, approved less than three years ago, after years of staff study, considerable neighborhood and citizen participation and comment, and extended review and comment from the City of Bowie, notes that the subject property is located near, and has easy access to, County health facilities, private medical offices, regional retail shopping outlets, restaurants and commercial offices, and public transportation. For these reasons, a substantial part of the housing proposed for the property, perhaps a majority of the dwelling units, should be considered for age-restricted occupancy. Applicant and staff should examine this issue and place in the record the reasons why the proposed mix of units is the best, for the housing community on the property and for the neighborhood and the City of Bowie.**
>
> **B. The subject property is at an unusual location, with extensive frontage on MD 197, and also on Northview Drive, with US 50 only a short distance away. The property is also oddly shaped, and does not have much depth from MD 197 and Northview, compared to the length of its frontage along those major roadways. The District Council finds from the record that vehicular access to and from Health Center Drive should be reevaluated, along with the pedestrian and bicycle circulation**

system on and adjacent to the property, to ensure that motor vehicle access to and circulation within the property promotes pedestrian and bicycle use of surrounding roads and walkways, and also public transportation uses. The record is not clear, also, as to the relation among the proposed parking reductions, the mix of housing types, and the justification for providing fewer on-site parking spaces.

C. The record does not reflect how the applicant will ensure that all residential units have interim noise levels lower than 45 dBA Ldn, or even whether day-night averaging is the appropriate way to measure and evaluate interior noise at this site. Noise mitigation, and justification for allowing noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn, should be considered on remand.

D. The recommendations from the professional staff and the City Council of the City of Bowie should be revised and updated. As the District Council understands it, Bowie staff did not present significant objections to the proposed vehicle access and circulation systems, the pedestrian and bicycle circulation, interior noise levels in units near MD 197, and the mix of conventional and age-restricted housing units in the development project, but the City Council identified these issues as worthy of further consideration.

E. A major purpose of detailed site plans, particularly for new residential projects of 80 or more units, is to allow Planning Board and District Council to review architectural elevations. The District Council and the City Council of Bowie have both had concerns, since before approval of the Master Plan in 2006, to upgrade the quality of architectural facades in new projects. This property is clearly visible to all Bowie residents, is immediately adjacent to the Bowie Towne Center, and is situated just off US 50 and also US 301, which carry substantial loads of interstate traffic to and from Annapolis, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. The Planning Board and staff should reexamine the quality of architectural design, architectural facades, and project amenities, and provide comments on upgrades to architectural design and amenities not already available in the area.

F. All persons who wish to become persons of record on remand should be permitted to do so.

The evidentiary hearing required by the Order of Remand is scheduled before the Planning Board on October 21, 2010. The following staff report examines the issues identified for analysis in the Order of Remand. Additional referral comments received based on the Order of Remand and staff comment, if any, are provided in Findings 13, 14c, 14d, 14f, and 14h. Responses to the various points in the Remand Order are provided in Finding 15 below.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

The Urban Design staff recommends REAPPROVAL of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066, Harmony Place, with the conditions listed in the Recommendation Section of this report.

EVALUATION

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

a. The requirements of the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and the Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, and 74B.*

b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential) and R-80 (One-Family Detached Residential) Zones.

c. The requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.*

d. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Conservation Ordinance.

e. The Remand Order of the District Council dated October 27, 2008.

f. Referral comments.

FINDINGS
(The findings and conditions below are those adopted by the Planning Board in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-60 with new language to be added **bold and underlined.)**

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

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for 286 multifamily residential units included within one 4-story 247-unit building and a second 4-story 39-unit building, attendant parking and recreational facilities within a gated community. The applicant has also separately requested parking departures for the number of parking spaces and the sizes of both the regular and compact parking spaces from the City of Bowie.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	**PROPOSED**
Zone(s)	R-18/R-80	R-18/R-80
Use(s)	Vacant	Residential
Acreage	15.44	15.44
Number of parcels	3	3

Other Development Data:

	REQUIRED	PROPOSED
Parking—Building 1	571	441*
Parking—Clubhouse	16	11*
Parking—Building 2	86	77*
Total Parking	673	529*
Including the following:		
Spaces for the Handicapped	14	14*
Compact Spaces (Maximum Allowed)	222	30*
Loading Space	1	1

*The applicant has applied to the City of Bowie for departures for the number and size of standard and compact spaces.

3. **Location:** The subject project is located in the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of MD 197 and Northview Drive in the City of Bowie.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject project is surrounded to the north by MD 197, with a movie theatre and restaurants beyond; to the east by Northview Drive with Bowie Town Center, an integrated shopping center, beyond; to the south by vacant land owned by the State Highway Administration and land owned by the City of Bowie developed with a senior center; and to the west by land developed with an assisted living facility.

5. **Previous Approvals**: The project is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07028. The project is also the subject of a stormwater management concept plan approved by the City of Bowie on August 24, 2007.

6. **Design Features:** The subject site stretches along the southwestern side of MD 197 and is bounded by Northview Drive on its southeastern end. Health Center Drive loops around its southwestern side and an assisted living facility is located immediately to its west. The project is accessed from two points along Health Center Drive, one located along the western end of the frontage, and another more formal entrance located approximately at the center of that frontage. The more formal entrance is enhanced by plantings and a landscaped median separating the entering and exiting traffic.

   A paved asphalt drive leads from the central access point to the left to the 247-unit building that includes internal structured parking, some limited surface parking and recreational facilities for the project. These include a standard and a children's pool, a room designated for aerobics and another slated for fitness equipment. Also included in this larger building are the following amenities intended for use of project residents: a daycare center, a clubroom, a media center, a library, a conference room and a "cyber café." A second asphalt road leads from the formal entrance to the right, to access a smaller, 39-unit building. Parking for the smaller building is primarily standard surface parking though a limited number of spaces are offered in 2 detached six-car-garages.

   Architecture for the project varies somewhat between the two main buildings, retaining enough in common to create a harmonious visual relationship between the two. The larger building includes well-massed forms and an eclectic mix of architectural detailing and materials. The facades and

roofline are articulated and the mix of architectural materials include "slate stone grey" composite (asphalt) shingling for the roof, "wheat" colored vinyl siding, "champagne" colored exterior insulating finishing system (EIFS) and brick specified as "Georgian" on the first story of the building and "rose, full range" colored brick on the second floor and above. Both brick colors are specified as "Cushwa" type. Fenestration is varied and presents a pleasing rhythm across the facades. White shutters and lighter-color banding are utilized on the first story of the building to create additional visual interest on the pedestrian level of the building. The footprint of the larger building is somewhat jagged, as the building recedes and projects in its visual presentation. Staff, however, has some concerns about the arrangement and relative amounts of the different exterior materials. Please see the Urban Design Section finding/discussion below.

A two-story projection on the eastern end of the building provides a counterpoint to the rest of the building with a predominant use of brick, a visually interesting and varied roofline configuration and its regular, more simplistic fenestration pattern. The differing exterior treatment of the appendage reflects the design program for the interior space. This two-story portion of the building provides the main entrance to the building, with a welcoming drive-through portico, indoor recreational facilities (an exercise and aerobics room), and other amenities for the project. The proposed standard and children's pool and the ancillary deck area with seating, cabanas and a pergola, are contained in a courtyard-like setting, nestled between the rear of the two-story portion of the building and a lateral projection immediately to its west.

A detail for the following has been included in the plans, though color and materials remain unspecified.

- entrance gate detail
- trash enclosure
- bench
- pergola
- pool fence

Staff would suggest that prior to signature approval that the applicant be required to provide color elevations and material samples of the above for review and approval by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

The smaller of the two buildings, "Building 2," utilizes much the same design pattern and materials as the larger building. In addition to the obvious difference in size and the concomitant lack of structured parking within, this building is designed in a more simple rectangular form. Parking for the building is provided in two surface lots located on either side of the building. In the center of the larger of the two lots, two detached 6-car garages are provided. Trash facilities for the project are provided in a small "trash building," located on the northern side of the larger building. Design of the garages and the trash building is simple and similar, with brick utilized on its water table and vinyl siding above. The asphalt composite roofing on these structures mimics that of the larger buildings.

Proposed signage for the project includes a ground-mounted entrance sign, a clubhouse sign, and three directional signs. The clubhouse and entrance signs are similar in design, with aluminum cabinets suspended between stacked stone columns with gold-colored caps, with the entrance sign having a stacked stone base larger in size. More particularly, the entrance sign measures 14 feet 6 inches across and 5 feet 8 inches high, with an 8-foot 9-inch wide and 4-foot 6-inch-high sign panel suspended between two columns with a lettering area measuring 3.76 square feet on each side. The column on each side of the entrance sign adds an additional two feet and three inches to

its width. The club house sign panel area measures 4 feet 2 inches wide by 3 feet 6 inches high equaling14.6 square feet. The design is similar to the entrance sign except for its obviously smaller size and lack of a base. Fabricated brushed gold titanium is utilized for the letters and logo, with smaller graphics utilizing applied vinyl as a material. The directional signs measure 6 feet high by 4 feet wide and have lettering identifying the project, its grand opening, and directions to the leasing center and to the apartments. The directional signs are only permitted by the Zoning Ordinance as temporary real estate signs and a recommended condition below would require their identification as such.

