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-09028

Application	**General Data**	
Project Name: M Square, University of Maryland Research Park	Planning Board Hearing Date:	03/08/12
	Staff Report Date:	02/29/12
Location: East side of River Road, approximately 2,700 feet west of Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201).	Date Accepted:	02/02/10
	Planning Board Action Limit:	Waived
	Plan Acreage:	13.43
Applicant/Address: M Square Associates, LLC 8601 Robert Fulton Drive Columbia, MD 21046	Zone:	I-3 & T-D-O-Z
	Dwelling Units:	N/A
	Gross Floor Area:	610,500 sq. ft.
	Planning Area:	66
	Tier:	Developed
	Council District:	03
	Election District	21
	Municipality:	Town of Riverdale Park College Park
	200-Scale Base Map:	208NE4&5

Purpose of Application	**Notice Dates**	
450,000 square feet of office space and a three-story, 160,500-square-foot parking garage in three phases.	Informational Mailing:	09/11/09
	Acceptance Mailing:	02/01/10
	Sign Posting Deadline:	02/07/12

Staff Recommendation	**Staff Reviewer:** Meika Fields **Phone Number:** 301-780-2458 **E-mail:** Meika.Fields@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-09028
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-006-06/04
M Square, University of Maryland Research Park

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

EVALUATION

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

a. The requirements of the 1997*Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* (TDDP);

b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance including: the College Park Airport Aviation Policy Area, APA 6; the Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone; and the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ);

c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89228 and Record Plat 76 @ REP 210;

d. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual;*

e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance; and

f. Referrals.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The proposed detailed site plan (DSP) is for 450,000 square feet of office space and a three-story, 160,500-square-foot parking garage in three phases.

The subject property is owned by the State of Maryland, and is part of M Square, University of Maryland Research Park. M Square, LLC is a public-private partnership between Corporate

Office Properties Trust and the University of Maryland. M Square is envisioned as a research park that includes office and research space for startup companies and larger technology clients. The park's location serves to physically and programmatically link university researchers, students, and staff with federal laboratories and private sector companies. The subject detailed site plan will offer three additional office buildings to the research park of 150,000 square feet each. No specific tenants for the office space have been named at this time.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	Existing	**Proposed**
Zone	I-3/TDOZ	I-3/TDOZ
Total Site Area	13.43 acres	13.43 acres
Total Building Gross Floor Area	0 sq. ft.	450,000 sq. ft. 160,500 sq. ft. (Garage)
Floor Area Ratio (FAR)	0	0.77
Building Coverage	0%	22%
Green Area	100%	44%
Impervious Area	0%*	56%

**There appears to be one driveway of negligible size on the existing site*.

3. **Location:** The property is located on the east side of River Road, approximately 2,700 feet west of Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201) in the City of College Park and the Town of Riverdale Park.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The property is surrounded on the north by the office of the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Center for Food Safety, and the Center for the Advanced Study of Languages (CASL). To the east is property on which offices for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) have recently been constructed. To the south is land occupied by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Across River Road to the west is the American Center for Physics (ACP).

5. **Previous Approvals**: The subject property, comprised of Lot 15 (3.85 acres), Lot 16 (5.84 acres), and Lot 17 (3.73 acres), is a portion of the land area previously subdivided through Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89228, which was adopted by the Planning Board on January 9, 1992 for the development of two million square feet of office space on 134.4 acres. The Planning Board's action for Preliminary Plan 4-89228 is contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 90-42(C)(A). Lots 15 through 17 are depicted on a final plat of subdivision entitled "Riverside," which was recorded among the Land Records of Prince George's County at Plat Book REP 213 Plat No. 69 on July 6, 2006.

6. **M Square Area History:** Prior to the adoption of the College Park TDOZ, the subject property was part of a historically industrial area near the College Park Airport. In 1981, the area was zoned I-1 (Light Industrial) and I-2 (Heavy Industrial). During the processing of a sectional map amendment initiated by The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), the subject property was part of a larger 130-acre tract owned by ACP Industries, a New Jersey corporation. The owner sought to retain the I-1 and I-2 zoning in order to develop a controlled industrial park. As a result, the owner entered a Declaration of Covenants with the Town of Riverdale (now Town of Riverdale Park) in order to establish certain development guidelines. These guidelines included a limitation on certain uses as well as the establishment of minimum setbacks.

In 1989, the original 130 acres were the subject of a preliminary plan of subdivision known as Riverside which was filed by the then owner, Marlborough C.L., Inc. The property was divided into several lots intended for future industrial development consistent with the Declaration of Covenants. During the processing of the preliminary plan, the Town of Riverdale raised concerns about the future development of the land. As a result, an amendment to Declaration of Covenants was adopted in 1990. These amended covenants established a development cap consistent with a condition imposed on the subdivision and also amended certain other provisions of the covenants. Pursuant to the subdivision, and in accordance with the covenants, the American Center for Physics, the USDA facility, and a data processing center for Riggs Bank were constructed. The remaining properties in the Riverside Subdivision, including the subject property, were platted.

In October, 1997, the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) was adopted. The Riverside Subdivision is included within the boundaries of the TDOZ. In addition to establishing the TDOZ, the underlying zoning of the subject property was changed from I-1 and I-2 to I-3. The TDOZ established Transit District Development Plan standards, as well as a use list to govern future development of the impacted properties.

Since the approval of the College Park-Riverdale TDOZ, four detailed site plans have been approved in the Riverside Subdivision. These applications include: Detailed Site Plan DSP-05078 (5850 University Research Court) contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-47, which was adopted by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006; Detailed Site Plan DSP-05079 (5825 University Research Court) contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-46, which was adopted by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006; Detailed Site Plan DSP-05080 (5801 University Research Court) contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-45, which was adopted by the Planning Board on March 2, 2006; and the NOAA facility, Detailed Site Plan DSP-06026 (5830 University Research Court) contained in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-233, which was adopted by the Planning Board on November 9, 2006. Buildings have been constructed at 5850 and 5825 University Research Court. The building at 5850 University Research Court was constructed as a secure government facility and is occupied by the Intelligence Advanced Research Project Activity (IARPA). The NOAA building is also substantially complete.

7. **Design Features:** The applicant is proposing a phased development of three, five-story, 150,000-square-foot office buildings and a four-story structured parking garage. The office building proposed in Phase I is identified as 4600 River Road. The second office building proposed in Phase II is identified as 4400 River Road, and the final office building proposed in Phase III is identified as 4500 River Road. The parking garage is proposed in the third and final phase of the development. The first two office buildings are designed to front River Road and the third office building is set back behind them, as a visual terminus to the central driveway. Site access is provided at three driveway entrances on River Road with full turning movements at the central driveway and right-in/right-out only access at the north and south ends of the property.

Each office building is constructed primarily of pre-cast concrete panels with aluminum window systems, glass entry canopies, and exterior insulation finishing system (EIFS) screening for roof-mounted building mechanical equipment. The parking garage structure is comprised of pre-cast concrete panels. During site plan review, the applicant revised the architecture to provide a more clearly defined base, middle, and top for each building, and to more clearly delineate the main building entrances. Staff additionally recommends that that applicant provide additional architectural detailing at the ground level of the office buildings, particularly facing River Road. The proposal is located in a transit district where pedestrian activity is encouraged. The ground level of each office building should therefore provide a high degree of architectural detailing to

enhance the pedestrian experience. Pedestrian amenities, such as site furnishings, near major entrances to the buildings are also encouraged. Information regarding the materials, textures, and/or finishes employed at the ground level of the proposed office buildings should be provided in order to ensure that visual interest is provided at the pedestrian scale of the transit district.

The applicant has submitted an exhibit (Applicant Exhibit 1) that modifies the detailed site plan proposal. With the support of the Town of Riverdale Park and the City of College Park, the applicant proposes to shift the proposed building at 4400 River Road approximately 21 feet to the north and the proposed building at 4600 River Road approximately 34 feet to the south to provide additional area between the main entrance driveway and the buildings to accommodate pedestrian plazas. While staff supports this concept, additional detail regarding the pedestrian plazas should be provided, and the building façades facing the newly created plaza areas should be improved to provide more visual interest. Elements that encourage visual interest include change in color, material, texture, and plane, in addition to details around windows and entrances. In addition, staff recommends that the darker gray material proposed at the ground level of the 4400 and 4600 River Road (currently shown as precast concrete panel) is designed to include the building façades that face the central driveway and newly proposed pedestrian spaces.

Additional modifications are necessary to accomplish the concept presented in Applicant Exhibit 1. This concept shifts the entrance located north of 4400 River Road approximately 35 feet to the north and the entrance south of 4600 River Road approximately 60 feet to the south, removes all parking spaces within 40 feet of River Road, and removes the pedestrian plazas from the triangular islands along the north and south sides of 4500 River Road.

The building elevations should be revised to include some general locations/areas for future building-mounted signs, such as tenant signage and office building numbers. A common signage plan is required for review for sites within the Transit District Overlay Zone. Staff recommends that some basic sign standards for building-mounted signs be presented at this time so that signs clearly within the approved design parameters may be approved by the Urban Design Section, as a designee of the Planning Board, in the future.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

8. **The 1997 Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (TDDP):** The 1997 Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (TDDP) defines long-range land use and development policies, detailed zoning changes, design standards, and a Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) for approximately 293 acres of land east of the College Park-University of Maryland Metro Station. The land use concept of the TDDP divides the district into two general areas based on a ten-minute walking distance from the College Park-University of Maryland Metro Station for the purpose of examining issues and opportunities and formulating recommendations. The area within the ten-minute walking distance is the northern area, which has been envisioned as an urban town center, and the area beyond the ten-minute walking distance is the southern area, which has been envisioned as a suburban campus. Each area has been further divided into land parcels for the purpose of defining the desired land use types, mixes, and character of development.

The subject site is Parcel 10 in the southern area of TDDP. The specific urban design concept for the southern area is that the buildings should relate to the streetscape and/or other buildings to create a suburban campus. The TDDP prescribes district-wide development requirements and

guidelines for the entire district and parcel-specific standards applicable to each parcel. The design guidelines and standards are also categorized into mandatory development requirements and guidelines and criteria for development.

a. In accordance with Section 27-548.08(c)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance, the applicant may ask the Planning Board to apply development standards that differ from mandatory requirements in the TDDP, unless the plan provides otherwise. The Zoning Ordinance specifically states that the board may amend any mandatory requirements except building height restrictions and parking standards, requirements which can only be amended by the District Council under procedures in Part 10A, Division 1. The Planning Board may amend parking provisions concerning the dimensions, layout, or design of parking spaces or parking lots.

   In approving the TDDP, the Planning Board must find that the mandatory requirements, as amended, will benefit the proposed development and the transit district and will not substantially impair implementation of the transit district plan, and the Planning Board must find that the site plan meets all mandatory requirements that apply.

   If approved with conditions, the subject application will conform to all of the recommendations and requirements except for those from which the applicant has requested an amendment. In areas where staff is recommending that the amendment be approved, staff believes that the granting of the amendment will not substantially impair implementation of the transit district plan.

b. The applicant requests amendments of the following design standards:

   S-3: River Road Section B (p.67).

   The streetscape design for River Road, Section B, shall be indicated in Figure 3.

   Figure 3 depicts a road section that includes an existing road width of 64 feet, a 10-foot-wide planting strip, an 8-foot-wide sidewalk, and a recommended 20-foot minimum building setback and 30-foot-maximum building setback from the existing edge of curb.

   S-231: Front Building Setback (p. 153).

   River Road
   20 feet minimum from the existing face of curb of River Road.
   30 feet maximum from the existing face of curb of River Road if cafes, plazas or courtyards are provided.

   Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to the above requirements of S-3 and S-231:

   "The TDDP establishes a streetscape design for Section B of River Road which is depicted on Figure 3, found on page 68. This design depicts the existing road width of 64 feet, and then envisions a 10-foot-wide tree lawn, an 8-foot-wide sidewalk, with a minimum building setback of 20 feet and a maximum setback of 30 feet from the existing edge of curb. If complied with, this would require the building to be constructed 12–22 feet behind the existing face of curb. River Road was constructed prior to the adoption of

the TDDP. Currently, within the existing 82-foot right-of-way, is a 4-foot-wide landscape strip and a 4-foot sidewalk. The properties to the north and the south of the subject property are not built to the streetscape shown in the TDDP, and the ACP property across River Road does not conform to the streetscape. Constructing the required streetscape would not match with the existing improvements within the public right-of-way. Further, the Declaration of Covenants establish a minimum building setback of 40 feet from any street. Thus the TDDP streetscape standards are in conflict with the Declaration of Covenants that govern the subject property and which the applicant is obligated to conform with. Finally, PEPCO has expressed concerns about the ability to provide utility service if the buildings are required to be constructed as close to the right-of-way as proposed by the TDDP.

"As a result of these conflicts with both the existing streetscape improvements and the Declaration of Covenants, the Planning Board modified the streetscape requirements of the TDDP when it approved DSP-05080. Specifically, the building was approved with a setback of 42 feet from the right-of-way of River Road, and 42 feet from the right-of-way of University Research Court. A ten-foot public utility easement exists within this 40-foot setback adjacent to the right-of-way line. Thus, the proposed building is approximately 51 feet from the existing face of curb on both streets. The original site plan filed by the applicant in this case depicted a 32-foot building setback from the right-of-way of River Road. However, this setback does not conform to the Declaration of Covenants. As a result, the applicant has amended its submission and is now proposing the same setback as was approved in DSP-05080. The building is proposed to be 40 feet from the right of way at its closest point.

"In response to comments received, the applicant has revised the detailed site plan to increase the width of the sidewalk along the property frontage to 8 feet. As now proposed, a tree lawn of 10 feet from the face of curb and a sidewalk of 8 feet, as shown in Section B for River Road (Figure 3), are provided. However, the building is still setback a minimum of 20 feet from the sidewalk in order to conform with the setbacks required by the Covenants. A waiver of S-3 will still be required to allow the larger building setback."

Comment: Urban Design staff is in partial agreement with the applicant's justification. In the previous approval for DSP-05080, the Planning Board did approve relief from the required maximum building setback along River Road from 30 feet to 40 feet, subject to the provision of a courtyard on the southern side of that building (along River Road). In this case, for the proposed maximum 48-foot building setback, the Urban Design Section recommends that an enhanced entrance treatment be provided at the main entrances of the two office buildings (Buildings 4400 and 4600) that front River Road. The area between the sidewalk and building entrance should be attractively designed to include special paving, seating, a focal point (such as art), and attractive landscaping and shade trees. Details of these features, including that of a decorative low wall, should be provided. With the provision of the above-described enhancements to these pedestrian spaces, it may be concluded that the requested amendments for S-3 and S-231 regarding building setback requirements will benefit the proposed development and will not substantially impair the implementation of the TDDP.

In consideration of future transit planning, such as the Purple Line transit system, eight-foot-wide sidewalks are the minimum necessary to support pedestrian needs along River Road. The submitted plans have been revised to provide a minimum 10-foot-wide

planting strip and an eight-foot-wide sidewalk to conform to TDDP standards. No further amendments of streetscape standards S-3 and S-231 are necessary.

***Note**: Prior to publishing the staff report, the applicant submitted a revised amendment request to standards S-3 and S-231. Due to the late date the request was submitted, staff is unable to provide further comment at this time. The request is attached, see Attachment A.

S-24: Pedestrian Access and Circulation (p.76).

The streetscape shall be continued to neighboring properties.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"As indicated previously, the proposed streetscape in the TDDP does not conform with the streetscape on neighboring properties and conflicts with the covenants that apply to the subject property. The applicant has no authority to go onto neighboring properties in order to conform or tie the streetscape on the neighboring properties to the subject property. Thus, the sidewalk will be transitioned from the existing four feet in width on the adjacent properties to the 8 foot width on the subject property."

Comment: The plan shows an eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the property frontage and, except for a very short segment (less than 100 feet in length), the sidewalk proposed on the subject property is almost the same as the existing sidewalk to the north of the subject site. The applicant is proposing to keep this short segment as transition area, which would mean the eight-foot-wide sidewalk would narrow to four feet and transition back to eight feet. Although this segment is located just to the north of subject site, staff recommends that the applicant work with the neighboring property owner, utility companies, and the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) to widen the existing sidewalk along this short segment to eight feet wide.

The applicant should revise the site plan to show a widening of the four-foot-wide segment of sidewalk north of the subject property (contingent upon obtaining all necessary approvals), and work with the neighboring property owner and DPW&T to provide a more continuous streetscape. Even though staff recommends that the site plan be revised to provide a more continuous street treatment, a waiver of S-24 should be approved in the event the applicant is unable to implement the off-site improvements.

S-29: Pedestrian Access and Circulation (p. 77).

New trails should be designed as indicated in Figure 16 that are not part of the streetscape on River Road and Paint Branch Parkway.

Figure 16 depicts a 10-foot-wide trail with minimum 3-foot-wide planting strips on either side of the trail.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The TDDP states that trail sections constructed within the Sector Plan should comply

with the Trail Section shown in Figure 16. Figure 16 depicts a 10-foot-wide trail. All of the trail sections which have been approved and built within the Riverside Subdivision, including trail sections approved by the Planning Board subsequent to the adoption of the TDDP, have been 8 feet wide. The applicant proposes to continue these trail across the subject property. As a result, the applicant is requesting a waiver of S-29 to permit 8-foot-wide trails consistent with the existing trails in the area."

Comment: The Urban Design staff supports the applicant's amendment request, and believes that eight-foot-wide trails are consistent with what has been constructed in the transit district.

S-59: Parking Lots (p. 82).

Connect parking lots between neighboring parcels by driveways.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The TDDP recommends that parking lots between neighboring parcels be connected by driveways. Lots 15, 16 and 17 which comprise the subject property will all have interconnected driveways. However, the applicant cannot connect to parking lots on properties which adjoin the subject property. The property to the north abutting Lot 17 was developed prior to the adoption of the TDDP and does not have a parking lot which abuts the subject property. The properties are also separated by an environmental feature. The property to the east is the NOAA building. NOAA is a secure facility and provides a parking garage on the opposite side of the building from the subject property. The detailed site plan approved by the Planning Board for NOAA precludes the connection recommended by the TDDP. The property to the south, USDA, also was developed prior to the adoption of the TDDP. While a parking lot does abut the southern boundary of both Lots 15 and 16, no provision was made to allow for interconnection between the sites, and the applicant cannot be forced to connect. Thus, a waiver of this requirement is requested."

Comment: Staff recommends that the submitted site plan show a stub driveway connection, preferably as an extension of a two-way parking driveway aisle from the subject property, preferably along the Lot 16 boundary line with Lots 15 and 17, to the southeastern property line with TDDP Parcel 11. This stub connection could serve important safety and access especially for emergency vehicles, or if deemed necessary by the College Park-Riverdale Transportation Demand Management Authority, when it is created for TDDP inter-parcel connections**.**

S-60: Parking Lots (p. 82).

Encourage the use of on-street parallel parking; and if road capacity is not sufficient, adjust the curb location so travel is not impeded.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The TDDP encourages on-street parking. However, the Department of Public Works and Transportation discourages on-street parking on River Road. Although this is not a

matter which is in control of the applicant, a waiver of this requirement is requested."

Comment: The Urban Design staff supports the applicant's amendment request.

S-178: Parking and Loading (p.124).

On-street, parallel parking shall be provided on all roads during the nonpeak periods. On-street parking improves the pedestrian environment in that it helps to slow down traffic, protect pedestrians on the sidewalk from moving cars, eases street crossings (because of the reduced number of travel lanes) and softens the perception of the street.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"These requirements encourage the Department of Public Works and Transportation to permit on-street parallel parking on River Road during off-peak hours. DPW&T will not permit on-street parking for operational and safety reasons. If necessary, the applicant requests a waiver of these requirements."

Comment: The Urban Design staff supports the applicant's amendment request.

S-188: Parking and Loading (p. 126).

The maximum standard and compact parking stall dimensions shall be 8 ½ feet by 18 ½ feet and 8 feet by 17 feet respectively.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The TDDP establishes maximum standard and compact parking space sizes. Standard spaces are to be dimensioned at 8.5 feet by 18.5 feet, while compact spaces are to be dimensioned at 8 feet by 17 feet. The detailed site plan proposes standard space dimensions of 9 feet by 18 feet and compact space dimensions of 8 feet by 16 feet. The requested modification of the dimensions is nominal."

Comment: The Urban Design staff supports the applicant's amendment request.

S-33: Access (p. 153).

There shall be a maximum of one curb cut via Haig Drive and River Road at the existing median break.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The subject property includes three record lots. The configuration of the lots was established to allow for the primary access point to align with a median break on River Road. Lot 16 has the shape of a flag lot, and the stem of this flag lot is the main entrance drive and exit from the proposed three building complex. This median break will allow southbound vehicles on River Road to turn left into the project and for vehicles exiting

the site to turn left onto southbound River Road. The detailed site plan proposes that Lots 15 and 17 to have a right-in/right-out access point to facilitate the movement of vehicles to and from the site. The purpose of this limited point of access is provide an alternative to forcing all traffic to the site from a singular driveway entrance. S-33 states that ‘ there shall be a maximum of one curb cut via Haig Drive and River Road at the existing median break.’ The applicant requests a waiver to allow these two limited movement points of access.

“There are several factors which support a waiver of this requirement. First, a literal interpretation of S-33 is that the only point of access for ‘ Parcel 10’ on River Road is at Haiig Drive. Haiig Drive is located on the south side of River Road across from University Research Court. At the time the Sector Plan was adopted, the only lot which had been platted and developed along this stretch of River Road was the USDA building. The property identified in the Sector Plan as Parcel 10, which extends around the USDA site, had not yet been platted. The Sector Plan envisioned the possibility that a road would extend through Parcel 10 which would extend from Haiig Drive to the curb cut on River Road adjacent to the subject property. However, the owner at the time was not required to provide a roadway through the property. Rather, University Research Court was platted as a cul-de-sac opposite Haiig Drive and today provides access to Lots 10, 12, 13, 14 and 18. The detailed site plan approved for the NOAA property prohibits the extension of a vehicular connection between the subject property and University Research Court. Thus, it is impossible to limit access to Parcel 10 (as depicted in the Sector Plan) to only one curb cut. The clear intent, however, is to limit the points of vehicular access while still providing for safe vehicular and pedestrian movements to and within the properties. The detailed site plan achieves this objective. The main access to the subject property is through a shared driveway which will provide the primary access point at the existing median break on River Road. No new median break is proposed. However, the volume of traffic generated by 450,000 square feet will require additional options for ingress and egress to promote vehicle safety and on-site circulation. Further, Lots 15, 16 and 17 are each record lots which are required to provide frontage on and access to a public street. This Zoning Ordinance requirement conflicts with the interpretation that S-33 prohibits even limited access points for Lots 15 and 17.

