



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


## Detailed Site Plan

## DSP-12025

| Application  | General Data                 |               |
|--|------------------------------|---------------|
| <b>Project Name:</b><br>Largo Center West, Parcels B and C<br>a/k/a Largo Town Center West<br><br><b>Location:</b><br>Southwest of Largo Drive West, approximately<br>315 feet west of its intersection with Lottsford<br>Road.<br><br><b>Applicant/Address:</b><br>Largo Centre West (D C) ASLI V, LLP.<br>923 North Pennsylvania Avenue<br>Winter Park, FL 32789 | Planning Board Hearing Date: | 03/21/13      |
|  | Staff Report Date:           | 03/05/13      |
|  | Date Accepted:               | 12/11/12      |
|  | Planning Board Action Limit: | Waived        |
|  | Plan Acreage:                | 16.11         |
|  | Zone:                        | M-U-I/D-D-O-Z |
|  | Dwelling Units:              | 532           |
|  | Gross Floor Area:            | 7,952 sq. ft. |
|  | Planning Area:               | 73            |
|  | Tier:                        | Developing    |
|  | Council District:            | 06            |
|  | Election District            | 13            |
|  | Municipality:                | N/A           |
|  | 200-Scale Base Map:          | 201NE08       |

| Purpose of Application  | Notice Dates           |          |
|---|------------------------|----------|
| A mixed-use development with 532 multifamily dwelling units in two buildings and 7,952 square feet of commercial space. | Informational Mailing: | 06/25/12 |
|   | Acceptance Mailing:    | 12/06/12 |
|   | Sign Posting Deadline: | 02/19/13 |

|                             |                                 |  |                   |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| <b>Staff Recommendation</b> |                                 | <b>Staff Reviewer:</b> Henry Zhang, AICP<br><b>Phone Number:</b> 301-952-4151<br><b>E-mail:</b> Henry.Zhang@ppd.mncppc.org |                   |
| <b>APPROVAL</b>             | <b>APPROVAL WITH CONDITIONS</b> | <b>DISAPPROVAL</b>   | <b>DISCUSSION</b> |
|                             | X                               |  |                   |



THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL  
PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY PLANNING BOARD

STAFF REPORT

SUBJECT: Detailed Site Plan DSP-12025  
Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPH-067-97-01  
Largo Center West, Parcels B and C

The Urban Design staff has completed the review of the subject application and appropriate referrals. The following evaluation and findings lead to a recommendation of APPROVAL 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 May 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas*;
- b. The requirements of the Zoning Ordinance in the M-U-I (Mixed Use-Infill) Zone and the Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z);
- c. The requirements of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-79179 and Record Plat;
- d. The requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*;
- e. The requirements of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) and the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance (TCC);
- f. Referral comments.

FINDINGS

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

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan (DSP) for a mixed-use development consisting of 532 multifamily residential dwelling units and approximately 7,952 square feet of commercial/retail space on two parcels within the M-U-I/D-D-O-Z Zone in the Largo Town Center area.

2. **Development Data Summary:**

|  | <b>EXISTING</b> | <b>PROPOSED</b>    |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Zone(s)</b>                                 | M-U-I/D-D-O-Z   | M-U-I/D-D-O-Z      |
| <b>Use(s)</b>                                  | Vacant          | Residential/Retail |
| <b>Acreage</b>                                 | 16.1            | 16.1               |
| Of which Parcel B                              | 5.69            | 5.69               |
| Parcel C                                       | 10.41           | 10.41              |
| <b>Commercial Gross Floor Area (sq. ft.)</b>   | -               | <b>7,952</b>       |
| Of which on Parcel B                           | -               | 3,677              |
| on Parcel C                                    | -               | 4,275              |
| <b>Number of Multifamily Residential Units</b> | -               | <b>532</b>         |
| Of which on Parcel B                           | -               | 216                |
| on Parcel C                                    | -               | 316                |

**OTHER DEVELOPMENT DATA**

|                                     | <b>REQUIRED</b>                            | <b>PROPOSED</b> |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----------------|
| <b>Total parking spaces</b>         | Max. 1,057 to Min. 634<br>(20% reduction)* | 889             |
| Of which Residential parking spaces | Max. 1,012 to Min. 632                     | -               |
| Commercial parking garage           | Max.45 to Min. 36                          | -               |
| Handicapped spaces                  | 18   | 18**            |
| <b>Total loading spaces</b>         | 5  | 5               |

**Note:** \*See Finding 6 below for details on parking calculations as required by D-D-OZ standards.

\*\*Of which three spaces are van accessible.