Stormwater management for the project is proposed in a series of surface and subsurface facilities. Wetlands, PMA, and required stream buffers have been identified on the site, are indicated on the plans and protected by the project. Partial frontage improvements for the project's Health Center Drive and MD 197 frontages have been identified, and a proposed Prince George's County Fire Station has been identified south of the eastern end of the project, immediately adjacent to the site in the northwestern quadrant of the intersection of Northview Drive and Health Center Drive.

Details for the project include an entrance gate detail, a trash enclosure, a bench, a pergola and a fence. Insufficient detail, however, has been provided. Therefore, staff has recommended conditions below that would require the applicant to submit additional information regarding these details for the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board to review and approve prior to signature approval.

7. **Recreational Facilities:** Outdoor recreational facilities for the project include a standard pool and a children's pool. Indoor recreational facilities include a 930-square-foot exercise room and a 270-square-foot aerobics room. The applicant also included in their list of "recreational facilities," a daycare room, clubroom, media center, library, conference room, and cyber café though the Urban Design Section does not normally consider such facilities as either active or passive recreational facilities.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07028:** Staff has included each relevant condition of the preliminary plan of subdivision in bold face type below and followed it with staff comment:

2. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan.

Comment: TCPII/02/08 has been reviewed by the Environmental Planning Section and is recommended for approval subject to conditions in conjunction with the subject detailed site plan. Therefore, it may be said that the applicant is in compliance with the requirements of this condition.

3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan #01-0807-206NE13 and any subsequent revisions.

Comment: A condition below would require that prior to signature approval the applicant receive confirmation from of the City of Bowie that the design of the subject project is in conformance with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 01-0807-0807-13, approved by the City of Bowie on August 24, 2007.

5. As part of the submission for certificate approval of the detailed site plan, the package shall be evaluated to ensure that it includes a final subsurface evaluation. The design and construction shall address the findings and recommendations of the final subsurface evaluation.

Comment: Such report has already been received by staff. A condition below would require the applicant to procure a writing from the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), stating that the design and construction of the project addresses the findings and recommendations of the final subsurface evaluation.

12. At the time of detailed site plan, the DSP and the TCPII shall locate the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour with a corresponding symbol in each plan's legend.

Comment: Two conditions below would ensure the location of the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour with a corresponding symbol in each plan's legend.

13. Prior to the acceptance of a detailed site plan, the package shall be evaluated to ensure that it includes a Phase II noise study that details how interior noise levels will be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn or less for interior areas.

Comment: This condition was complied at an earlier stage of review of the subject detailed site plan.

15. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide adequate, private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines, subject to the following:

Comment: A condition below would require the addition of specified private recreational facilities to ensure that the recreational facilities package for the project is adequate to serve the needs of the project's population, and that they are designed in accordance with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and applicable safety standards.

a. Submission of three original, executed recreational facilities agreements (RFA) to DRD for their approval three weeks prior to a submission of a final plat. Upon approval by DRD, the RFA shall be recorded among the land records of Prince George's County, Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Comment: Compliance with this subcondition is required at a juncture later than the subject detailed site plan approval.

b. Submission to DRD of a performance bond, letter of credit, other suitable financial guarantee, or other guarantee in an amount to be determined by DRD within at least two weeks prior to applying for building permits.

Comment: Compliance with this subcondition is required at a juncture later than the subject detailed site plan approval.

16. The developer, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall satisfy the Planning Board that there are adequate provisions to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities.

Comment: A condition below would require that the applicant provide proof that adequate provisions have been made to assure retention and future maintenance of the proposed recreational facilities. Staff notes that a homeowner's association is not envisioned as part of the subject project.

17. Private recreational facilities which comply with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines* shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Review Section of DRD for adequacy and property siting at the time of the detailed site plan.

Comment: Private recreational facilities offered include a pool, exercise room, and aerobics room. A condition below would require the addition of a 200-400-square-foot passive recreational area, a tot lot of a 2,400 square-foot minimum and a preteen playground measuring at least 5,000 square feet. Such recreational facilities should be located in the area along the southeastern and southwestern sides of the larger parking area for Building #2, currently slated for afforestation. Staff would like to note that the portion of this area measuring less than 35 feet wide could not be utilized for afforestation and that the Environmental Plan Section has verbally informed staff that the displaced afforestation could be compensated for by increasing the off-site afforestation component in a revision of the applicant's tree conservation plan, that could be accomplished prior to signature approval of the subject project.

18. The applicant his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a six-foot-wide trail or sidewalk connection from the subject property to the existing master plan trail along Northview Drive. The trail location shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

Comment: A condition below shifts the location of the connection shown by the applicant on the plans in accordance with the recommendation of the trails coordinator.

19. The applicant his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along the subject property's entire frontage of Health Center Drive, unless modified by the City of Bowie.

Comment: The sidewalk referenced in this condition would be required by a recommended condition below.

20. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide an internal pedestrian connection between Building 1 and Building 2. The exact location of the trail or sidewalk connection shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

Comment: Such pedestrian connection between Building 1and Building 2 has been shown on the plans except for a needed crosswalk across the main entrance to the project. A recommended condition below would require that the design and location of that crosswalk and the extension of a landscape island to provide a pedestrian refuge. Final plans for that crosswalk would be required to be reviewed and approved by the trails coordinator prior to signature approval of the plans by the recommended condition.

21. At the time of detailed site plan, the applicant his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall demonstrate conformance with the fencing and setback requirements for the proposed swimming pool in accordance with Section 27-424 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Comment: The Zoning Ordinance requires that fences measure six feet high and that pools meet the same set back requirements as main structures in the subject zone. The fence meets this requirement and the pool retains the 30-foot rear yard setback requirement in the R-18 Zone.

23. Development of this property shall be limited to any permitted uses that generate no more than 149 AM peak-hour trips and 172 PM peak-hour trips on the weekdays.

Comment: In comments dated March 3, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site plan is acceptable as shown and mentioned no problems with trip caps.

9. **The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the R-18 and R-80 Zones:**

a. The proposed multifamily residential use is permitted pursuant to Section 27-441.

b. The proposal is also in conformance with the applicable requirements of Section 27-442, Regulations.

10. ***Landscape Manual:*** The project is subject to Section 4.1 Residential Requirements, Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses, and Section 4.3, Parking Lot Landscape Strip and Interior Parking Lot Landscaping Requirements. Staff has reviewed the project against those requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* and found them to be in compliance.

11. **Woodland Conservation Ordinance:** The site is subject to the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/024/07). A Type II tree conservation plan was submitted, reviewed, and is recommended for approval, subject to conditions in the recommendation section of this technical staff report. Therefore, it may be said that the subject application is in conformance with the requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

12. **Departures Requested of the City of Bowie:** The applicant has requested three departures for parking and loading standards from the City of Bowie. More specifically, the applicant requested the following:

- That the project provide 529 spaces, whereas Part 11 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance would require 673 spaces.

- That the size of the regular parking spaces be permitted to measure nine by 18 feet as opposed to the 9½ feet by 19 feet required by Part 11 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

- That the size of compact spaces be permitted to measure eight and a half by 18 as opposed to the eight by 16½ feet required by Part 11 of the Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance.

Representatives of the City of Bowie have informed staff that the Planning Advisory Committee met Tuesday, March 25, 2008, and recommended approval of all three requested departures. That

recommendation, however, will not be acted on by the City Council, nor can it be finally approved, until April 22, 2008, at the earliest, which is after the writing of this report. Therefore, the applicant has offered an alternative elevation design that would permit the inclusion of all required size parking within Building #1. Should Bowie fail to grant the requested departures, the applicant would proceed with construction of the alternative design, which would meet the requirements of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to the number of required spaces and their minimum size. Please note that staff has determined that the third departure requested of the City of Bowie was unnecessary from the outset. **The two departure applications that had been submitted to the City of Bowie at the same time as the original application for the project are deemed to have been denied by operation of statute as the Bowie City Council failed to act on them in a timely fashion. The applicant is appealing the denial through the Courts.**

13. **Urban Design Section Comments:** The architecture of the project would benefit from the increased use of brick. Therefore, staff would recommend that where sections of a facade have a different, especially a pedimented, roofline, that the use of brick extend upward to the eaves of that section of the facade. Also, in the case of highly visible facades, such as Elevations 2, 7 and 12 that are visible from the pool area, staff would suggest a similar enhancement of those facades. Staff has included a condition in the recommendation section of this report that would accomplish the above improvements to the architecture.

Remand Comments: Please see Finding 15 for Urban Design remand comments with respect to Subpart E of the Remand Order dated October 27, 2008 regarding the architecture of and amenities provided by the subject project.