“The applicant submits that the two proposed limited access curb cuts have no adverse impact on pedestrian safety. In fact, the proposed site plan enhances pedestrian safety. The applicant is proposing a trail connection along River Road prior to any of the proposed limited access curb cuts. Pedestrians coming from or going to the Metro station from any other property within further away from the Metro than the subject property can either stay on the west side of River Road and not cross these curb cuts, or can cross River Road and utilize the trail to get to the NOAA building, USDA building or University Research Court. The only pedestrians which will walk across either of these curb cuts are those walking to the buildings on the subject property, and then only the northernmost curb cut. Forcing all access out of the main entrance will only increase pedestrian/vehicular conflicts within the site, as all delivery vehicles as well as all passenger vehicles will be forced to gain ingress and egress at this single point. With a right-in/right-out entrance serving lots 15 and 17, delivery vehicles will be able to access the loading areas with minimal disruption of pedestrians internal to the site. Further, if a public road had been constructed through Parcel 10 as was envisioned at one time, this road would have had at least two, if not more, full movement curb cuts to provide vehicular access to buildings constructed on either side of this road. Thus, by placing three buildings with shared parking on these three lots, and limiting the turning

movements at the proposes points of access to lots 15 and 17, the applicant has reduced pedestrian conflicts internal to the site, and reduced pedestrian conflicts over that which would have existing under the plan envisioned by the TDDP which is no longer possible. For these reasons, the applicant requests a waiver from S-33 to permit the proposed limited movement access points."

Comment: Staff supports the amendment request. The amendment will not substantially impair the implementation of the TDDP or safe pedestrian movements along River Road. The applicant proposes clearly marked pedestrian crossings at each point of access.

S-240: Internal Road Circulation (p. 154).

An internal road network should be created that is pedestrian friendly and minimizes views of parking lots while maintaining direct pedestrian access from the building to the road without crossing parking lots or driveways. This internal road network may provide vehicular and pedestrian access between the two existing median breaks along River Road and Haig Drive to the north of the Rivertech Court.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"As indicated above, the Sector Plan envisioned the possibility that a road would extend through Parcel 10 which would extend from Haig Drive to the curb cut on River Road adjacent to the subject property. However, the owner at the time was not required to provide a roadway through the property. Rather, University Research Court was platted as a cul-de-sac opposite Haig Drive and today provides access to Lots 10, 12, 13, 14 and 18. The detailed site plan approved for the NOAA property prohibits the extension of a vehicular connection between the subject property and University Research Court. Prior Planning Board actions prevent implementation of this requirement. Therefore, a waiver is requested."

Comment: Staff supports the amendment request. The applicant has no ability to create an internal road network at this time.

c. The applicant requests amendment of the following environmental standards:

S-66: Screening and Buffering (p. 83).

Add additional landscaping comprised of native plant materials in buffers adjacent to natural areas such as streams, wetlands and woodlands.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-66 recommends that additional landscaping be added to buffers…[T]he floodplain is 100% wooded and only the disturbance necessary to construct the trail and stormdrain line is proposed and no additional landscaping is feasible."

Comment: Staff recommends approval of the request. The riparian area of the site is located adjacent to the stream and functions to minimize flooding and erosion by keeping

the stream banks stabilized, slowing water flow, and allowing some stormwater to naturally infiltrate into the ground. The Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) and DSP propose to preserve the existing woodland within the riparian area of the site, and additional plantings are not necessary.

S-135: Stormwater Management (p. 100).

Riparian reforestation within the transit district should be considered a priority for woodland mitigation measures.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-135 addresses riparian woodland reforestation within the transit district, and relates to Map 13 which depicts woodland adjacent to the manmade channel. The subject property is subject to a previously approved TCP for which a fee in lieu was already paid, for Lot 13, Block ' C' . As indicated above, some limited clearing associated with the construction of the trail is proposed. To the extent that a waiver of this requirement is necessary to implement the applicant's plan, a waiver is requested."

Comment: This requirement has been addressed. No waiver is necessary. The riparian area of the site is located adjacent to the stream and functions to minimize flooding and erosion by keeping the stream banks stabilized, slowing water flow, and allowing some stormwater to naturally infiltrate into the ground. The TCPII and DSP propose to preserve the existing woodland within the riparian area of the site.

S-137: Stormwater Management (p. 100)

Permanent structures should not be located within 25 feet of the stream buffer area.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-137 states that permanent structures should not be located within 25 feet of the stream buffer area. The applicant assumes that this requirement relates to the Northwest Branch stream buffer area, not the floodplain buffer adjacent to the subject property. As such, this requirement does not appear to be applicable to the DSP. However, since there are references to this channel as a stream in some maps on the TDDP, the staff has indicated that a waiver is necessary and therefore a waiver is requested. This issue is addressed with regard to the impact of constructing the trail, a permanent structure, adjacent to and partially within the floodplain easement and buffer."

Comment: Staff supports this request. The stream buffer area, also the riparian area, is the 50-foot-wide area adjacent to the stream. The plan does propose a trail within 25 feet of the stream buffer area; however, this area was previously graded in accordance with previous approvals for the site. The applicant has requested a waiver from this requirement to allow for the trail and outfall. The proposed trail crossing and connection are in accordance with the TDDP standards. The outfall is necessary to convey stormwater safely to the stream.

S-138: Buffer Impacts

The number of buffer impacts should be minimized to maintain an unbroken corridor of riparian forest. Crossings should occur at direct angles rather than oblique angles to avoid more clearing of the buffer area.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-138 states that the number of buffer impacts should be minimized. The applicant submits that the revised plan minimizes buffer impacts to the maximum extent possible and believes that this requirement is satisfied."

Comment: As it currently exists, the riparian forest on this site is continuous and unbroken. The applicant has requested an amendment to this requirement for a trail crossing, trail connection, and stormwater outfall necessary to convey stormwater to the adjacent stream. The buffer has been preserved to the extent possible by relocating the trail to the perimeter of the existing buffer. Staff supports this request.

S-140: Woodland Conservation (p. 102).

Wooded 100-year floodplains shall remain as preservation areas.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-140 requires that wooded 100-year floodplain remain as preservation area. As depicted on the detailed site plan, the only proposed disturbance to the floodplain is to improve and extend an existing storm drain outfall, to extend the trail which was constructed on the NOAA site and to depict a future trail connection to the north contemplated by the TDDP to increase pedestrian connectivity. A waiver is requested for these limited disturbances."

Comment: Staff recommends that the waiver be approved for these limited disturbances.

S-142: Woodland Conservation (p. 102)

Preservation of existing trees is the highest priority of woodland conservation within the transit district, followed by on-site afforestation/reforestation. Afforestation or reforestation can occur off-site but it must be within the limits of the transit district area. There shall be no fee-in-lieu option.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"This requirement states that on-site tree preservation is the highest priority and that no fee-in-lieu option should be available. However, the subject property is subject to a tree conservation plan approved prior to the TDDP and a fee-in-lieu has already been paid. Furthermore, a grading permit was approved and issued under Permit No. 16418-2004."

Comment: The site was approved for the use of fee-in-lieu to meet part of the woodland conservation requirement under previous approvals for this application. The site was

cleared under a rough grading permit that included the entire M-Square site, which also included four other parcels. The previous approvals were subject to a fee-in-lieu for the clearing of woodland on the overall site. The revised TCPII for this application proposes a very minimal amount of clearing for the trail and outfall. The existing woodland has been given the highest priority for conservation. Staff believes the application complies with the above requirement and a waiver is not necessary.

S-147: Woodland Conservation (p. 103).

Preservation, reforestation and afforestation along stream buffers should be considered as a first priority for conservation areas.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-147 states that tree preservation along stream buffers should be considered a first priority. The 50 foot buffer from the floodplain is being partially cleared and graded to comply with the pedestrian/commuter pathway which is to be constructed adjacent to the floodplain. As with S-137, since the buffer required by the TDDP is referenced as a floodplain buffer, not a stream buffer, it appears that this requirement may not be applicable. However, a waiver is requested nonetheless in the event that this is deemed applicable for the reasons set forth herein related to disturbance of the floodplain buffer."

Comment: Staff recommends that the waiver be approved for the reasons stated above.

S-149: Woodland Conservation (p. 103).

All reasonable efforts should be made to preserve those specimen and historic trees identified. Justification must be provided in the event that preservation will not occur.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-149 states that all efforts should be made to preserve specimen trees. In this case, a single specimen tree located along the edge of the floodplain buffer will be impacted as part of the installation of the pedestrian/commuter pathway. The tree is currently in fair condition, and will likely not survive even if it is not immediately required to be removed. The applicant requests a waiver to allow this tree to be removed in the event it is determined in the field during installation that it cannot be retained."

Comment: The plan proposes to remove one specimen tree, a 37-inch white oak in fair condition, for the construction of the trail as required by the TDDP. Staff recommends that the waiver be approved.

S-233: Floodplain Buffer (p. 153).

A minimum 50-foot buffer from the 100-year floodplain shall be provided. Preservation of existing trees and afforestation within this buffer are preferred rather than reforestation. The area of woodland conservation required that is not met with the 50-foot buffer will be determined at time of Detailed Site Plan.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"S-233 provides for the establishment of the 50 foot buffer from the 100-year floodplain. Preservation of existing trees is preferred rather than reforestation. The TDDP also depicts a trail along the buffer. The proposed trail is now being constructed predominantly outside the buffer and the only disturbance of the buffer is the minimum necessary to construct the trail. The applicant believes that the appropriate balance between pedestrian connectivity and tree preservation has been struck with the revised plan."

Comment: The 50-foot-wide 100-year floodplain buffer is shown on the TCPII; however it is not shown on the DSP. The DSP and TCPII propose to remove a limited portion of the woodland within the floodplain buffer along the southern perimeter for placement of a trail. A request to amend this requirement to allow for the construction of the trail has been submitted. Staff supports this request.

Prior to certification of the DSP, the DSP and landscape plan should be revised to show the 50-foot 100-year floodplain buffer.

S-234: Parcel 10 (p. 154)

Conservation of additional woodland can be used for other transit district woodland conservation requirements in accordance with District-wide Mandatory Requirement S-142.

Applicant's Justification: The applicant provided the following justification in response to this requirement:

"The Sector Plan suggests that additional woodland conservation on Parcel 10 could be used for other transit district woodland conservation requirements. The subject property is included in a previously approved TCP for which a fee-in-lieu was approved and already paid. To date, this property has met the tree conservation requirements as the approved plan indicates. Other than what has been previously preserved, there are no other opportunities for on-site conservation, as the subject property is substantially graded. Should it be determined that a waiver from this requirement is necessary, such waiver is requested."

Comment: No waiver from the above standard is necessary. The woodland conservation requirement has been met on the subject site and on other parts of the site in accordance with the current approved TCPII. The woodland conservation on this site is part of the overall requirement for the entire M Square site.

d. The applicant is not requesting amendments from the following design standards, and staff believes the following standards can be met in full with design modifications or through the submission of additional information, or as otherwise discussed below:

P8: No development within the 100-year floodplain shall be permitted without the express written consent of the Prince George's County Department of Environmental Resources.

Comment: With regard to P8, the development proposed in the 100-year floodplain is for a stormwater outfall, a pedestrian trail crossing, and a trail connection. The disturbance for the stormwater outfall is necessary to safely convey stormwater to the unnamed tributary. The trail crossing and connection are consistent with the parcel-specific goals of the TDDP.

Review for conformance with the floodplain ordinance is now under the jurisdiction of the DPW&T and will be reviewed in conjunction with the stormwater management requirements.

P-12: Any new development shall provide for water quality and quantity control in accordance with all Federal, State and County regulations. Bioretention or other innovative water quantity or quality methods are strongly encouraged where deemed appropriate.

Comment: Copies of the stormwater management concept approval letter for each lot were submitted; however, the associated plans were not. The letter states that stormceptors are required on Lots 15 and 17, and bioretention and infiltration are required on Lot 16. The only stormwater management feature shown on the current plans is a piped system. There do not appear to be any areas of bioretention or other forms of environmental site design proposed on the plans. The approved concept plan for each lot is necessary to determine if the stormwater management system shown on the DSP and TCPII is consistent with what was approved on the concept plan.

Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, copies of the stormwater management concept approval plan for each lot should be submitted. The concept should address bioretention and other innovative water quantity and quality control methods to the maximum extent practicable. The approved concepts should be shown consistently on all associated plans.