3. **Location:** The subject property consisting of two parcels is located southwest of Largo Drive West, west of its intersection with Lottsford Road, within the Metro Core Area of Largo Town Center, in Planning Area 73, Council District 6 and in the Developing Tier of Prince George's County.
4. **Surrounding Uses:** The subject site is located in Subarea 5 of the Largo Town Center Metro Core Area, which includes properties that are generally within one-third of a mile of the metro station. The site is bounded on the west and south by the right-of-way (ROW) of the Capital Beltway (I-95); on the north by the ROW of Largo Drive West; and on the northwest and southeast sides by developed properties. All adjacent uses are in the M-U-I Zone, over which the D-D-O-Z has been superimposed. The Largo Metro Station is within approximately 1,000 feet of the subject site, across both Largo Drive West and Harry S Truman Drive.
5. **Previous Approvals:** Parcels B and C are located in an area bounded by Harry S Truman Drive, Central Avenue, the Capital Beltway and the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) subway overpass, consisting of approximately 70 acres. This land was zoned R-R until 1978, when the property was placed in the C-O Zone by the July 1990 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73*. Development of an office park known as "The Woodlands" began. In 1988, a tract of 40 acres, including Parcels B and C, was rezoned to the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone pursuant to Zoning Map Amendment A-9682. The goal of the rezoning was to attract flex-tech

and R and D businesses to the property. On the 70-acre assemblage, four buildings were constructed in either the C-O (Commercial Office) Zone or the E-I-A (Employment and Institutional Area) Zone, including a hotel (Parcel E-1, Largo Centre West, PB 132 Plat 34), an office building (Parcel D, Largo Centre West, PB 135 Plat 69), a paper company (Parcel M, Largo Centre West, PB 135 Plat 69) and the USBI warehouse (Parcel N, Largo Centre West Subdivision PB 180 Plat 35). The 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* (SMA) rezoned the entire 70-acre area, including the subject site, to the M-U-I Zone and superimposed a D-D-O-Z on the subject site. The site also has an approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 35629-2007-00, which will be valid through May 4, 2013.

6. **Design Features:** The longer side of the site has frontage on Largo Drive West, which has an 80-foot-wide right-of-way (ROW) that is connected to Harry S Truman Drive at both ends. One vehicular access in the middle of the site's frontage links the site to Largo Drive West. There are streams, wetlands or 100-year floodplain on the rear half of the site. Two buildings with varied heights of five-to-six stories occupy the portions of both Parcels B and C that front on Largo Drive West. The rear portions of both parcels adjacent to the ROW of the Capital Beltway (I-95) that have environmental features are preserved in their nature states. A loop pedestrian path is shown at the rear of the two buildings.

The two buildings occupy almost the entire site's frontage on Largo Drive West. The buildings are also set back 26-33 feet from the face of the curb with sidewalks and landscaped strips between the buildings and the street. The first floor of the two buildings consists of commercial store fronts around the site entrance areas. The rest of the first floor and the other floors above consist of multifamily residential dwelling units and lobby areas. The two buildings are designed to enclose a parking structure and a courtyard in the middle of the building block. Amenities and recreational facilities such as a swimming pool, sitting area, pergola and trellis are provided in each courtyard to serve the future residents in the buildings.

The two proposed buildings feature flat roofs and are finished with a combination of concrete masonry units, brick, metal panels and cementitious siding. Tower elements are used at the ends of each elevation and accents of vertical modules are also employed on the entire elevation to further break down the visually horizontal dominance of the long elevation. The mix of different building materials has been utilized as a way to enhance the esthetics of the elevations. Specifically, brick has been predominantly applied to stress the base section of the buildings. The arrangement of various architectural elements, the window pattern, and the combination of exterior building materials on the elevations are attractive and are also compatible with the proposed building on Parcel O that is located directly across Largo Drive West from Parcel B.

### **Signage**

The signage proposed with this DSP includes numerous building-mounted signs to be located above the future storefronts in a narrow band below the sills of the second floor windows. Since the users are not known at this time, the specific sign details will be provided when the spaces are leased. However, the general dimensions such as the length and width of the sign area should be provided. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report to require the applicant to provide the general sign face area prior to certification of this DSP.

### **Parking and Loading Requirements**

The parking requirements located in the Site Design Section of the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* offer three steps to establish both maximum and minimum numbers of off-street parking spaces for

developments in the D-D-O-Z. By taking into account shared parking arrangements, which is the third component of the D-D-O-Z parking standards, off-street parking spaces are calculated for each development in the core area as follows:

#### **Parking Standards—Step A**

The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use type is required to be equal to the minimum number of required off-street parking spaces in accordance with Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. This DSP includes multifamily residential and commercial/retail uses. The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for the proposed residential use is 789, and for the retail use is 45, for a total of 834 spaces.

#### **Parking Standards—Step B**

In accordance with D-D-O-Z parking standards, the minimum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for each land use is required to be calculated by reducing by 20 percent the maximum number of off-street parking spaces required by Section 27-568(a) of the Zoning Ordinance. The proposed development is wholly within the core area of the Largo Town Center metro station plan. The minimum number of required off-street parking spaces for the proposed residential use is 632, and 36 for the retail use, for a total of 668 spaces. The maximum number of off-street parking spaces permitted for multifamily dwellings wholly within the core area and for which the parking is substantially (at least 90 percent ) provided in the form of structured parking may be increased to 1.75 spaces per dwelling unit, plus an additional 0.33 space per bedroom in excess of one per unit. In this case, the maximum number of parking spaces for residential use is 1,012 and for retail use is 45, for a total of 1,057 spaces.