14. **Referral Comments:** The subject application was originally referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows. **The application was subsequently subject to a limited re-referral in response to the issues raised in the Remand Order. Additional comments received in response to the re-referral are identified below as "Remand Comments":**

    a. **Historic Preservation—**In comments dated February 8, 2008, the Historic Preservation Section stated that the subject project would have no effect on historic resources located in the vicinity of the subject site.

    b. **Archeological Review—**In a memorandum dated February 22, 2008, the staff archeologist stated that she would not recommend a Phase I archeological survey of the subject site because a search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates that the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is low. Additionally, noting that extensive grading had occurred on the property at the time MD 197 was built, the staff archeologist stated that this grading most likely adversely impacted any intact archeological deposits that may have been present on the property. As caveats, however, the staff archeologist mentioned that there are 12 known archeological sites within a one-mile radius of the subject property; one historic resource, the Enfield-Chase Site (71B-006), within a one-mile radius of the subject property; and that Section 106 review may require an archeological survey for federal agencies if state or federal monies are used or permits required for the subject property.

    c. **Community Planning—**In a memorandum dated March 7, 2008, the Community Planning North Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002

General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier. Further, they stated that the application conforms to the 2006 approved Bowie and vicinity master plan's land use recommendation for high-density residential uses and that they expected the design guidelines specifically applicable to the subject property would be reviewed through the detailed site plan process. Toward that end, they included the following site specific quoted guidelines from the 2006 approved Bowie and vicinity master plan in the "Planning Issues" section of their memorandum:

"(1) Site Design

"(a) A minimum of 75 percent of the required parking should be in garages.

"(b) Enhance pedestrian and area safety by encouraging a strong visual connection between the interiors of the buildings and the sidewalk, private oversight of public space, and the provision of pedestrian-oriented lighting.

"(2) Building Design

"(a) High-quality materials that are durable and attractive should be used on the facades of all proposed buildings.

"(b) Upscale and luxurious apartments with elevators are encouraged.

Remand Comments: In a memorandum dated April 14, 2010, the Community Planning North Division stated that the application is not inconsistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier and that the application conforms to the high-density residential land use recommendation of the 2006 Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan. In terms of planning issues connected with the project, the Community Planning North Division stated that the application, located in the developing tier, is subject to the following overall planning issues as identified in the Background Section on page 9 of the master plan:

- **Lack of pedestrian-oriented environments that give identity to an area or create a sense of place.**
- **Need for more diversity of housing types.**
- **Need to protect existing neighborhood character and quality of housing.**
- **Need for senior housing.**
- **Achievement of high-quality development.**

Further, the Community Planning North Division stated that while the master plan identifies a need for diversity of housing types and senior housing, it does not specifically recommend senior housing at this location. However, senior housing may be appropriate because of the proximity of the Bowie Senior Center, the Bowie Town Center, and other amenities and services appropriate for senior citizens. The property abuts the Bowie Regional Center, an area designated for medium- to high-density, mixed-use, and pedestrian-oriented development.

Urban Design Comment: The Community Planning North Division notes that the master plan identifies, in a general sense, the need for diversity of housing types and senior housing, but it does not specifically recommend senior housing for the subject site. For a discussion regarding conformance of the project to design guidelines contained in the master plan, see Finding 15 below.

d. **Transportation—**In comments dated March 3, 2008, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site plan is acceptable as shown.

Remand Comments: In a memorandum dated October 11, 2010, the Transportation Planning Section stated:

The District Council identified six specific subparts that are to be addressed by the Planning Board. Of those six subparts, only one (Subpart B) pertained to transportation, and consequently will be the basis of this review.

Subpart B:

> **The subject property is at an unusual location, with extensive frontage on MD 197, and also on Northview Drive, and with US 50 only a short distance away. The property is also oddly shaped, and does not have much depth from MD 197 and Northview, compared to the length of its frontage along those major roadways. The District Council finds from the record that vehicular access to and from Health Center Drive should be reevaluated, along with the pedestrian and bicycle circulation system on and adjacent to the property, to ensure that motor vehicle access to and circulation within the property promotes pedestrian and bicycle use of surrounding roads and walkways, and also public transportation uses. The record is not clear, also, as to the relation among the proposed parking reductions, the mix of housing types, and the justification for providing fewer on-site parking spaces.**

Based on staff's review of the application both as a preliminary plan of subdivision as well as a detailed site plan, the proposed application is deemed to be acceptable regarding the site access as well as the on-site circulation of traffic. This determination is limited to the vehicular system. It is advisable to seek comment from the trails planning staff regarding pedestrian and bicycle usage.

Regarding parking reductions, that issue has been addressed by the City of Bowie.

Urban Design Comment: The Transportation Planning Section has indicated that they would deem both site access and on-site circulation as acceptable with respect to vehicular circulation. See Finding 14f for a discussion of pedestrian and bicycle circulation on the subject site. See Finding 12 for a discussion of the parking departures requested of the City of Bowie. Please note that should the requested parking departures not be granted, the buildings shall be designed in accordance with the alternative design as evidenced in the PowerPoint slide entitled "Architecture Revised Per Condition (Five Level A)," which was part of the Planning Board's original approval of the case. As previously mentioned, the statutory denial of the two requested departures, which resulted from the Bowie City Council failing to act on them, is currently being appealed by the applicant through the courts.

e. **Subdivision**—In a memorandum dated March 14, 2008, the Subdivision Section stated that the property is the subject of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07028, approved by the Planning Board on October 25, 2007 and remains valid until November 29, 2009. The resolution of approval, PGCPB Resolution No. 07-202, was adopted on November 29, 2007. In Finding #17 of that resolution the Subdivision Section noted that they had received a copy of a letter sent from then Councilman Douglas J. Peters to Chairman Samuel J. Parker, Jr., dated September 19, 2007, stating that his vision for the subject property was to allow for a multifamily residential use for seniors, whether for sale or rental purposes, and that the application as currently proposed for non-age restricted multifamily rental development was not, in his opinion, consistent with the Bowie Master Plan. However, PGCPB Resolution No. 07-202 did not condition that senior housing be required on the site, nor did it indicate that senior housing be taken into account for formal consideration. Additionally, the Community Planning Section, in their comments dated March 7, 2008, stated that the proposed project is not inconsistent with the *2002 General Plan* and conforms to the *2006 Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan's* land use recommendation for high-density residential uses. At the public hearing for the project, however, the applicant proffered that he would do preferential marketing for seniors.

The property is subject to the conditions contained in the resolution of approval, containing 23 conditions. The Subdivision Section stated that conditions 2, 3, 5, 10 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23 are relevant to the subject approval. See Finding 8 for a further discussion of those conditions.

Lastly, the Subdivision Section offered the following comments regarding the plan:

- The detailed site plan proposes the construction of two sanitary sewer lines within Parcel B that were not reflected on Preliminary Plan 4-07028 or TCPI/024/07, that will result in a revised limit of disturbance and additional clearing within a parcel that was solely proposed for tree preservation and afforestation. The additional clearing for the sanitary sewer lines and the removal of the tree preservation and afforestation area within the limits of the sanitary sewer easement should be reflected within the worksheet of the TCPII and be further addressed by the Environmental Planning Section as part of their referral comments. The sanitary sewer easements should also be reflected on the final plat of subdivision.

- There are several bearings and distances along the north side of Health Center Drive that are not reflected on the detailed site plan. A ten-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) should also be shown contiguous and adjacent to MD 197.

- It should be noted that the height of both buildings has been reduced from what was previously shown on TCPI/024/07. Within TCPI/024/07, Building 1 had a proposed height of 63.7 feet, and Building 2 had a proposed height of 56 feet. The detailed site plan is now proposing both buildings to be 49 feet in height. The detailed site plan also proposes several revised bio-retention areas, garages within the parking compound along the southeast side of Building 2, and a different building footprint than what was reflected within TCPI/024/07. Due to the extensive sensitive environmental features located on the site, the changes to the building footprint, particularly in the clubhouse area where a variation from

Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations was granted by the Planning Board for impacts to the isolated wetland area, should be carefully examined by the Environmental Planning Section to ensure that no additional impacts would result from the revised design.

In summary, Subdivision Section found the proposed detailed site plan in substantial conformance with Preliminary Plan 4-07028.

f. **Trails—**In a memorandum dated March 19, 2008, the senior trails coordinator offered the following:

The subject site includes the southern approach to the existing pedestrian bridge over MD 197. This bridge provides safe pedestrian access across MD 197 in an area with numerous traffic movements and sometimes high speed. This bridge provides access between the Bowie Town Center and the movie theatre/restaurant and hotel complex on the north side of MD 197. It also connects existing master plan trails along MD 197 and Northview Drive. It provides a crucial pedestrian connection through the Bowie Town Center. There is an existing trail along the south side of Health Center Drive. The north side of Health Center Drive is a closed section, but does not include a sidewalk. This includes the frontage of the subject property. Proposed Building 2 and its parking lot are adjacent to the existing trail along Northview Drive.