S-133: All new stormdrain inlets associated with the development of this Transit District shall be stenciled with the words "Do Not Dump, Chesapeake Bay Drainage." Detailed Site Plans and sediment and erosion control plans shall have notation regarding storm drain stenciling.

Comment: Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, the DSP should be revised to include notes and a detail regarding the stenciling of storm drain inlets with "Do Not Dump—Chesapeake Bay Drainage."

P-15: Parking ratios for each land use type in the transit district shall not exceed the levels presented in Table 11. This parking ratio shall apply to existing and proposed development in the northern and southern areas. In addition, for Parcels 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11, the total parking provided shall not exceed levels established by the Planning Board as a part of the approval of Riverside Subdivision.

P:16 The appropriate parking ratios for each parcel shall be determined based on the parcel's distance to the Metro Station. If a parcel lies within two walking rings, shown on Map 19, an average of the two parking factors shall be the maximum parking ratio for any development within that parcel.

Comment: The site plan complies with standards P-15 and P-16.

Parking Required

Parking ratios are outlined in Table 11 of the *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* (TDDP). Destinations within closer walking proximity to the College Park Metro Station are required to have less parking. The TDDP states that, if a parcel lies within two walking rings, an average of the two parking factors shall be the maximum parking ratio for any development within that parcel (P-16). The subject site is located within two walking rings, Ring 2 and Ring 3.

Parking ratio (3+2)/2 = 2.5 spaces per 1,000 GSF

Phase One (150,000 GSF)

Parking spaces required per TDDP: *(2.5 spaces per 1,000 GSF)*	375
Parking spaces provided:	563
Total ADA spaces required per Zoning Ordinance:	8
Total ADA spaces provided:	10
ADA van spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1 of 4 ADA spaces)*	2
ADA van spaces provided:	4
Loading spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1+ each additional 100,000 sq. ft. of GFA (or fraction) per office building)*	2
Loading Spaces Provided:	2

Phase Two (300,000 GSF)

Parking spaces required per TDDP: *(2.5 spaces per 1,000 GSF)*	750
Parking spaces provided:	869
Total ADA spaces required per Zoning Ordinance:	15
Total ADA spaces provided:	20
ADA van spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1 of 4 ADA spaces)*	4
ADA van spaces provided:	8
Loading spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1+ each additional 100,000 sq. ft. of GFA (or fraction) per office building)*	4
Loading Spaces Provided:	4

Phase Three (450,000 GSF)

Parking spaces required per TDDP: *(2.5 spaces per 1,000 GSF)*	1,125
Parking spaces provided:	1,114
Total ADA spaces required per Zoning Ordinance:	23
Total ADA spaces provided:	38
ADA van spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1 of 4 ADA spaces)*	6
ADA van spaces provided:	12
Loading spaces required per Zoning Ordinance: *(1+ each additional 100,000 sq. ft. of GFA (or fraction) per office building)*	6
Loading Spaces Provided:	6

Upon full build-out, the parking facilities proposed will fully conform to the Transit District Development Plan's recommendations. Temporary interim parking as part of a phasing plan should not require a waiver of the parking ratios.

9. **Zoning Ordinance:** The subject site plan has been reviewed for conformance with the applicable requirements of the Zoning Ordinance including the College Park Airport Aviation Policy Area, APA 6; the Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone; and the Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). The following discussion is offered regarding these requirements.

a. **Transit District Overlay Zone Submission Requirements**
The subject site is located in a TDOZ. In addition to the information required by Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance for detailed site plans, additional information is required on plans in the T-D-O Zone per Section 27-548(b)(1), Contents. The subject site plan is substantially in conformance with this section; however, as required by the ordinance, the applicant should also provide the following information:

Section 27-548(b)(1)

(I) A development schedule indicating the approximate dates when construction can be expected to begin and to be completed.

Comment: Staff understands that tenants for the office buildings have not been determined at this time. Construction commencement dates have not been provided. A more complete description of the project timeline, to the extent that the applicant has a timeline, should be verbally presented to the Planning Board for its consideration.

b. **Transit District Overlay Zone Required Findings**

Section 27-548.08(c)(1)

The findings required by Section 27-285(b) shall not apply to the T-D-O Zone.

Instead, the following findings shall be made by the Planning Board when approving a Detailed Site Plan in the T-D-O Zone:

(A) The transit district site plan is in strict conformance with any mandatory development requirements of the transit district development plan.

Comment: The detailed site plan is in conformance with all applicable mandatory development requirements of the TDDP.

(B) The transit district site plan is consistent with, and reflects the development guidelines and criteria contained in the transit district development plan.

Comment: The subject site plan is also consistent with, and reflects most of the development guidelines and criteria contained in the TDDP. For those requirements that cannot be met, the applicant has requested an amendment from the Planning Board in accordance with Section 27-548.08(c)(2) of the Zoning Ordinance. See Finding 8 above for a detailed discussion on the amendment of standards and requirements.

(C) The Transit District Site Plan meets all of the requirements of the transit district development plan, and applicable regulations of the underlying zone.

Comment: With the conditions in the Recommendation section and approval of the requested amendments, the DSP will meet this requirement.

(D) The location, size and design of buildings, signs, other structures, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation systems, and parking and loading areas maximize safety and efficiency, and are adequate to meet the purposes of the Transit District Overlay Zone.

Comment: The detailed site plan, if amended with the conditions in the Recommendation section, will be in compliance with this requirement. The building and parking locations, open spaces, landscaping, pedestrian and vehicular circulation on-site, and the loading areas as shown meet the design intent and vision of the TDDP for a suburban campus and are designed to maximize safety and efficiency.

(E) Each structure and use, in the manner proposed, is compatible with other structures and uses in the transit district and with existing and proposed adjacent development.

Comment: The detailed site plan meets this requirement. The proposed office buildings are compatible with other existing office buildings in the transit district, as modified with the conditions proposed.

c. **College Park Airport Aviation Policy Area 6**

This application is located under the traffic pattern for a small general aviation airport (College Park Airport). This area is subject to Aviation Policy Area regulations adopted by County Council Bill CB-51-2002 (DR-2) as Sections 27-548.32 through 27-548.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. Specifically, the subject property is located in Aviation Policy Area (APA) 6. The APA regulations contain additional height requirements in Section 27-548.42 and purchaser notification requirements for property sales in Section 27-548.43 that are relevant to evaluation of this application. The applicable

regulations regarding APA 6 are as follows:

Section 27-548.42. Height requirements

(a) Except as necessary and incidental to airport operations, no building, structure, or natural feature shall be constructed, altered, maintained, or allowed to grow so as to project or otherwise penetrate the airspace surfaces defined by Federal Aviation Regulation Part 77 or the Code of Maryland, COMAR 11.03.05, Obstruction of Air Navigation.

(b) In APA-4 and APA-6, no building permit may be approved for a structure higher than fifty (50) feet unless the applicant demonstrates compliance with FAR Part 77.

Comment: District-wide Development Requirements and Guidelines of the TDDP for the College Park-Riverdale TDOZ P4 and P5 have a specific maximum height for the entire transit district. The maximum building height varies per parcel. In Parcel 10, which is located further south of the College Park Airport, the maximum building height is 84 feet.

The three five-story office buildings are indicated to have a height of 84 feet, and the four-story parking garage is indicated to have a height of 55 feet. Both the office buildings and parking garage are within the height limit of the TDDP, yet additionally require compliance with Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77. The application has been forwarded to the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) for review regarding FAR Part 77 and comment. Prior to signature approval of the DSP, the applicant should provide evidence that the proposed project complies with FAR Part 77. If the MAA indicates an obstruction or issue with the site plan prior to plan certification, then the site plan should be revised at the time of certification to reduce or eliminate any perceived obstruction identified by MAA.

Section 27-548.43(b)(2). Notification of airport environment

(b) Every zoning, subdivision, and site plan application that requires approval by the Planning Board, Zoning Hearing Examiner, or District Council for a property located partially or completely within an Aviation Policy Area shall be subject to the following conditions:

(2) Developments without a homeowners' association: A disclosure clause shall be placed on final plats and deeds for all properties that notifies prospective purchasers that the property has been identified as within approximately one mile of a general aviation airport. The disclosure clause shall include the cautionary language from the General Aviation Airport Environment Disclosure Notice.

Comment: The required disclosure clause should be placed on a prominent location on the detailed site plan, such as the coversheet, and on the minor record plat, once filed.

d. **Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone Regulations**

Section 27-548.04. Relationship to other zones

The Transit District Overlay Zone shall be placed over other zones on the Zoning Map, and shall modify specific requirements of those underlying zones. Only those requirements of the underlying zones specifically noted in this Subdivision and elsewhere in this Subtitle are modified. All other requirements of the underlying zones are unaffected by the Transit District Overlay Zone. The Transit District Overlay Zone may not be placed over the Urban Center or Corridor Node Zones (UC).

Comment: Only those requirements of the underlying zones specifically noted in this subdivision and elsewhere in this subtitle are modified. All other requirements of the underlying zones are unaffected by the Transit District Overlay Zone. The proposed detailed site plan meets the purposes of the I-3 Zone. The main purposes of the I-3 Zone, as referenced in Section 27-471(a)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, are to provide increased and enhanced employment opportunities for the residents of the county; provide a mix of industrial, research, and office uses; minimize detrimental effects on uses of adjacent land; assure the compatibility of proposed land uses with surrounding land uses; maximize open space so as to create a park-like setting; and improve the overall quality of industrial/employment areas in Prince George's County.

The DSP revision has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of Section 27-474, Regulations of the I-3 (Planned Industrial/Employment Park) Zone.

I-3 ZONE REGULATIONS	Required	Provided
Setbacks (Minimum in feet)(including parking/loading)		
From street: All except Freeway/Parkway	30*	10
From adjoining land in any nonresidential zone:		
all yards	20	20
Building Coverage (Maximum % of net lot area)	45	22.39
Green area (Minimum % of net lot area)	25	43.76

This regulation marked with an asterisk is modified by a TDOZ standard.

Comment: The subject plan conforms to the requirements of the I-3 Zone with the exception of the requirement that buildings and parking be set back 30 feet from streets. The submitted site plan shows an area of parking approximately 10 feet from the River Road right-of-way. This I-3 standard is similar to TDOZ standard S-51, which requires that a 40-foot-wide landscape buffer be provided between the sidewalk and new parking lots. Staff recommends that the applicant provide a landscape buffer in accordance with standard S-51 of the TDOZ, which will place the site in conformance with the I-3 setback requirement. Revisions conditioned with Applicant Exhibit 1 will place the site in conformance with standard S-51 and the requirements of the I-3 Zone.

e. **Signage in the Planned Industrial/Employment Park (I-3) Zone**

Sections 27-613 and 27-614 provide detailed regulations regarding the square footage of signage that may be approved in the 1-3 Zone, whereas the TDOZ focuses on the design or appearance of signage.

The detailed site plan includes details for three ground-mounted freestanding signs and no building-mounted signs. If building-mounted signs are proposed, the area of those

signs should not exceed the provisions of the I-3 Zone, and the design of the signs should fully conform to the TDOZ standards.

10. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-89228:** Review of this detailed site plan is subject to the current approved Preliminary Plan, 4-89228 (PGCPB Resolution No. 90-42(C)(A)), adopted by the Planning Board on January 9, 1992, which included the subject property. The preliminary plan is known as the Riverside Subdivision and contains 134.4 acres. Lots 15–17, Block C are a part of the larger subdivision.

The resolution of approval (PGCPB No. 90-42(C)(A)) contains 23 conditions. The following conditions relate to the review of this detailed site plan. Comments have been provided where appropriate:

3. Development of the total site shall be limited to the equivalent of two million square feet of office space. Phase I will contain the equivalent of 705,448 square feet of office space and Phase II will contain the equivalent of 1,294,552 square feet of office space. Phase I shall contain the 470,448 square feet allocated in Final Plat 5-91250 (Phase IA), plus an additional 235,000 square feet allocated in Final Plat 5-91259 (Phase IB).

Comment: As of this writing, there is a total of 1,803,795 square feet of office building that either has been constructed or allocated by various record plats, of which 235,000 square feet are assigned to undeveloped TDOZ Parcel 9, subsequently recorded as Riverside Lots1–4, Block B. These four undeveloped lots are also owned or controlled by the University of Maryland and/or a partnership that owns or controls the subject property (Lots 15–17). The subject application is proposing 450,000 square feet of office development (to be constructed in three phases), which would result in total development within Riverside exceeding the established development cap of 2,000,000 square feet by 253,795 square feet, if all allocated and approved square footage in Riverdale were also constructed. To address this, the applicant is proffering to transfer the entire unbuilt development square footage assigned to TDDP Parcel 9 to the subject site. The Prince George's County Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Planning Department concurs with this approach, provided the transfer of the 235,000 square feet of office development is done by filing a new record plat for TDDP Parcel 9 (Lots 1–4, Block B) pursuant to Section 24-108(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, and prior to issuance of any building permit for the second proposed building. Provided that no building permit has been issued for Lot 18 and prior to issuance of any building permit for the third proposed building, the applicant shall submit a revised site plan and record plat pursuant to Section 24-108(a) for Lot 18 to cap development on Lot 18 at no more than 56,205 square feet in lieu of the 75,000-square-foot building approved under DSP-05080, unless the site plan is no longer valid, as DSP-05080 is scheduled to expire on January 1, 2013. In lieu of submittal of a new site plan and record plat for Lot 18 and until such time as the said development cap is relaxed, the applicant may propose any other acceptable means to demonstrate that the total approved and assigned development levels in the Riverside Subdivision do not exceed the approved level of 2,000,000 square feet.

12. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, a Detailed Site Plan for each lot shall be approved by the Planning Board. This plan shall address, but not be limited to, the following:

a. Orientation of building on lots and architectural features;
b. Tree preservation areas and supplemental plantings;
c. Landscaping and streetscaping techniques; and
d. Parking and loading.

Comment: The above condition is addressed with the subject application.

16. The total inbound AM peak hour traffic of the subdivision shall be limited to 720 vehicle trips for Phase IA, 360 vehicle trips for Phase IB, and 1980 vehicle trips for Phase II, equaling a total site limitation of 3,060 vehicle trips.

Comment: While the applicant will be required to comply with this condition at the time of building permit for each phase, the stated trip cap is for the full build-out of the Riverside Subdivision. As of this writing, only 1,218,816 square feet of office space (ACP: 120,478; USDA: 337,428; Riggs: 156,360; UMD Research Park Buildings 1–3: 315,000; and NOAA: 289,550) has either been constructed or is approved for construction. Approval of the subject project as proposed would increase the total square footage of approved or constructed office buildings in the Riverside Subdivision to 1,668,816 square feet, which is well below the ultimate development cap, and in turn the trip cap associated with the full build-out.

17. The total on-site parking for the entire development of this subdivision shall be limited to 1,400 spaces for Phase IA, 700 spaces for Phase IB, and 3,850 spaces for Phase II, equaling a total of 5,950 spaces for the entire site.

Comment: Including the 700 parking spaces assigned and allocated to TDDP Parcel 9, or Riverside Lots 1–4, Block B, the total unallocated parking in the Riverside Subdivision is 844 spaces. This project proposes to construct 1,114 (570 structure and 544 surface) parking spaces for the proposed 450,000 gross-square-foot office development, resulting in total parking supply that exceeds the established parking cap by as much as 270 spaces. Similar to the proposed transfer of assigned development from TDDP Parcel 9, the applicant has proffered to transfer 270 assigned and allocated parking spaces by filing a new record plat from TDDP Parcel 9 to the subject property (Lots 15–17) pursuant to Section 24-108(a) of the Subdivision Regulations, in order to fully comply with the established parking cap, as noted above, and for the Riverside Subdivision. The Subdivision Review Section indicates that the detailed site plan is in substantial conformance with the preliminary plan of subdivision, and that the reallocation of parking within Riverside does not require a reconsideration of the preliminary plan or conditions of approval. The reallocation of parking capacities may occur through plat revisions only.

18. Prior to the issuance of any building permits, the following road improvements shall be constructed or fully bonded for construction by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, or be fully funded in the CIP or CTP (and/or in combination with others). The bonding requirement may also be satisfied by a binding financial agreement which is acceptable to the appropriate governmental agency:

PHASE I

- **US 1 at Campus Drive/Calvert Road Relocated**

- **Provision of a new, second right-turn lane on the westbound Calvert Road approach to US 1 (Phase IA).**

- **Calvert Road Relocated at 50th Avenue**

- **Provision of an exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound Calvert Road approach to 50th Avenue (Phase IB).**

- **MD 201 at Good Luck Road/Calvert Road**

- **Provision of a new, second left-turn lane on the southbound MD 201 approach to Good Luck Road (Phase IA).**

- **Provision of a third through lane on northbound MD 201, not to exceed 2,000 feet beyond the intersection (including the reconstruction of the northbound right- turn lane) (Phase IB).**

- **MD 201 at River Road/Tuckerman Street**

- **Provision of an exclusive right-turn lane on the southbound MD 201 approach to River Road (Phase IA).**

- **Provision of an exclusive left-turn lane on the northbound MD 201 approach to River Road (Phase IA).**

- **Provision of an exclusive left-turn lane, a shared left/through lane and an exclusive right-turn lane on the eastbound River Road approach to MD 201 (Phase IA).**

- **River Road/50th Avenue**

- **Provision of a continuous, largely divided, 4-lane major collector facility within a nominal 82-foot right-of-way between MD 201 and Calvert Road Relocated (Phase IA).**

PHASE II

- **Calvert Road Relocated at 50th Avenue**

- **Provision of a new, second left-turn lane on the northbound 50th Avenue approach to Calvert Road Relocated.**

- **Provision of a new, second right-turn lane on the eastbound Calvert Road Relocated approach to 50th Avenue.**

- **Provision of a new, second left-turn lane on the westbound Calvert Road Relocated approach to 50th Avenue.**

- **MD 201 at Good Luck Road/Calvert Road**

- **Provision of a new, third left-turn lane on the eastbound Calvert Road approach to MD 201.**

- **MD 201 at River Road/Tuckerman Street**

- **Provision of a new, second right-turn lane on the southbound MD 201 approach to River Road.**

- **Provision of a new, second left-turn lane on the northbound MD 201 approach to River Road.**

- **Provision of an acceleration lane on southbound MD 201 for the eastbound River Road right-turn movement.**

MD 201

Provision of a full and continuous six-lane highway section from south of River Road/Tuckerman Street through the Pontiac Street/West Chester Park Drive intersection with reconstruction of all displaced auxiliary turn lanes (except the northbound MD 201 right-turn movement at Tuckerman Street).

The above improvements may require minor modifications when mutually agreed upon by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission staff and appropriate implementing agencies (State Highway Administration (SHA) and/or the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)). Required lengths of auxiliary turn lanes and discontinuous through lanes shall be determined by SHA and/or DPW&T. Any necessary adjustments to signing, marking and/or signalization required by the above improvements, as required by SHA and/or DPW&T, shall be the responsibility of the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns (or in combination with others).

The phasing allocations beyond Phase I, outlined in Conditions 3, 16, 17 and 18 may be modified if mutually agreed upon by the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, The M-NCPPC Planning Department and implementing agencies (SHA and/or DPW&T). However, in no situation would the total development level, vehicle trip cap, parking space cap, or transportation improvements be affected.

Comment: Prior to issuance of the building permit application for the NOAA building (Riverside Lot 14), the applicant was required to submit necessary information that demonstrated full conformance to the requirements of this condition. While the applicant is required to comply with this condition at the time of building permit, the submitted plans include copies of three surety bonds on behalf of Corporate Development Services, LLC, and in favor of State of Maryland Department of Transportation (Bond No.: 929390262 for $1,763,750.00, Bond No.: 929463037 for $1,580,565.00, and Bond No.: 929463036 for $1,647,360.00), for a total amount of $5,000,000 that has been deemed by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) as needed for construction of all required improvements outlined by this condition. Although these bond amounts provide full financial assurance for all required off-site improvements required by this condition, the applicant has again proffered to make adjustments to these bond amounts as deemed appropriate on future detailed review by SHA.

19. At the completion and opening of the College Park Metro Station, the applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall provide the following shuttle service from 11:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. from the proposed subdivision to the College Park DBD via

50th Street and Calvert Road with a stop at the Metro station. This condition may be satisfied through an extension of the University of Maryland shuttle service to the subject site with operating hours which include the above-stated hours.

Comment: In addition to bus service provided by Prince George's County's The Bus, The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority's (WMATA) Metrobus and an existing Shuttle-UM bus provides service for employees and visitors to the Transit District and UM Research Park. The information provided by the applicant shows that the existing UM service, the River Road M Square shuttle, provides service to the College Park Metro Station, ACP, Raytheon, FDA sites, USDA, and the University Research Park (including the NOAA building) with less than 15 minute headways with stops at the Baltimore Avenue (US 1)/Paint Branch Parkway intersection (a northern gateway to College Park) and UM campus.

20. The applicant, his heirs, successors and/or assigns, shall establish a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan to reduce the number of peak hour single-occupant vehicle trips generated by the subdivision after 500,000 square feet of space is occupied. The plan shall include the following:

a. A full-time, on-site commute program manager. His or her duties shall include:

- **marketing and registration of a matching program for employees;**
- **coordinating the formulation of car/van pools;**
- **promoting the use of public transit;**
- **monitoring and reporting the progress of TDM:**
- **promoting staggered work hours;**
- **designated preferential parking spaces for car pools and van pools; and**
- **coordinating with local transit agencies.**

22. The applicant shall submit annual monitoring reports to the Transportation and Public Facilities Planning Division to determine the AM inbound vehicle arrival rate and the successful progress of the TDM plan. The first monitoring report shall be submitted after 85% occupancy is achieved for the first building constructed. The last monitoring report shall be submitted three years after the last building permit has been issued or upon achieving 80% occupancy for the last building.

Comment: The main purpose of Conditions 20 and 22 is to implement measures at each building site, and prior to the establishment of the Transportation Demand Management (TDM) District as outlined by the TDDP, that will reduce the number of peak hour single-occupant vehicle trips to and from each site. Prior to issuance of any building permit for the site, and since more than 500,000 square feet of office space is already occupied in Riverside, the applicant will be required to provide a specific Transportation Demand Management Plan to the Transportation Planning Section and DPW&T for review and approval. The plan should be similar to the site-specific TDM plans prepared and submitted with the building permit applications for the UM

Research Park buildings and the NOAA building, which fully outline the on-site TDM strategies and annual reporting details showing the extent of each measure's effectiveness.