Conditions 18–20 of approved Preliminary Plan 4-07028 (PGCPB No. 07-202) address internal pedestrian connections as well as the connection to the existing trail along Northview Drive and the pedestrian bridge. Staff recommends that these pedestrian connections be reflected on the subject site plan. These required connections are summarized below:

- A pedestrian connection between Building 1 and Building 2 (Condition 20).

- A pedestrian connection from the subject site to the trail along Northview Drive (Condition 18).

- A standard sidewalk along the site's frontage on Health Center Drive, unless modified by the City of Bowie (Condition 19).

As the portion of the master plan trail along Northview Drive that fronts on the subject site includes the graded approach to the bridge (see attached photos), steep slopes must be negotiated to make this connection. Staff believes that this is feasible with minimal grading at the location marked in red on the attached plan.

Staff supports the City of Bowie recommendation that internal sidewalks be a minimum of six feet in width. A four-foot width is typically only suitable for relatively low density, single-family development. In areas of higher density and pedestrian movement, such as the Bowie Town Center, wider sidewalks are necessary to accommodate the heavier pedestrian traffic.

Subsequently, the trails coordinator, after further consideration, in an e-mail dated April 2, 2008, suggested that a condition be included to require a crosswalk in the pedestrian path between the two buildings. Specifically, he suggested that such condition read: "Revise the plans to include a marked crosswalk and extend the median to provide a

pedestrian refuge as marked in red on the attached plan. Design and placement of such crosswalk shall be approved by the trails coordinator and urban design section prior to signature approval of the plans." Such condition has been included in the recommendation section of this report, except for the standard sidewalk along the site's frontage on Health Center Drive, which is already reflected on the plans.

The trails coordinator's suggestions have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report, except for the standard sidewalk along the site's frontage on Health Center Drive, which is already reflected on the plans.

Remand Comments: In a memorandum dated October 11, 2010, the trails coordinator, noting that the project had been reviewed for conformance with the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* and/or the appropriate area master/sector plan in order to implement planned trails, bikeways, and pedestrian improvements, offered the following comments:

The subject application is irregularly shaped and relatively long and narrow. It is bound on the east by Northview Drive, on the north by MD 197, and on the south by Health Center Drive. It has approximately 270 linear feet of frontage along Northview Drive and 1,596 linear feet of road frontage along Health Center Drive. It is in the area covered by the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, and 74B* and is also covered by the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*. The site is in close proximity to the Bowie Town Center, the Bowie Fire Station, several health facilities, and residential development.

Review Comments (Master Plan Compliance and Prior Approvals)
The subject detailed site plan was remanded to the Planning Board by the District Council. The Order of Remand mentioned several factors, one of which was bicycle and pedestrian access. Subpart B of the Remand Order includes the following direction (in part):

> **The District Council finds from the record that vehicular access to and from Health Center Drive should be reevaluated, along with the pedestrian and bicycle circulation system on and adjacent to the property, to ensure that motor vehicle access to and circulation within the property promotes pedestrian and bicycle use of surrounding roads and walkways, and also public transportation uses.**

The subject site includes the southern approach to the existing pedestrian bridge over MD 197. This bridge provides safe pedestrian access across MD 197 in an area with numerous traffic movements and sometimes high speed. This bridge provides access between the Bowie Town Center and the movie theatre/restaurant and hotel complex on the north side of MD 197. It also connects existing master plan trails along MD 197 and Northview Drive. It provides a crucial pedestrian connection through the Bowie Town Center. There is an existing trail along the south side of Health Center Drive.

The north side of Health Center Drive is closed section, but does not include a sidewalk. This includes the frontage of the subject property.

Proposed Building 2 and its parking lot is adjacent to the existing trail along Northview Drive. This trail leads to the pedestrian bridge over MD 197. The bridge provides a grade separated crossing between the Bowie Town Center and commercial/office space on the north side of MD 197.

Conditions 18 through 20 of approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-07028 (PGCPB Resolution No. 07-202) address internal pedestrian connections, as well as, the connection to the existing trail along Northview Drive and the pedestrian bridge. These pedestrian connections should be reflected on the subject site plan. These conditions of approval are copied below:

18. The applicant his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a six-foot-wide trail or sidewalk connection from the subject property to the existing master plan trail along Northview Drive. The trail location shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

19. The applicant his heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide standard sidewalks along the subject property's entire frontage of Health Center Drive, unless modified by the City of Bowie.

20. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assignees shall provide an internal pedestrian connection between Building 1 and Building 2. The exact location of the trail or sidewalk connection shall be determined at the time of detailed site plan.

Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066 was approved by the Planning Board prior to the remand by the District Council. This Planning Board approval included the following conditions related to bike and pedestrian facilities (only the conditions related to bicycle or pedestrian facilities are copied below):

1(b) The detailed site plan shall be revised and additional documentation shall be submitted as follows:

(2) A six-foot-wide trail or sidewalk connection from the subject site to the existing master plan trail along Northview Drive shall be indicated on the detailed site plan as per the illustration provided by the trails coordinator. Design and placement of such crosswalk shall be approved by the trails coordinator and Urban Design Section as designees of the Planning Board.

(3) Provide crosswalks across all roadways crossed by the six-foot-wide internal sidewalk connection between Building 1 and Building 2. The design and exact location of such crosswalks shall be approved by the trails coordinator and the Urban Design Section as designees of the Planning Board.

(18) All proposed sidewalks and trails shall be clearly shown on the plans.

As the portion of the master plan trail along Northview Drive that fronts on the subject site includes the graded approach to the bridge (see attached photos), steep slopes must be negotiated to make this connection. This should be feasible with minimal grading at the location marked in red on the attached plan. At the time of the original DSP approval, the Planning Board included a condition requiring this connection. However, the submitted DSP does not reflect this connection, and the plans should be revised to conform to this condition of approval.

The City of Bowie's recommendation (made at the time of the preliminary plan) that internal sidewalks be a minimum of six feet in width should be carried forward. A four-foot width is typically only suitable for relatively low density, single-family development. In areas of higher density and pedestrian movement, such as the Bowie Town Center, wider sidewalks are necessary to accommodate heavier pedestrian traffic.

The 2006 Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment also designates Health Center Drive as a master plan bikeway. This can be implemented by the City of Bowie through signage and appropriate pavement markings via the city's ongoing bikeway signage program and/or standard road maintenance or resurfacing. Typically, road restriping is best undertaken during road surfacing or through other maintenance projects, not on a parcel by parcel basis or frontage of an individual property.

There are several locations where internal sidewalks and/or crosswalks are not indicated on the subject plan. Several recommendations are made below to address these gaps. Regarding the provision of sidewalks, it should be noted that the 2009 Countywide Master Plan of Transportation includes the following policies in the Complete Streets Section on page 33:

POLICY 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.

POLICY 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.

Conclusion

From the standpoint of non-motorized transportation, it is determined that this plan is acceptable, fulfills the intent of applicable master plans and functional plans, fulfills prior conditions of approval, and meets the finding required for a detailed site plan as described in Section 27-274(a)(2)(C) of the Zoning Ordinance if the following conditions were to be placed.

1. In conformance with the 2006 *Approved Master Plan for Bowie and Vicinity and Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 71A, 71B, 74A, and 74B* and the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation*, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall:

a. Provide a six-foot-wide trail or sidewalk connection from the subject site to the existing master plan trail along Northview Drive (see approximate location marked in red on the attached plan).

b. Revise the width of the sidewalk along Health Center Drive from five to six feet in width (or to a width consistent with the existing sidewalk along the frontage of the adjacent Fire Station), unless modified by the City of Bowie.

c. Provide a six-foot-wide internal sidewalk connection between Buildings 1 and 2, unless modified by the City of Bowie. The location shown on the submitted plan is acceptable.

d. **Provide a marked crosswalk and extend the median to serve as a pedestrian refuge along the internal sidewalk (between Buildings 1 and 2) at the subject site's main access point (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

e. **Provide a marked crosswalk along Health Center Drive at the subject site's western access point (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

f. **Provide a marked crosswalk along the internal road at the access point to the parking area west of Building 2 (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

g. **Provide six-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the western access road to the subject site, unless modified by the City of Bowie (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

h. **Provide a marked crosswalk along the internal road at the ingress/egress of the north side of the parking garage (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

Urban Design Comment: While the substance of recommended conditions 1(a) and (c) was included in the original Planning Board approval of the case, conditions 1(b) and (d) through (h) were not. Therefore, they are included in the Recommendation Section of this report to supplement the trails-related conditions of the original approval in accordance with the direction of Subpart B of the Order of Remand to improve the pedestrian and bicycle circulation systems on and adjacent to the property, to ensure that motor vehicle access to and circulation within the property promotes pedestrian and bicycle use of surrounding roads and walkways.

g. **Permits—**In a memorandum dated February 20, 2008, the Permit Review Section offered numerous comments that either have been addressed by revisions to the plans or in the recommended conditions below.

h. **Environmental Planning—**In a memorandum dated March 20, 2008, the Environmental Planning Section offered the following:

This 15.44-acre property is located on the east side of Health Center Drive, west of MD 197 and north of Northview Drive. The property is zoned R-18 and R-80. According to available information, regulated environmental features are associated with the site. These features include a stream, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, and areas of steep slopes at 25 percent or greater. According to the Prince George's County Soil Survey, the soils found to occur on the site are in the Collington, Mixed alluvial land, Monmouth, and Shrewsbury soils series. Marlboro clays do not occur in the vicinity of the site. The site is in the vicinity of MD 197, a major arterial, and noise impacts are anticipated. There are no designated scenic and historic roads located in the vicinity of this property. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened or endangered species found to occur on this property or adjacent properties**.** According to the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan,* two network features, evaluation areas and network gaps, are located on-site. The property is in the Collington Branch watershed of the Patuxent River basin. The site is also in the Bowie and Vicinity Planning Area and the Developing Tier of the approved General Plan.