Future of the Riverside Subdivision: As is indicated in the details of this technical staff report, the development capacity of the Riverside Subdivision is nearly exhausted, with the exception of square footage allocated to the American Center for Physics site. While the subject application has been reviewed using this preliminary plan approval, it is unlikely that future development intensities envisioned within the transit district can be realized without a new preliminary plan approval and further restructuring of the *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone.*

11. ***Prince George's County Landscape Manual:*** The site plan is subject to Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual). The following discussion is offered:

    a. Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscaped Strips along Streets, specifies that for all nonresidential uses in any zone and for all parking lots, a landscape strip shall be provided on the property abutting all public and private streets. For sites located within a development district overlay zone (DDOZ) with a required build-to-line, the Landscape Manual provides flexibility from the landscape standard. Since the applicant does not propose to build to the recommended building setback, a landscape strip in accordance with Section 4.2 should be provided. The width of the required landscape strip may vary, and be reduced in areas where the building or required pedestrian amenities, such as entry plazas, abut the street. The landscape plan indicates the required amount of shade trees and the substitution of additional ornamental trees for some of the required shrubs, which will benefit the proposed development. The submitted DSP meets the Section 4.2 requirement along River Road.

    b. Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements, requires that parking lots over 7,000 square feet provide planting islands throughout the parking lot to reduce the impervious area. When these planting islands are planted with shade trees, heat island effect created by large expanses of pavement may be reduced. The landscape plan indicates conformance with Section 4.3 and the proposed areas of interior green are integrated with a network of walkways in order to provide safe and attractive pedestrian connectivity through the parking lot to the office buildings.

    c. Section 4.4, Screening Requirements, requires that all dumpsters, loading spaces, and mechanical areas be screened from adjoining existing residential uses, land in any residential zone, and constructed public streets. The plan proposes walls to screen loading and dumpster areas. The applicant should provide a detail that shows the appearance of the wall used to screen the dumpster and loading areas. The screen walls should have architectural interest as well as some continuity with the building façade. The final design should be approved by the Urban Design Section, as designee of the Planning Board.

    d. The site is subject to Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, which requires that a percentage of the proposed plant materials be native plants. The submitted plan indicates conformance with this section.

12. **Prince George's County Woodland Conservation and Tree Preservation Ordinance:** This

site is subject to the provisions of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance because it has previously approved tree conservation plans (TCPI-09-90, TCPII-073-06, and TCPII-006-06). A revised Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) has been submitted.

According to the TCPII worksheet, the overall site, which includes the subject site, has a woodland conservation threshold of 6.62 acres and a total requirement of 18.01 acres. The revised TCPII proposes to meet the requirement with 3.01 acres of on-site preservation and 14.70 acres of fee-in-lieu. The TCPII and DSP propose to preserve most of the 50-foot-wide stream buffer and the 50-foot-wide100-year floodplain buffer. The tree conservation plan is in conformance with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

Additional technical revisions should be required prior to signature approval. The TCPII does not show the limit of disturbance (LOD). The legend provides a symbol for the LOD; however, it is not shown on the plan. The TCPII shows a stormwater management outfall to the adjacent stream. The applicant should revise the TCPII and DSP to show the associated easement and LOD for the outfall.

13. **Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance:** The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance came into effect on September 1, 2010. The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage on properties that require a tree conservation plan or letter of exemption. Properties zoned I-3 are required to provide a minimum of ten percent of the gross tract area in tree canopy. The application demonstrates conformance with the tree canopy coverage requirements as follows:

	REQUIRED	**PROPOSED**
Tree Canopy	58,370 sq. ft.	84,282 sq. ft.

While minor revisions to the landscape plan may be necessary prior to signature approval, the submitted plan exceeds the tree canopy coverage requirements.

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

    a. **Community Planning North Division—**In a revised memorandum dated January 31, 2012, the Community Planning North Division provided referral comments on the subject application. The application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for centers in the Developed Tier, and conforms with the land use recommendations of the 1997 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone;* however, several key design standards of the Transit District Development Plan (TDDP) and design guidelines from the General Plan have not been adequately addressed, and the applicant should continue to refine the architectural and site designs to better meet the intent of these standards.

(1) **2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan**

The 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* sets the county's development policies. The application is consistent with the land use recommendations of the 2002 General Plan for metropolitan centers—specifically with regard to the desired concentration of employers and workers for large government service, major employment centers, and major educational complexes.

(2) **1997 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone***

This application conforms to the land use recommendations of the 1997 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* (hereafter TDDP). The proposal for three office buildings and associated parking is in keeping with the TDDP recommendation for planned employment land uses including office, retail, and light industrial development in a suburban campus character.

(3) **Development Standards**

Building Siting, Pedestrian Design, and Development Covenants
The full streetscape required along River Road by Standard S-3 on page 67 and Figure 3 on page 68 has not been provided. However, in this revised site plan the applicant has redesigned the street frontage to incorporate eight-foot-wide sidewalks and ten-foot-wide tree areas in accordance with Figure 3. The proposed buildings are still 20 feet away from the proposed sidewalk.

This application addresses a resubmitted, modified proposal that sets the two office buildings along River Road further back from the street to a distance of 40 feet from the right of way. This additional setback distance from the already large setback included in the original proposal is contrary to best practices for the transit- and pedestrian-oriented design advocated by the General Plan for centers. The applicant's justification for this additional setback is that it was mandated by a Declaration of Covenants executed with the Town of Riverdale Park.

Parking Layout
With regard to the overall design of parking on the site, the applicant has chosen a design solution reflective of the "least preferred" option shown with Standard S-57 on page 82 (see Figure 20). This proposed site plan should be revised to better screen parking from pedestrians, bikers, and drivers along River Road. In general, there remains a significant amount of parking proposed by this application, with similarly large amounts of impervious surfaces that will prove detrimental to the stream quality and local environment by enhancing the urban heat island effect within the TDDP area.

With regard to the proposed parking reflected on the site plan, Standard S-51 on page 81 has not been met. This standard requires either a 40-foot landscape buffer or a low wall separating parking from the streetscape, in this case River Road. Parking spaces near the southwest corner are located within 40 feet of the roadway and are not screened by a wall. Other spaces are screened, but by a wall

that is only 18 inches in height. A more appropriate and more effective screening wall would be approximately three feet in height, and should be provided in lieu of an overly short screening wall that would fail to mask the front grilles of many private vehicles parked on the site in those spaces.

Building Siting and Public Spaces
The three proposed office buildings on the subject property function as independent buildings that do little to foster the creation of pedestrian spaces. While the applicant has made strides with the revised site plan to address this initial concern, the location of proposed pedestrian amenities within the surface parking areas raises concerns.

Two small pedestrian gathering places are now indicated in the revised site plans on either side of the Phase III office building, but these spaces are surrounded by parking and access drives. It is unclear whether employees, visitors, and guests will use these spaces. The applicant may wish to consider relocating these pedestrian gathering places to adjoin one or more of the proposed office buildings, which would enhance safety, reduce pedestrian/traffic conflicts, and encourage use of these spaces.

Site Circulation and Access
The overall connectivity throughout this site and to adjoining properties is lacking in both vehicular and pedestrian accessibility. Standard S-240 on page 154 provides just one example of the desired connectivity on the subject site:

Internal Road Circulation:
An internal road network should be created that is pedestrian friendly and minimizes views of parking lots while maintaining direct pedestrian access from the building to the road without crossing parking lots or driveways. This internal road network may provide vehicular and pedestrian access between the two existing median breaks along River Road at Haig Drive and to the north of the Rivertech Court. (See Map 29)

Additionally, Map 29 reflects connections to the north to both 52nd Avenue and 51st Avenue. Neither connection is indicated in this application as a roadway connection, though a potential future hiker-biker trail linking the subject property to the north is reflected.

Architecture and Design
The proposed office buildings have a site layout which is at odds with the preferred character of a more urban, mixed-use environment such as that envisioned by the General Plan for metropolitan centers. The applicant should demonstrate how the design of the proposed office buildings will fully meet the intent of Standards S-100 through S-103 on page 89, which all relate to architectural materials and colors to enhance quality and visual interest. Further detailing of the proposed façade design could add visual interest to the proposed office buildings.

The applicant should be commended for working to address previous concerns relating to the parking structure by transitioning from a three-story to a four-story

parking garage as proposed in the submitted revised plans. The proposed parking structure, while architecturally compatible with the proposed office buildings, features a very generic design that does little to contribute to the overall quality of the visual environment of either the subject property or the metropolitan center. Additionally, a large amount of surface parking will remain upon completion of the parking structure.

Aviation Policy Area
This application is located under the traffic pattern for a small general aviation airport (College Park Airport). This area is subject to Aviation Policy Area regulations adopted by CB-51-2002 (DR-2) as Sections 27-548.32 through 27-548.48 of the Zoning Ordinance. The application should be referred to the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) for information and comment.

Comment: Staff believes that the recommended conditions address a number of the outstanding concerns posed by the Community Planning Division.

b. **The Transportation Planning Section**—In a referral dated February 16, 2012, the Transportation Planning Section provided analysis of the subject site plan. The proposed office buildings will be on a portion of the property identified in the approved College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (CP-R-TDOZ), as Parcel 10, and per Zoning Ordinance No. 35-1997. The CP-R-TDOZ designated Parcel 10 has since been subdivided into eight individual lots (Lots 10 and 12 through 18). In total, the TDDP identifies 29 primary, and 188 secondary district-wide requirements, as well as 11 additional site specific secondary requirements dealing with such things as the zone boundary, underlying zoning, permitted land use categories, access, parking, and transportation infrastructure requirements.

The Transportation Planning Section provided the following comments regarding conformance with the TDDP:

(1) **Transportation, Parking, and Transportation Demand Management, P-15 and P-16—**The plan recommends mandatory measures to reduce the overall transportation demand on the road system and ensure timely implementation of required and identified improvements and transportation demand management (TDM) programs.

In approving the plan, the District Council understood that a reduction of the parking supply within the district would be a significant incentive to reduce automobile usage in the district and its vicinity. As a result, parking is a key issue in reviewing this plan. **For this review, no traffic study is required because the accumulated sum of all approved parking spaces including the total parking proposed by this application does not exceed the parking caps identified in Table 12 of the TDDP.** The subject property is in the southern portion of the TDOZ, and the maximum allowed parking for this area is 6,955 spaces, of which 1,400, 1,005, and 66 parking spaces are pre-allocated to Parcels 3, 4, and 8 of CP-R TDOZ, respectively. Parcel 9 of the CP-R TDOZ, has been subdivided into four lots, and has been allocated a total of 700 parking spaces. Parcels 5 and 11 have been improved with office developments and 434, and 856 parking spaces, respectively. In March 2006, the Planning Board approved the University of Maryland Research Park Buildings 1, 2, and 3 on

Lots 11, 12, and 13, respectively, with combined parking allocations of 950 spaces. Similarly, in October 2006, the Planning Board approved the NOAA Building on Lot 14 with a total parking allocation of 700 spaces, of which only 32 spaces are surface parking. Using these figures, staff has determined the total unallocated parking in the southern portion of the TDDP is 844 spaces.

The proposed buildings for Lots 15, 16, and 17, similar to the original Parcel 10, straddle the CP-R-TDOZ designated "Walking Rings" 2 and 3. Therefore, and in accordance with Table 11 (TDDP Parking Requirements), the maximum allowable parking ratio for the proposed office building will be 2.50 parking spaces for every 1,000 gross square feet of development. This ratio is less than the amount generally prescribed by Subtitle 27.

The site plan shows a total of 1,114 parking spaces (570 structured and 544 surface) for the proposed 450,000 gross square feet office development, resulting in an overall parking ratio of 2.48, which is just below the required 2.5 ratio. The submitted justification statement and development plans both call for development and parking construction in three phases. Phase 1 will consist of 150,000 square feet of office use and construction of 563 surface parking spaces. Phase 2 will consist of an additional 150,000 square feet of office use (for a total of 300,000 square feet) and 306 additional surface spaces (for a total of 869). Phase 3 will include an additional 150,000 square feet of office use (for a total site development of 450,000 square feet) and construction of a 570-space parking garage replacing 325 of the constructed surface spaces (for a total 1,114 spaces). The proposed 563 and 869 spaces for Phases 1 and 2 will result in the interim parking ratios for Phases 1 and 2 to be 3.75 and 2.90, respectively. Even though the prior Planning Board and District Council approvals in the TDOZ area allow for such interim increases in parking ratios, the applicant has stated on the submitted plans that some of this excess parking is needed for use by the construction trailers and contractors during construction activities for the subsequent phases.