Master Plan Conformance
The site is in the Bowie and Vicinity Planning Area. The environmental infrastructure chapter of the master plan contains goals, policies and strategies to preserve, enhance and, where appropriate, restore environmentally sensitive features. The environmental vision recognizes values of an interconnected system of public and private lands that contain significant areas of woodlands, wetlands, wildlife habitat, and other sensitive areas with minimal intrusions from land development, light and noise pollution.

This site contains headwater areas in the Collington Branch watershed, one of the two designated primary corridors in the master plan. The site also contains extensive areas of wetlands, including three wetland areas all located along the north side of Health Center Drive. The protection of headwater areas and the associate wetlands is critical to the overall health of stream systems. The development proposal shows the protection of the regulated areas to the fullest extent possible with the exception of minor encroachments due to the unique configuration of the site that result in some constraints with respect to development. Protection is provided through the preservation of existing woodlands in addition to proposed afforestation/reforestation. The preservation of existing woodlands on-site provides some much needed green space on a project that proposes high-density residential uses.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the master plan conformance.

Green Infrastructure Plan Conformance
Most of the site is within an evaluation area of the countywide green infrastructure plan. There are several regulated features found on-site that are concentrated along the north side of Health Center Drive. The woodlands within and adjacent to these regulated features are considered priority woodlands for preservation and are in excellent condition with few invasive plant species. Because the site is small and constrained and the woodland conservation threshold is being met on-site, the design is in conformance with the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan because it provides for the permanent protection of high priority woodlands adjacent to the stream valley.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan conformance.

Review of Previously Approved Conditions
The following text addresses previously approved environmental conditions related to the subject application. The text in **BOLD** is the actual text from the previous cases or plans. The plain text provides the comments on the plan's conformance with the conditions.

PGCPB No. 07-202 File No. 4-07028

2. A Type II tree conservation plan shall be approved in conjunction with the detailed site plan.

Comment: A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted.

3. Development of this site shall be in conformance with Stormwater Management Concept Plan 01-0807-206NE13 and any subsequent revisions.

The site has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan (01-807-206NE13). The concept plan shows an underground stormwater management facility and several above ground bio-retention facilities that will be used to safely treat and convey stormwater from the site. The concept is correctly reflected on the TCPII.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to stormwater management.

5. As part of the submission for certificate approval of the detailed site plan, the package shall be evaluated to ensure that it includes a final subsurface evaluation. The design and construction shall address the findings and recommendations of the final subsurface evaluation.

Comment: The subsurface evaluations were submitted with the subject application. The Department of Public Works and Transportation is responsible for the evaluation of this information to ensure that the proposed construction techniques are used.

7. Prior to signature approval of the TCPI, it shall be revised to show at least ten feet of clearing and grading between all outer walls of the buildings and structures to the limits of disturbance.

Comment: This condition was addressed on the TCPI, TCPII and DSP and is in conformance with this condition.

9. Prior to signature approval of the preliminary plan, a revised TCPI shall be submitted which demonstrates the following:

a. Remove the fee-in-lieu payment in the worksheet and show this acreage as off-site mitigation on another site.

Comment: This condition has been addressed.

b. Remove the soils layer from the legend and the plan.

Comment: This condition has been addressed.

c. Remove the conceptual spot grades and provide the conceptual grading with a corresponding symbol in the legend.

Comment: This condition has been addressed.

d. Within standard TCPI note 5, refer to the city of Bowie's applicable stormwater management concept plan case number.

Comment: This condition does not apply to this application.

e. Add the following note: "The TCPII shall show the provision of chain-link fencing, six feet in height, around all woodland preservation areas within 10 feet of any road or building

construction on the north side of Health Center Drive. Other tree protection devices shall be provided for all other preservation areas. All tree protection devices shall be installed prior to issuance of the grading permit and shall remain in place until the first use and occupancy permit has been issued, or until sign-off for the fence removal has been obtained from the DPW&T Inspector and M-NCPPC's Environmental Planning Section. At no time during construction shall this fencing be removed for any reason. Any impacts to woodland preservation areas shall be mitigated at a ratio of 2 to 1." This note will also be added to the TCPII and the details for the chain-link fencing shall be shown on the plan.

The note has been added to the TCPII; however, the chain-link fencing has not been shown in the one area where the woodland conservation is within ten feet of the building: where the exterior stairs are proposed on the western end of the building. The plans must be revised to provide a detail for the chain-link fencing and a symbol that is to be added to the plan.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised to provide a section of chain-link fence along the area where the exterior stairs on the western end of the building bring that section of the building within ten feet of the woodland conservation area. The TCPII shall be revised to provide a detail for the chain-link fencing and a symbol that must be added to the plan.

f. Add the following note: "The TCPII shall show the locations and details for the additional signage to explain the purpose and maintenance of the bioretention areas and the afforestation areas. Afforestation areas shall be planted with trees one inch in caliper and greater."

The note has been added to the TCPII; however, the required sign details and their proposed locations are not shown on the plan. The use of one-inch caliper trees is reflected in the planting schedule for the site.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall show the locations and details for the additional signage to explain the purpose and maintenance of the bio-retention areas and the afforestation areas.

g. After these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.

Comment: The submitted plan has been signed by a qualified professional.

12. At the time of detailed site plan, the DSP and the TCPII shall locate the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour with a corresponding symbol in each plan's legend.

Comment: This condition has been addressed.

13. Prior to the acceptance of a detailed site plan, the package shall be evaluated to ensure that it includes a Phase II noise study that details how interior noise levels will be mitigated to 45 dBA Ldn or less for interior areas.

This condition has been addressed. A Phase II noise study, dated October 25, 2007, has been submitted. The study's noise reduction analysis concludes that the interiors of some of the proposed residential units will experience noise levels above 45 dBA Ldn. The study recommends that some upper level units, particularly those facing MD 197, be constructed with appropriate construction materials that will reduce noise levels. Prior to certification of this detailed site plan, the application shall address how these recommendations will be addressed. Details must be provided on the DSP because they may affect the architecture of the buildings.

The site contains one outdoor activity area. For this area, noise will be mitigated by the proposed building; therefore, additional mitigation is not required for the outdoor activity area.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the DSP shall be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Phase II noise study with regard to the construction materials needed to mitigate noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less in the interiors of all the residential units. A description of the materials shall be reflected on the DSP.

Recommended Condition: Prior to the approval of building permits, 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 and address the noise recommendations of the Phase II noise study submitted with this application.

Environmental Review

(1) A staff signed Natural Resources Inventory (NRI/031/07-01) was included in this application. The total woodland on-site is 7.45 acres and the plan shows the correct PMA.

According to the forest stand delineation, the site contains four forest stands. There are six specimen trees located on the NRI; two of the six are on-site and both are located in Stand 1. The other four specimen trees are located off-site. Stands 1–3 have tulip poplar as the dominant tree species and pine is the dominant tree species in Stand 4. Stands 2 and 3 have been identified as "priority" retention based on each stand's forest structure and overall environmental features located within them.

The NRI information is correctly shown on the submitted TCPII and detailed site plan.

Comment: No additional information is needed with regard to the natural resources inventory.

(2) The proposed activities may require the permission of the appropriate state and/or federal agencies, due to impacts proposed to streams, wetlands and buffers.

Recommended Condition: 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.

Recommended Condition: At the time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the Patuxent River Primary Management Preservation Area (PMA) and all woodland conservation areas, except for areas of approved impacts, 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."

(3) The site is subject to the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation Ordinance because the site has an approved Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI/024/07). A Type II tree conservation plan has been submitted and reviewed.

The plan shows the overall property totals 15.44 acres, with no areas of 100-year floodplain on-site. The site is split-zoned with two residential zones (R-18 and R-80), which are correctly reflected in the TCPI worksheet.

The site's woodland conservation threshold (WCT) is 3.09 acres and the woodland conservation requirement is 4.61 acres. The threshold is proposed to be met on-site with 2.59 acres of on-site preservation and 1.27 acres of afforestation/reforestation. The remainder of the requirement is proposed to be met with 0.75 acre of off-site mitigation. The TCPII is in conformance with the approved TCPI.

Some additional revisions are needed to the plans. The plans show preservation areas labeled as "forest conservation." The legend and label for those areas should read "woodland preservation." Also in the legend, add "65dBA Ldn" to the identification for "unmitigated noise contour." The limits of the property are not readable on the plan. Either change the property line symbol or make the property line more visible on the plan.

On Sheets 2 and 3, a 20-foot right-of-way is shown for proposed sewer connections on the southwest side of Health Center Drive. Because these are easements for the sewer lines, and not rights-of-way, each label should read "proposed 20' sewer easement."

On Sheet 3, the label for "Afforestation Area 5" identifies an area where no afforestation is shown. Revise the plan to correctly identify the proposed afforestation area associated with that label.

The on-site afforestation areas have not been provided with the required protective fencing. Revise the TCPII to show the required fencing on the plan and provide the required details.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:

a. Change the label "forest conservation" to "woodland preservation" in the plan and legend where it is applicable.

b. Add "65dBA Ldn" to the identification for "unmitigated noise contour" in the legend.

c. Provide a more visible property line for the site.

d. Correctly label the proposed sewer easements located on the south side of Health Center Drive as "proposed 20-foot sewer easement."

e. Correctly identify afforestation area 5 on the plan.

f. Provide the required protection fencing for the reforestation/afforestation areas and add the required details to the plan.

After these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.

Remand Comments: In a memorandum dated March 29, 2010, the Environmental Planning Section stated that they had reviewed the Order of Remand for the subject project and offered the following environmental review regarding the environmentally-related item (Subpart C) of the Order of Remand, which is reiterated below:

> **The record does not reflect how the applicant will ensure that all residential units have interim noise levels lower than 45 dBA Ldn, or even whether day-night averaging is the appropriate way to measure and evaluate interior noise at this site. Noise mitigation, and justification for allowing noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn, should be considered on remand.**

The proposed development for this site consists of residential uses. For any site with residential or residential type uses, it is standard to measure the average noise levels over a 24-hour period, taking into account that these uses are not limited to specific times of the day, and the fact that at night, people's sensitivity to noise increases.

During the review of the detailed site plan, staff reviewed a Phase II noise study conducted by Henning Associates of Rockville, Maryland. The purpose of the Phase II noise study was to address the necessary mitigation measures to reduce the interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less. The report provided detailed recommendations for materials needed within specific locations of the proposed structures. While these details were not provided in the

staff report, the noise study and the recommended materials were part of the record for this case. The following recommendations below, in bold typeface, were provided by the consultant in the Phase II noise study:

"NOISE MITIGATION MEASURES

"For the apartment rooms where the projected interior roadway noise levels are expected to exceed 45 dBA Ldn, the following exterior building construction noise mitigation measures are recommended to achieve compliance with this Prince George's County interior noise level requirement.

"Building #1 Apartment Units Facing MD Route 197 (Excluding Ground Level Units):

"1. In the living-dining rooms of Apartment Unit B3, install windows with a minimum 28 STC rating. Alternatively, add a storm window on the inside or outside of each window. The storm window should have minimum 3/32 in. thick glass and a minimum 2 inch airspace between the primary window glazing and the storm glazing.

"2. For any apartment unit with a bedroom at the corner of the building where vinyl siding is the exterior wall finish instead of brick veneer, in the exterior walls of the bedroom install RC-1 resilient channels between the studs and the interior gypsum board finish. Alternatively, install bedroom windows with a minimum 30 STC rating, or add a storm window on the inside or outside of each window. The storm window should have minimum 3/32 inch thick glass and a minimum 2 inch airspace between the primary window glazing and the storm glazing.

"Building #2 Apartment Units Facing MD Route 197 (Excluding Ground Level Units):

"1. In the bedrooms of Apartment Unit A1, install windows with a minimum 29 STC rating. Alternatively, add a storm window on the inside or outside of each window. The storm window should have minimum 3/32 in. thick glass and a minimum 2 in. airspace between the primary window glazing and the storm glazing.

"2. In the bedrooms of Apartment Unit B3, install windows with a minimum 28 STC rating. Alternatively, add a storm window on the inside or outside of each window. The storm window should have minimum 3/32 in. thick glass and a minimum 2 in. airspace between the primary window glazing and the storm glazing.

"3. In the living-dining rooms of Apartment Unit B3, install windows with a minimum 30 STC rating. Alternatively, add a storm window on the inside or outside of each window. The storm window should have minimum 3/32 in. thick glass and a minimum 2 in. airspace between the primary window glazing and the storm glazing."

According to the study, the recommended noise mitigation measures for this project consist of storm windows with a minimum of 3/32 inch thick glass at various sound transmission classes (STC) for specific units within the proposed building. As a result of the review of the study, staff recommended the following condition of the original DSP approval (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-62) that requires the final plans to be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Phase II noise study.

2. **Prior to the approval of building permits, certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits, stating that building shells of structures within the prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less and address the noise recommendation of the Phase II noise study submitted with this application.**

Staff further recommends that the DSP be revised to address the specific recommendations in the noise study prior to certification by adding the recommended mitigation measures to the Notes section of the plan.

The final plans will be reviewed for conformance with the above recommendations when the site's building permit is submitted for review.

Recommended Condition: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the DSP shall be revised to add the exterior building construction noise mitigation measures from the Phase II noise study.

Urban Design Comment: The above recommended condition is already reflected in the approving resolution for the project as Condition 1(b)(1).

i. **Prince George's Fire/EMS Department (Fire Department)—**In a memorandum dated March 20, 2008, the Fire/EMS Department offered comment on needed access for fire apparatuses, the design of private streets, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

j. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—**In a memorandum dated February 29, 2008, DPW&T stated that because the project is located in the City of Bowie, it does not impact any county-maintained roadways and coordination should be with the City of Bowie regarding roads and stormwater management, as well.

k. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—** In a memorandum dated April 3, 2008, SHA stated the following:

- the subject property is located on MD 197 (Collington Road), a State owned and maintained six-lane divided arterial road, with a posted speed limit of 45 miles per hour and an annual average daily trip volume at this location of 21,075;
- that access to the development is provided by a 40-foot monumental entrance and one 24-foot full movement access along Health Center Drive requiring a permit for relocation of the existing driveway;
- that they were in support of the trip cap recommendation for the project; and
- that they were working with the applicant to landscape the MD 197 (Collington Road) embankment, located on the northern property boundary, as part of their development requirements.

l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)—**In a memorandum dated March 3, 2008, WSSC stated that a water and sewer extension might be required; that an

on-site plan review package should be submitted, that additional rights-of-way may be required, that public safety concerns may require special considerations and modifications of proposed development near large diameter water transmission pipelines, and that the northwestern corner of Building 1 is shown on the edge of an existing 30-foot right-of-way line for a 30-inch water transmission main and that the proposed building should be at least 25 feet away from the water main. Further, they stated that the applicant should indicate how the proposed buildings will be served by water and sewer.

m. **Verizon—**In an e-mail received February 15, 2008, Verizon stated that a ten-foot public utility easement is needed along MD 197 outside the WSSC sewer right-of-way to Northview Drive, and that on Health Center Drive, several light poles, two street signs and stormdrain end walls need to be removed from the public utility easement. Further, they stated that the public utility easement on Northview Drive should connect to the public utility easement on MD 197. In a later e-mail, dated March 20, 2008, Verizon stated that after further review they determined that because of the WSSC easement along MD 197, they would be able to serve the subdivision from the public utility easement on Northview Drive and that it would be the developer's responsibility to connect to Verizon-provided service at Northview Drive.

n. **Baltimore Gas and Electric (BG&E)—**In comments received February 18, 2008, BG&E had no objections to the Harmony Place Development.

o. **Bowie**—In a letter dated April 9, 2008, the Bowie City Council recommended disapproval of the application because it did not involve senior housing as recommended by the adopted Bowie Area Master Plan, and the requested parking departures had not yet been approved.

Remand Comments: At the time of this writing, staff has not received referral comments on the remand from the City of Bowie. However, in an e-mail dated October 11, 2010, a representative of the City of Bowie stated that the subject case is scheduled to be heard by the Bowie City Council on October 18, 2010, after which they would forward the City's official position letter to the Planning Board.

Urban Design Comment: Copies of the City of Bowie's comments will be transmitted to the Planning Board as additional back-up when they are received and the City of Bowie's comments will be incorporated verbally into staff's presentation.

15. **Order of Remand from the Prince George's County District Council dated October 30, 2008: The Remand Order from the Prince George's County District Council stated that after a review of the administrative record for the project, they remanded the case to the Planning Board for appropriate revisions to the site plan, and for a new review by the Planning Board staff and Planning Board in accordance with the following. Staff has provided each subpart of the Remand Order in underlined bold face type below and followed it with staff comment:**

A. The applicant, staff, and Planning Board have given insufficient attention to recommendations in the text of the Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan, approved in 2006. The Master Plan, approved less than three years ago, after years of staff study, considerable neighborhood and citizen participation and comment, and extended review and comment from the City of Bowie, notes that the subject property is located near, and has easy access to, County health facilities, private

medical offices, regional retail shopping outlets, restaurants and commercial offices, and public transportation. For these reasons, a substantial part of the housing proposed for the property, perhaps a majority of the dwelling units, should be considered for age-restricted occupancy. Applicant and staff should examine this issue and place in the record the reasons why the proposed mix of units is the best, for the housing community on the property and for the neighborhood and the City of Bowie.