It is important to note that the approval of an additional 1,114 parking spaces as proposed would exceed the established parking cap (6,955) based on the already approved parking allocation as noted above by as much as 270 spaces. To remedy this situation, additional actions, stated as recommended approval conditions, should be required by the Planning Board and/or District Council for any building permit issuance beyond the first phase, or 150,000 square feet of office use.

In addition to parking allocation and ratio requirements, page 129 of the TDDP identifies collection of a mandatory one-time fee at detailed site plan review which will be used to fund future shared parking structures needed to serve development within the transit district. Since the site is within the predefined southern area, the applicant must pay $115 per surface parking space toward future parking structures in the area. These cost figures are in 1997 dollars. The total amount due in current dollars should be calculated using the following formula:

> $115 per surface parking space multiplied by 544, the proposed ultimate number of surface parking spaces to be constructed, and the result

multiplied by a factor X (appropriate construction adjustment factor for inflation obtained from DPW&T based on the most recent available FHWA construction Index).

The TDDP also includes recommendations concerning the establishment of a TDM district with a Transportation Management Association (TMA). However, there has not, to date, been sufficient justification for the establishment of a TDM district. As a result, the TDM annual fee ($5.00 per parking space) as shown on page 128 might not be required at detailed site plan review. The applicant should however be aware that when the TDM district is established and the annual fee per parking space will be applied, as prescribed by the CP-R TDDP.

(2) **Bike Loaner Program—**The CP-R TDDP, referring to promoting the bicycle and pedestrian transportation modes as cost effective and viable alternatives to the use of automobiles, recommends implementation of a free loaner bike program, common now in the country and the Washington Capital Region, referred to as the Bike Sharing Program.

The TDDP identifies several suggested locations on Map 18 as potential "pickup and drop-off" locations (potential bike sharing stations) in the transit district. The site closest to the proposed site is a location identified across from Rivertech Court and on Parcel 11. Parcel 11 was constructed prior to approval of the TDDP, and since it was among the very first buildings built in the district, the feasibility for the provision of a bike share station and program at that time was deemed unwarranted. The City of College Park, similar to other jurisdictions in the area (Arlington County, District of Columbia, and Montgomery County), is developing a city-wide bike sharing program that would be beneficial to the city and the transit district. Considering the importance of promoting alternative modes of commuting in the district, the applicant should work with the City of College Park in establishing the City's bike sharing program and actively promoting this site as one of the designated bike sharing stations.

(3) There are a number of transportation-related conditions that need to be addressed prior to issuance of any building permits. The relevant conditions have been discussed as a part of Finding 9.

(4) The vehicular and pedestrian access and circulation provided in this site plan are acceptable. Site access will be provided at three driveway entrances on River Road with full turning movements at the central driveway and limited right-in/right-out only access at the north and south ends of the property. The TDDP recommends only one full access to River Road. Staff concurs with the applicant and DPW&T's assessment that provision of two additional limited driveways along River Road is acceptable and their provision, while greatly improving the distribution of site generated traffic, would not create any operational or safety issues for the vehicular and pedestrian traffic along River Road.

c. **Trails**—The site was reviewed for master plan trail compliance on February 10, 2011. This proposal has been reviewed for conformance with the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* (TDDP).

The TDDP recommends that the internal road network be pedestrian friendly and that a system of trails be developed within the TDDP. The TDDP contains detailed road cross sections and development requirements with guidelines that are appropriate for the district and that directly affect the subject property. These guidelines are intended to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Detailed policies and strategies for pedestrian access and circulation are contained in the TDDP and are intended to create a "pedestrian-friendly transit district."

It is recommended that the applicant show the proposed sidewalk on River Road within the right-of-way of the road. However, the applicant has expressed that there are practical difficulties in extending the right-of-way. In particular, right-of-way expansion would overlap the existing utility location. Additionally, the applicant's Declaration of Covenants with the Town of Riverdale states that proposed buildings must be set back 40 feet from River Road (meaning River Road right-of-way). If the right-of-way were extended to include the streetscape and proposed eight-foot-wide sidewalk, this would affect the building setback, unless the applicant was able to amend the Declaration of Covenants with the Town of Riverdale.

If the sidewalk or portions of the sidewalk are not within the right-of-way of River Road, then a detailed statement should be provided indicating the manner in which the sidewalk will be held, owned, and maintained for the indicated purpose (including any proposed covenants or other documents), per Section 27-282 of the Zoning Ordinance.

Based on the preceding analysis, the Transportation Planning Section concludes that adequate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 24-123 of the Subdivision Regulations if the application were to be approved with conditions.

d. **The Environmental Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated January 27, 2012, the Environmental Planning Section provided comments on their review of the above-referenced Detailed Site Plan, DSP-09028, Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-006-06-04, and amendment requests, stamped as received on December 08, 2011. The Environmental Planning Section recommends approval of DSP-09028 and TCPII-006-06/04 subject to conditions and offered the following comments:

(1) The 13.43-acre site is in the I-3 Zone and is located on the north side of River Road, approximately 500 feet north of the intersection of Haig Drive and River Road. There is a stream and associated 100-year floodplain on the subject property. The site has been developed in conformance with previous approvals and is currently approximately 10 percent wooded. The site is relatively flat and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Lower Northeast Branch of the Anacostia River basin. No historic or scenic roads are nearby. River Road and Paint Branch Parkway are the nearest sources of transportation-generated noise impacts. The CSX railroad tracks, located to the west, and the College Park Airport, located to the north, are not noise concerns because the proposed uses are not residential in nature. Furthermore, the proposed use is not expected to be a noise generator. The entire property is located within the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ). No species listed by the State of Maryland as rare, threatened, or endangered are known to occur in the vicinity. The *Prince George's County Soil Survey* indicates that the predominant soil types on the site

are in the Codorus, Hatboro, Fallsington, Beltsville, Keyport, and Elsinboro series. These soil series generally exhibit moderate limitations to development due to perched water tables, impeded drainage, flood hazard, slow permeability, and steep slopes.

(2) Lots 15, 16, and 17 have a Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-027-09). A total of 0.72 acre of woodlands exists on these lots, dominated by sweetgum and white oak. The site has one specimen tree, a 37-inch white oak in fair condition, which the applicant seeks approval to remove.

e. **The Subdivision Review Section**—In a revised memorandum dated August 24, 2010, the Subdivision Review Section provided the following comments on the subject detailed site plan:

The preliminary plan was approved (January 1992) prior to approval of the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) (October 1997). However, the development of this property continues to be subject to the development restriction pursuant to Subtitle 24 and the preliminary plan approval.

Staff understands that the applicant intends to phase the development of this property. At the first phase of development (150,000 GFA), the applicant has indicated that they would be within the cap on development in the Riverside Subdivision (2 million). However, development of this site beyond the first phase would require a redistribution of the existing capacities which exist within the Riverside Subdivision. It should be noted that, in order to provide gross floor area beyond the capacities of the Riverside Subdivision, a new preliminary plan of subdivision should be approved, and it is likely that the 1997 *Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* will need to be amended.

The Subdivision Review staff also recommends that a cross parking and access easement be required as a part of this DSP, and recorded in county land records. The agreement should be referenced on the DSP. This information should also be reflected on a record plat for the subject property. Prior to the building permit for Phase I, the applicant should file a minor record plat to reflect the required easements and provide the liber and folio of the recorded documents.

f. **The Historic Preservation Section**—In a memorandum dated July 25, 2011, it was stated that the DSP proposal has no effect on historic sites, resources, or districts.

g. **Archeology**—In a referral dated August 10, 2011 from the archeological planner coordinator, it was stated that the probability of archaeological sites within the subject property is low and a Phase I archeological survey is not recommended on the site. The proposal will not impact any archaeological sites.

h. **The Permit Review Section**—The Permit Review Section provided detailed referral comments in a memorandum dated February 18, 2010. The applicable comments have been addressed through revisions to the plans.

i. **The City of Greenbelt**—The City of Greenbelt provided a referral of no comment dated February 4, 2010 for DSP-09028.

j. **The City of College Park**—The College Park City Council voted unanimously to approve the subject detailed site plan with conditions on February 14, 2012. Staff concurs with the recommendations of the Council and Mayor, and Council-recommended conditions have been incorporated where deemed appropriate. In some limited instances, recommended conditions have been modified.

The City of College Park requested that additional information be provided, prior to certification of the DSP, regarding conformance to trip caps and parking space requirements. Staff believes that the subject report with the analysis contained herein and subsequent Planning Board resolution will provide the requested information, and therefore no conditions regarding additional documentation are necessary. Staff notes that the phasing allocations beyond Phase I, outlined in Conditions 3, 16, 17, and 18 of PGCPB Resolution No. 90-42, may be modified if mutually agreed upon by the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees, The M-NCPPC Planning Department, and implementing agencies (SHA and/or DPW&T), as long as the total development level, vehicle trip cap, parking space cap, or transportation improvements are not affected. The application has been referred to all of the necessary agencies, and no concerns have been raised regarding the phasing proposed by the applicant. Additionally, a few of the city's recommended conditions appear to be met through the submitted plan. A detail and location for trail signage is provided. Secure bicycle parking is noted to be provided in the garage, however the number of bicycle parking spaces proposed should also be noted. The site plan also notes that showers and changing facilities will be provided in each building. The location of the changing facilities should be described in more detail on the site plan, or within a site plan note.

k. **The Town of Riverdale Park**—The Town of Riverdale Park provided referral comments on the subject detailed site plan dated February 7, 2012. At the Town of Riverdale Park meeting which was held on February 6, 2012, the Town Council moved to approve the application with conditions. Staff concurs with the recommendations of the Council and Mayor. Staff has incorporated many of the Town of Riverdale Park's recommended conditions in the Recommendation section of this report verbatim. In other limited instances, staff has provided modifications.

The Town of Riverdale Park requested that additional information be provided, prior to certification of the DSP, regarding conformance to trip caps and parking space requirements. Staff believes that the subject report with the analysis contained herein and subsequent Planning Board resolution will provide the requested information, and therefore no conditions regarding additional documentation are necessary.

The town also requested that a signal warrant study be completed for the main access drive. Signalization can be an important aspect of pedestrian connectivity, as major pedestrian destinations within the plan are located on the opposite side of River Road, including the College Park Metro Station and proposed Purple Line Station. A signal with pedestrian enhancements would be of benefit to the development, if warranted. Staff recommends that prior to the issuance of a building permit for Phase III, that the applicant submit a signal warrant study for the central access drive for consideration by DPW&T, MNCPPC, and the City of College Park. If deemed warranted by DPW&T the applicant shall bond the total cost of signalization per DPW&T standards, and the associated cost of pedestrian enhancements.

l. **The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)—**In a memorandum dated September 2, 2010, DPW&T offered the following comments:

(1) The property is located on the east side of River Road, approximately 2,700 feet west of Kenilworth Avenue (MD 201) in the Town of Riverdale Park. Right-of-way dedication and frontage improvements in accordance with urban collector standards are required for River Road.

(2) The detailed site plan is consistent with approved site Stormwater Management Concepts 18803-2006-01, 18815-2006-01, and 18816-2006-01 dated September 2, 2010.

m. **The Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)—**In referral comments submitted on August 15, 2011, SHA stated that they will require the applicant to obtain an access permit for the off-site improvements to state roads prior to issuance of building permits for the subject site. The above comments will be addressed by SHA and do not require further M-NCPPC action.

n. **Verizon—**In undated referral comments, Verizon stated that the applicant is proposing numerous obstructions including an eight-foot-wide sidewalk within the existing public utility easement (PUE) along River Road.