Staff Comment: The multifamily dwellings applied for in the subject case are indicated as a permitted use in the R-18 (Multifamily Medium Density Residential) Zone in the residential use table of the Zoning Ordinance. While not a permitted use in the R-80 Zone, that portion of the site is diminutive and contains only tree conservation. It is generally the landowner's right to determine, from the uses permitted, which land use to seek to establish on a given site. The Zoning Ordinance does not require strict conformance to the master plan in this zone, or that the mix of units be the best possible mix for the neighborhood or the City of Bowie. However, as the Community Planning Section stated in their original referral comments on the application, the application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developing Tier, and it conforms to the 2006 Approved Bowie and Vicinity Master Plan as well, especially in its land use recommendation for high-density residential uses. The fact that the site has easy access to county health facilities, private medical offices, regional retail shopping outlets, restaurants and commercial offices, and public transportation makes it an attractive site not only for age-restricted living but for high-density residential use as well, as recommended by the Bowie Sector Plan. The only concern the Community Planning Division expressed in their comments was that the design guidelines specified in the plan be utilized, and it would appear that they have. The master plan's guidance regarding age-restricted housing is permissive rather than mandatory. It states that senior housing should be considered for the site, not that senior housing must be the land use established on the site. In fact, there is evidence that the applicant did consider the project for senior housing. At the original Planning Board hearing, the applicant offered to market the smaller 35-unit building to seniors first then, if they did not sell to seniors, to the general public. In making this offer, the applicant appears to have considered making the entire project senior housing, than making one entire building senior housing. However, considering market demand and the economics of the project, the applicant appears to have decided that, in order to have a successful project, it would be reasonable to market the smaller building to seniors, then, if the apartments did not sell, open it up to a wider market.

B. **The subject property is at an unusual location, with extensive frontage on MD 197, and also on Northview Drive, with US 50 only a short distance away. The property is also oddly shaped, and does not have much depth from MD 197 and Northview, compared to the length of its frontage along those major roadways. The District Council finds from the record that vehicular access to and from Health Center Drive should be reevaluated, along with the pedestrian and bicycle circulation system on and adjacent to the property, to ensure that motor vehicle access to and circulation within the property promotes pedestrian and bicycle use of surrounding roads and walkways, and also public transportation uses. The record is not clear, also, as to the relation among the proposed parking reductions, the mix of housing types, and the justification for providing fewer on-site parking spaces.**

Staff Comment: In its original comments on the case, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site plan as shown is acceptable. In a subsequent memorandum, dated May 6, 2010, the Transportation Planning Section stated that, based on staff's review of the application both as a preliminary plan of subdivision and as a detailed site plan, the proposed application is acceptable regarding vehicular access and internal circulation. The Transportation Planning Section suggested that comment be sought from the trails planning staff regarding pedestrian and bicycle usage (See Finding 14.f.) and from the City of Bowie (See Finding 14.o.) regarding the requested parking departures. The trails planning staff is recommending approval subject to conditions which have been included in the Recommendation section of this staff report. Though the City of Bowie originally recommended disapproval of the project because inter alia the requested parking departures had not yet been approved, their comments on the remand are delayed by the City Council schedule which does not include a meeting until October 18, 2010. The City of Bowie has sole jurisdiction over the evaluation of the requested parking departures.

C. The record does not reflect how the applicant will ensure that all residential units have interior noise levels lower than 45 dBA Ldn, or even whether day-night averaging is the appropriate way to measure and evaluate interior noise at this site. Noise mitigation, and justification for allowing noise levels of 45 dBA Ldn, should be considered on remand.

Staff Comment: In a memorandum dated March 29, 2010, the Environmental Planning Section stated that the proposed development of this site consists of residential uses and that for any site with uses of this type, it is standard to measure the average noise levels over a 24-hour period, taking into account that the uses are not limited to specific times of the day, and the fact that at night, people's sensitivity to noise increases. Further, they stated that, in their initial review of the detailed site plan, they reviewed a Phase II noise study conducted by Henning Associates of Rockville, Maryland that was prepared for the purpose of addressing necessary mitigation measures to reduce the interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less. The report provided detailed recommendations for materials needed within specific locations of the proposed structures. More specifically, the noise mitigation measures for this project consist of storm windows with a minimum of 3/32 inch thick glass at various sound transmission classes (STC) for specific units within the proposed building. Further, the approval of the project included the following condition that required final plans be revised to reflect the recommendations of the Phase I noise study regarding noise mitigation measures including construction requirements and final plans will be reviewed for conformance to this condition when the site's building permit is submitted for review.

Approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066 (PGCPB Resolution No. 08-62)

Condition 2. Prior to approval of building permits, certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permits, stating that building shells of structures within the prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less and address the noise recommendation of the Phase II noise study submitted with this application.

D. The recommendations from the professional staff and the City Council of the City of Bowie should be revised and updated. As the District Council understands it, Bowie staff did not present significant objections to the proposed vehicle access and

circulation systems, the pedestrian and bicycle circulation, interior noise levels in units near MD 197, and the mix of conventional and age-restricted housing units in the development project, but the City Council identified these issues as worthy of further consideration.

Staff Comment: At the time of the original hearing on the case, in a letter dated April 9, 2008, the Bowie City Council recommended disapproval of the application. Their stated reasons for the recommendation of disapproval of the project was that it did not include senior housing as recommended by the Bowie Area Master Plan and because the requested parking departures had not yet been approved. At that time, Bowie did not posit objections based on the proposed vehicle access and circulation systems, the pedestrian and bicycle circulation, or interior noise levels in units near MD 197.

At the time of this writing, staff has not received referral comments on the remand from the City of Bowie. However, in an email dated October 11, 2010, a representative of the City of Bowie stated that the subject case is scheduled to be heard by the Bowie City Council on October 18, 2010. The representative indicated that after such time, they would forward the City's official position letter directly to the Planning Board.

E. **A major purpose of detailed site plans, particularly for new residential projects of 80 or more units, is to allow Planning Board and District Council to review architectural elevations. The District Council and the City Council of Bowie have both had concerns, since before approval of the master plan in 2006, to upgrade the quality of architectural façades in new projects. This property is clearly visible to all Bowie residents, is immediately adjacent to the Bowie Towne Center, and is situated just off US 50 (John Hanson Highway) and US 301, which carry substantial loads of interstate traffic to and from Annapolis, Baltimore, and Washington, D.C. The Planning Board and staff should reexamine the quality of architectural design, architectural façades, project amenities, and provide comments on upgrades to architectural design and amenities not already available in the areas.**

Staff Comment: Amenities for the project, as originally proposed by the applicant, included outdoor standard and children's pools, a 930-square-foot exercise room and a 270-square-foot aerobics room, a day care center, a clubroom, a media center, a library, a conference room, and a "cyber café." Condition 12 of the Planning Board's approval additionally required a 200 to 400-square-foot passive recreational area, a tot lot at least 2,400 square feet in size, a preteen play area at least 5,000 square feet in size, and a trail connection to be provided on the site.

The pools, exercise and aerobics rooms, passive recreation area, tot lot, pre-teen lot, and trail connection, all considered recreational facilities, were evaluated, met, and exceeded the minimum expected expenditure on recreational facilities as calculated by use of a standard formula which takes into account the type of unit and the average household size in the planning area.

Additionally, the recreational offerings both originally proposed and conditioned together met the test normally used to evaluate the appropriateness of recreational facilities including convenient location of some facilities to all residents, a mix of active and passive facilities, and facilities appropriate for all age groups.

The day care room, clubroom, media center, library, conference room, and cyber café are considered amenities, normally not considered recreational facilities, and undoubtedly would add to the expense and enhance the quality offered by the development to its residents. Additional recreational offerings for the project could more easily be accommodated within the building, because of limited space on the balance of the site, potentially by eliminating a unit. Suggested enhancements of the amenities/recreational package could include an expanded library/media center that includes a computer lab, card tables, and/or an interior play area or "ball room" offering additional recreational facilities for younger children on rainy days. A recommended condition below would provide these additional recreational facilities/amenities to the development.

With respect to the architecture offered for the project, as originally noted, it is generally pleasing. The architecture is harmonious between the two buildings, with the larger building having well-massed forms and a varied mix of architectural materials. Fenestration is varied and presents a pleasing rhythm across the façades, with white shutters and lighter-color brick banding utilized on the first story to create additional visual interest on the pedestrian level of the building. A jagged footprint of the larger building gives the building a feeling of movement in its visual presentation.