Comment: The site plan requires further coordination with the utility companies. There are existing utilities that will be affected by the subject proposal. A note on the site plan states that it shall be the responsibility of the permittee to arrange for all necessary adjustments to the existing utilities affected by this project. While this note assists somewhat with the challenge of managing the existing PUE location and the proposed improvements, staff also recognizes the importance of providing adequate space for utilities and their maintenance. Staff therefore recommends that the applicant expand the existing PUE to provide a 20-foot PUE inclusive of the proposed eight-foot-wide sidewalk, or provide an agreement from the affected utility companies to construct the sidewalk within the existing PUE prior to approval of the detailed site plan.

o. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—In comments dated December 23, 2011, WSSC provided comment on the subject detailed site plan. Required WSSC easements should not overlap with designated woodland preservation areas; therefore, all required easements should be noted on the detailed site plan and tree conservation plan. WSSC also stated that private water and sewer easements will be required. A private sewer easement will be required and should be recorded on Lot 16 to serve Lots 15 and 17. A private water easement will be required and should be recorded on Lot 17 to serve Lot 16. WSSC recommends that the required easements be delineated on the DSP and that the horizontal width is labeled on the plan.

p. **Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA)**—The application has been forwarded to the Maryland Aviation Administration (MAA) for review regarding Federal Aviation Regulation (FAR) Part 77. Prior to building permit, the applicant should provide evidence that the proposed project complies with FAR Part 77. If MAA indicates an obstruction or issue with the site plan prior to plan certification, the site plan should be revised at the time of certification to reduce or eliminate any perceived obstruction identified by MAA.

q. **Prince George's County Health Department**—At the time of the publishing of this technical staff report, comment had not been received from the Health Department. Recently enacted County Council Bill CB-41-2011(DR-2) requires that the Planning Board refer development proposals to the Prince George's County Health Department for a health impact assessment review in order to identify health impacts or implications of proposed development on the community.

r. **Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)**—Due to the site's proximity to the College Park Metro Station, the application was referred to WMATA. No comment was received prior to publishing of the technical staff report.

RECOMMENDATION

Based upon the foregoing evaluation and analysis, the Urban Design staff recommends that the Planning Board adopt the findings of this report and APPROVE Detailed Site Plan DSP-09028 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-006-06/04 for M Square, University of Maryland Research Park, with the following conditions:

A. Staff recommends APPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:

1. **S-3 and S-231:** To allow for an increased building setback from River Road.

2. **S-24:** To allow the applicant to tie into a four-foot-wide sidewalk if further coordination is not possible.

3. **S-33:** To allow for two additional limited movement points of access onto River Road.

4. **S-29:** To permit eight-foot-wide trails consistent with the existing trails in the area, rather than a ten-foot-wide trail.

5. **S-60 and S-178:** To allow for off-street parking only, as on-street parking is discouraged on River Road.

6. **S-88:** To allow standard parking spaces at 9 by 18 feet and compact spaces at 8 by 16 feet.

7. **S-240:** To allow the applicant to not provide an internal roadway through Parcel 10 (connecting Haig Court to River Road).

8. **S-66:** To preserve the existing woodland without additional plantings.

9. **S-137, S-138, S-140, S-147, S-233:** To allow the applicant to impact the floodplain buffer in order to construct the outfall and trail connection.

10. **S-149:** To allow the removal of one specimen tree.

B. Staff recommends DISAPPROVAL of the alternative development district standards for:

1. **S-59:** Parking Lots, as the applicant should be required to provide a stub driveway at the

southeastern property line, as conditioned below.

C. Staff recommends APPROVAL of Detailed Site Plan DSP-09028 and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-006-06/04 for M Square, University of Maryland Research Park with the following conditions:

1. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, revise the site plan in accordance with Applicant Exhibit 1 as follows:

   a. Shift the proposed building at 4400 River Road approximately 21 feet to the north and the proposed building at 4600 River Road approximately 34 feet to the south to provide additional area between the main entrance driveway and the buildings to accommodate pedestrian plazas. Full detail regarding the pedestrian plazas shall be provided, and at least the first floor building façades facing the newly created plazas shall be improved to provide more visual interest.

   b. Shift the entrance located north of 4400 River Road approximately 35 feet to the north and the entrance south of 4600 River Road approximately 60 feet to the south.

   c. Remove all parking spaces within 40 feet of River Road and provide green area, with the exception of driveway aisles and sidewalks.

   d. Remove the pedestrian plazas from the triangular islands along the north and south sides of 4500 River Road and provide pedestrian plazas in the enlarged green areas located between the main entrance driveway and the proposed buildings at 4400 and 4600 River Road.

   e. Modify the parking lot layout and islands as necessary to accommodate the above changes.

2. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, revise the site phasing plan in accordance with Applicant Exhibit 2 to reflect the modifications shown on Applicant Exhibit 1.

3. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, provide a landscape phasing plan in accordance with Applicant Exhibit 3, consistent with the modifications shown on Applicant Exhibit 1. Evergreen plantings shall be provided along River Road and in front of the Phase III building to more fully screen the proposed interim surface parking.

4 Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan (DSP), the following information shall be provided or revisions made:

   a. The area between the sidewalk and building entrances that front River Road shall be attractively designed to include special paving, seating, a focal point (such as art) and landscaping. Details of these features including a low-decorative wall shall be provided.

   b. The site plan shall reflect widening of the four-foot-wide segment of sidewalk north of the subject property to eight feet wide. A note shall be provided to state that widening is contingent upon an agreement with the adjacent property owner and DPW&T.

c. The DSP shall be revised to include notes and a detail regarding the stenciling of storm drain inlets with "Do Not Dump—Chesapeake Bay Drainage."

d. The DSP and the landscape plan (DSP-5) shall be revised to show the 50-foot 100-year floodplain buffer.

e. The applicant shall complete an FAA Form 7460-1 and submit it to the Maryland Aviation Administration, and subsequently provide evidence that the project complies with FAR 11. If the MAA identifies an issue, then the plan shall be revised to reduce or eliminate any perceived obstruction identified by MAA.

f. A general aviation disclosure notice shall be placed on a prominent location on the DSP.

g. Show the location of a medium bikeshare station (8 bikes, 15 docks) within the portion of the subject property located within the municipal boundaries of the City of College Park.

h. Provide the bearings and distances on each parcel or include an inset to ensure that the parcel configuration is consistent with the record plat.

i. A cross parking and access easement shall be noted on the plan as a part of this DSP, and recorded in county land records.

j. A 20-foot-wide public utility easement (PUE) shall be provided adjacent to the River Road right-of-way; or the applicant shall provide an alternate agreement from the affected utility companies.

k. The detailed site plan shall be revised to show at least a paved 24-foot-wide two-way parking driveway aisle extending from the subject property, preferably along the Lot 16 boundary line with Lots 15 and 17 to the southeastern property line with TDDP Parcel 11.

l. The applicant shall provide a detail that shows the appearance of the wall used to screen the dumpster and loading areas. The screen walls should have architectural interest as well as continuity with the building façade. The final design shall be approved by the Urban Design Section.

m. The proposed crosswalk across River Road shall be included on the site plan.

n. The Liber and Folio of the required PUEs for the trails and sidewalk on the subject property shall be placed on the site plan and documents specifying responsibility for maintenance of those facilities shall also be recorded in Land Records.

o. The required private water and sewer easements, including their horizontal width, should be delineated on the DSP.

p. The Section 4.2 landscape schedule should be revised to indicate that the width of the proposed landscape strip varies from 10 to 20 feet, or as is otherwise

proposed.

q. The number of bicycle parking spaces proposed within the garage shall be noted on the plan.

r. The location of the changing facilities shall be described in more detail on the site plan.

5. Prior to signature approval of the detailed site plan, the following information shall be provided or revisions made to the architectural plans:

a. The applicant shall provide additional architectural detailing at the ground level of the office buildings. Information regarding the materials, textures, and/or finishes employed at the ground level of the proposed office buildings shall be provided in order to ensure that visual interest is provided at the pedestrian scale of the transit district.

b. The darker grey concrete panel at the ground level of 4400 and 600 River Road shall also be provided at the ground level of the building façades facing the central driveway and proposed pedestrian spaces.

c. The elevations shall include some general locations/areas for future building-mounted signs, such as tenant signage and office building numbers, so that signs may be approved by the Urban Design Section, as designee of the Planning Board, in the future. Basic sign standards shall also be provided. If building-mounted signs are proposed, the area of those signs shall not exceed the provisions of the I-3 Zone, and the design of the signs shall fully conform to the applicable Transit District Overlay Zone (TDOZ) standards.

6. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan the Type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) shall be revised as follows:

a. Show the limits of disturbance (LOD).

b. Show the easement associated with the storm drain and LOD for the outfall located in the floodplain.

c. Revise the worksheet as necessary.

d. Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plans.

7. Prior to certification of the detailed site plan, copies of the stormwater management concept approval plan for each lot shall be submitted. The concept shall address bioretention and other innovative water quantity and quality control methods to the maximum extent practicable. The approved concepts shall be shown consistently on all associated plans.

8. Eight-foot-wide sidewalks shall be provided within the River Road right-of-way, or within an easement with an associated maintenance agreement or covenant. The liber/folio of any proposed easement or agreement shall be reflected on future plans.

9. A bikeshare station shall be constructed as part of a bikeshare program operated by the City of College Park in the second phase of development. If, however, prior to issuance of the first building permit, the City of College Park notifies the Planning Board or its designee that the applicant has no further obligation to construct the bikeshare station, then this condition will be deemed to have been satisfied.

10. Prior to issuance of any building permits for the site, the applicant shall provide documentation that a safety plan has been provided to the Town of Riverdale Park.

11. Prior to issuance of any building permits for any building on the site, the applicant shall, in coordination with the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), install a crosswalk across River Road, unless modified by DPW&T.

12. Prior to issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide payment of $115 x 544 (the number of proposed surface parking spaces) to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). The required fee per parking space is expressed in 1997 dollars and shall be adjusted for inflation at the time of payment using the DPW&T construction index which is based on the latest Engineering News Record Highway Construction Cost Index. The collected fee shall be applied toward the financing of shared parking structures within the transit district, as noted on pages 128 and 129 of the 1997*Approved Transit District Development Plan for the College Park-Riverdale Transit District Overlay Zone* (TDDP).

13. Prior to issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit an acceptable transportation demand management (TDM) plan for the proposed site with financial assurance to include hiring of a full-time, on-site commute program manager with the responsibility to market a carpool matching program for employees, promote and coordinate the formulation of car/vanpools, promote the use of public transit, promote staggered work hours for employees, designate preferential parking spaces for carpools and vanpools, and prepare annual reports on the effectiveness of the TDM.

14. Prior to issuance of any building permits in excess of 150,000 square feet within the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide evidence that either: the total development cap of 2,000,000 square feet for Riverside Subdivision is no longer in force; or the transfer of the 235,000 square feet of office development and 270 of the 700 assigned and allocated parking spaces from TDDP Parcel 9 to the subject property have been accomplished by record plat for TDDP Parcel 9 (Lots 1–4, Block B), pursuant to Section 24-108(a) of the Subdivision Regulations.

15. Prior to issuance of any building permits in excess of 300,000 square feet within the subject property, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide evidence that either: the total development cap of 2,000,000 square feet for Riverside Subdivision is no longer in force; or a revised site plan and record plat have been approved for Lot 18 of the Riverside Subdivision that limits the development on Lot 18 to no more than 56,205 square feet, unless Detailed Site Plan DSP-05080 is no longer valid.

16. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for Phase III, the applicant shall submit a signal warrant study for the central access drive for the consideration of the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC), and the City of College Park. If deemed warranted by DPW&T, the applicant shall bond the total cost of signalization per DPW&T standards, and the associated cost of pedestrian enhancements.

17. Prior to the building permit for Phase I, the applicant shall file a minor record plat to reflect the easements and airport disclosure clause required with this approval and provide the liber/folio of the recorded documents, unless a new preliminary plan is approved for the subject area.