From the outset, however, staff was concerned about the arrangement and relative amounts of varying architectural materials on the major portion of the buildings and the Planning Board conditioned the use of additional brick. More specifically, in accordance with Staff's Architectural Exhibit No. 1, the applicant was required to extend the brick upwards to the eaves where usually projecting sections of the façade have a different, most often pedimented, roofline on multiple indicated elevations. In addition, three highly-visible façades visible from the pool area were required to be architecturally enhanced, and the trash building and the detached garages were required to be sheathed entirely in brick. The applicant has submitted revised elevations which indicate some of the additional required brick, but not the enhanced treatment in the pool area.

After review of these proffered elevations and taking direction from Subpart E of the Order of Remand to upgrade the quality of the architectural façades, it is clear that better design would result from the sensitive application of additional brick and the elimination of the use of vinyl siding for the project. Thus, staff has recommended in proposed Condition 1(b)19 that the Georgian color brick, utilized on the first story be extended upwards to the eaves where indicated. In addition, it is recommended that the applicant further revise the architecture to replace all vinyl siding with "Rose, Full Range"-colored brick.

Staff recommends the above enhancements to the recreational facilities and amenities package and the proposed architecture in accordance with the guidance of Remand Order Subpart E.

F. All persons who wish to become persons of record on remand should be permitted to do so.

Staff Comment: Staff responsible for processing persons of record have been made aware that the District Council, in their Remand Order, has specified that persons who wish to become listed should be permitted to do so. A review of the current persons of record list, however, indicates that, as of this writing, no one has availed themselves of this opportunity, with the last person of record having been listed on April 17, 2008, the date of the Planning Board hearing on the subject application.

16. As required by Section 27-285 (b), the detailed site plan represents 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

Based upon the preceding evaluation, the Urban Design Section recommends that the Planning Board adopt the revised findings of this report and REAPPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-07066 for Harmony Place and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/021/08, subject to the conditions below. (The conditions below are those adopted by the Planning Board in PGCPB Resolution No. 08-60 with new language to be added **bold and underlined.**)

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall revise plans for the project as follows and/or submit the required documentation:

   a. The TCPII shall be revised as follows:

      (1) Change the label "forest conservation" to "woodland preservation" in the plan and legend where it is applicable.

      (2) Provide a more visible property line for the site.

      (3) Correctly label the proposed sewer easements located on the south side of Health Center Drive as "proposed 20-foot sewer easement."

      (4) Correctly identify afforestation area 5 on the plan.

      (5) Provide the required protection fencing for the reforestation/afforestation areas and add the required details to the plan.

      (6) Provide a section of chain-link fence along the area where the exterior stairs on the western end of the building bring that section of the building within ten feet of the woodland conservation area. A detail for the chain-link fence shall be included and a symbol indicating it must be added to the plans.

      (7) Locations and details for the additional signage to explain the purpose and maintenance of the bio-retention areas and the afforestation areas shall be added to the plans.

      (8) The TCPII shall locate the unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour with a corresponding symbol in plan's legend.

      (9) After these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it.

b. The detailed site plan shall be revised and additional documentation shall be submitted as follows:

(1) The detailed site plan shall reflect the recommendations of the Phase II noise study with regard to the inclusion of a description of the construction materials needed to mitigate noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less in the interiors of all residential units on the detailed site plan.

(2) A six-foot-wide trail or sidewalk connection from the subject site to the existing master plan trail along Northview Drive shall be indicated on the detailed site plan as per the illustration provided by the trails coordinator. Design and placement of such crosswalk shall be approved by the trails coordinator and Urban Design Section as designees of the Planning Board.

(3) Provide crosswalks across all roadways crossed by the six-foot-wide internal sidewalk connection between Building 1 and Building 2. The design and exact location of such crosswalks shall be approved by the trails coordinator and the Urban Design Section as designees of the Planning Board.

(4) A parking ratio shall be provided in the parking schedule.

(5) The clubhouse uses shall be broken down by use and the parking requirements shall be expressed per use in the parking schedule.

(6) Split zoning line shall be clearly indicated throughout the plans for the project.

(7) The applicant shall provide the top and bottom elevations on all retaining walls.

(8) Details regarding gates and all fencing shall be provided, including heights on the plans.

(9) The height of the garage shall be included on the plans.

(10) The applicant shall provide to staff a writing from DPW&T stating that they have reviewed the plans for the project and found that the findings and recommendations contained in the submitted final subsurface evaluation have been duly incorporated into the plans for the project.

(11) The applicant shall submit to staff written confirmation from a representative of the City of Bowie that the design of the subject project conforms to approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 01-0807-0807-13, approved by the City of Bowie on August 24, 2007.

(12) The applicant shall incorporate a 200-400-square-foot passive recreational area, a tot lot measuring at least 2,400 square feet and a preteen play area measuring a*[s]***t** least 5,000 square feet into the design of the project to be located in the area adjacent to the southeastern and southwestern sides of the parking lot for Building #2 as indicated by cross hatching on Staff's Exhibit #1, currently slated for afforestation. The TCPII shall be revised to include any afforestation area displaced by the above in the calculation of off-site afforestation. Such recreational amenities shall be well coordinated with the natural features and the

trail connection to be provided on the site. Final design of said amenities shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board, and a note shall be added to the plans that all recreational facilities shall be designed in accordance with the standards outlined in the *Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines*, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and applicable safety standards.

(13) The detail provided for lighting fixtures shall be replaced with one of full cut-off design. Final design choice for light fixtures shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

(14) The three "Directional Signs" included in plans for the project shall be deleted.

(15) Applicant shall include color elevation drawings with materials labeled for the following plan details:

- entrance gate detail
- bench
- pergola
- pool fence
- bench on the plans

Such details shall be reviewed and approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

(16) Bottom and top elevations of the retaining walls shall be included on the plans.

(17) Color elevations for the garage and trash buildings and the dumpster enclosure with materials labeled shall be included on the plans. Sheathing material for these accessory buildings shall be exclusively Cushwa/Georgian brick except for necessary detail, trim or doors which may be constructed of other materials. Final design of and material choices for these structures shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board. All garage doors shall be carriage style and the height of all structures shall be dimensioned on the plans.

(18) All proposed sidewalks and trails shall be clearly shown on the plans.

(19) As shown on Staff's architectural Exhibit No. 1, (which will be presented at the Planning Board hearing), the applicant shall revise the architecture such that brick, **specified as "Georgian" color, like that utilized on the first story,** will extend upwards to the eaves where (usually) projecting sections of a façade have a different, especially a pedimented, roofline, notably, Elevations #1, 2, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14**,** 15**,** and 16 of Building 1, Elevations 8, 9, 10 and 11 of Building #2. Additionally, in case of highly visible facades, notably 2, 7 and 12 of Building #1 that are visible from the pool area, applicant shall provide an enhanced treatment of those facades. **In addition, the applicant shall revise the architecture to replace all material labeled as "vinyl siding" on the architectural elevations with brick, specified as "Rose, Full Range," except on the above specified sections of the building, where the brick shall be "Georgian" color.** The trash building and the detached garages shall be sheathed entirely in brick, except for

necessary detail. Final design of the architecture shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

(20) **Revise the width of the sidewalk along Health Center Drive from five to six feet in width (or to a width consistent with the existing sidewalk along the frontage of the adjacent Fire Station), unless modified by the City of Bowie.**

(22) **Provide a marked crosswalk and extend the median to serve as a pedestrian refuge along the internal sidewalk (between Buildings 1 and 2) at the subject site's main access point in accordance with staff's exhibit.**

(23) **Provide a marked crosswalk along Health Center Drive at the subject site's western access point in accordance with staff's exhibit.**

(24) **Provide a marked crosswalk along the internal road at the access point to the parking area west of Building 2 in accordance with staff's exhibit.**

(25) **Provide six-foot-wide sidewalks along both sides of the western access road to the subject site, unless modified by the City of Bowie in accordance with staff's exhibit.**

(26) **Provide a marked crosswalk along the internal road at the ingress/egress of the north side of the parking garage (see marked in red on the attached plan).**

(27) **A note shall be added to the plans that private security personnel shall be provided on-site 24-hours a day, 7 days a week.**

(28) **The plans for the project shall be revised to convert a single unit into recreational/amenity space, expanding the library/media center to include a computer lab with six computers for common use and card tables, and/or an interior play area including play equipment, a "ball room" (common in many fast food venues), or other facilities that would offer additional recreational facilities for younger children on rainy days. Final design of said recreational/amenity space shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.**

2. Prior to the approval of building permits, 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 and address the noise recommendations of the Phase II noise study submitted with this application.

3. Prior to the issuance of any permits that 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.

4. At the time of final plat, a conservation easement shall be described by bearings and distances. The conservation easement shall contain the Patuxent River Primary Management Preservation Area and all woodland conservation areas, except for areas of approved impacts, 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."

5. If the requested departures are not received from the City of Bowie, construction of the project shall proceed in accordance with the Applicant's Exhibit Elevation Drawing for Building #1, reflecting an alternative design that would provide the additional required 144 parking spaces within its structured parking.