#### **Parking Standards—Step C**

For any property under one ownership and containing two or more uses, the number of parking spaces should be computed by multiplying the minimum amount of parking required for each land use, as stated in Step B, by the appropriate percentage as shown in the shared parking requirements by time period. The number of parking spaces required for the development is then determined by adding the results in each column. The column totaling the highest number of parking spaces becomes the minimum off-street parking requirement. In this case, the highest column yields 634 parking spaces. The DSP provides a total 889 spaces, of which ten are surface parking spaces and 879 are structured parking spaces.

#### **Loading Spaces**

Section 27-582 of the Zoning Ordinance requires one loading space for multifamily dwelling units up to 300 and one additional loading space for each additional 200 dwelling units (or fraction); for retail sales and service, one loading space for 2,000-10,000 square feet of gross floor area (GFA) is required; a total of four spaces is required. A total of five loading spaces has been provided and therefore the DSP complies with the loading requirement of the Zoning Ordinance.

#### **Private Recreational Facilities**

This development of 532 multifamily residential units is required to provide \$448,630 worth of recreational facilities in accordance with the current recreational facility cost calculation formula. The applicant will provide a recreational facility package consisting of internal facilities within the proposed buildings and external facilities outside of the buildings with approximately \$569,580.00 in total value. The proposed internal recreational facility package by itself exceeds

the private recreational facility requirements. The recreational facilities proposed are broken down as follows:

| <b>Within buildings and courtyards</b>                 | <b>Dollar amount</b> |
|--|----------------------|
| Swimming Pool 1  | 198,200.00           |
| Swimming Pool 2  | 251,800.00           |
| Fitness Center 1- 1,500 sq. ft. (\$20 per sq. ft)      | 30,000.00            |
| Fitness Center 2-1,050 sq. ft.                         | 21,000.00            |
| <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>501,000.00</b>    |
| <b>Outside buildings</b>                               |                      |
| 6' wide trail (\$35.00 per linear foot for 1,068 feet) | 37,380.00            |
| Fitness stations (6 in total)                          | 16,000.00            |
| Sitting area (400 sq. ft)                              | 5,000.00             |
| Picnic area  | 7,000.00             |
| Play area (8,000 sq. ft)                               | 3,200.00             |
| <b>Subtotal</b>  | <b>68,580.00</b>     |
| <b>Total value</b>                                     | <b>569,580.00</b>    |

Additional recreational facilities such as picnic and sitting areas, a looped pedestrian path and open play field are also provided at the rear of the two buildings, in the southwest part of the site fronting the Capital Beltway (I-95). Since the area is completely within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour line, the external facilities are not included in the recreational facility package to be counted toward the fulfillment of the private recreational facility obligation for this project.

### **Lighting**

Two types of light fixtures have been proposed in this DSP including pole lights for streets and parking areas and bollard lights for pathways and sidewalks. A note has been included on the detail sheet of the landscape plan where the light fixtures are shown. The note indicates that "Full cut-off optic light fixtures shall be used throughout the development and shall be directed downward to reduce glare and light intrusion." However, the pole light shown is not a full cut-off type of light fixture. A condition has been included in the recommendation section that requires a full cut-off light along with the product specification sheet be provided prior to certification.

### **Green Building Technologies**

A mixed-use project like the subject development presents many opportunities for the application of green building technologies. This application includes reuse of stormwater for on-site landscaping irrigation. Additional green technologies such as those that would improve the building's energy efficiency, daylighting (the practice of placing windows or other openings and reflective surfaces so that during the day natural light provides effective internal lighting), and other innovative environmental technologies in the building and site design should be applied in this development to the extent possible.

## **COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA**

- The May 2004 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas:** The sector plan and sectional map

amendment amends portions of the 1993 *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Landover and Vicinity*, the 1990 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* and the 1986 *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Suitland-District Heights and Vicinity, Planning Areas 72, 73 and 75A*, the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*, the 1992 *Prince George's County Historic Sites and Districts Plan*, the 1990 *Approved Public Safety Facilities Master Plan*, and the 1975 Countywide Trail Plan. The purpose of the sector plan is to analyze the existing situation and to set forth goals, concepts, guidelines, recommendations and design standards to achieve the development characters desired for future development at the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Core Areas and the Central Avenue Corridor Node in the sector plan area, in accordance with goals and policies of the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan* recommendations for mixed-use, pedestrian- and transit-oriented development in centers and corridors. The sector plan contains a comprehensive rezoning element known as the Sectional Map Amendment (SMA) intended to implement the land use recommendations of the sector plan for the foreseeable future. On March 18, 2004, the Planning Board approved (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-50), the preliminary sector plan, and the proposed sectional map amendment. On May 27, 2004, the District Council, by adopting County Council Resolution CR-36-2004, approved the sector plan and sectional map amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center metro areas.

The subject site is located in Subarea 5 of the Largo Town Center Metro Core Area. The *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* rezoned Subarea 5 to the M-U-I Zone and further superimposed a Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z) over Subarea 5 (see below for a detailed discussion of compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone and standards of the D-D-O-Z). The subject application has been reviewed for conformance with the approved sector plan and sectional map amendment and has been found to be in general compliance with the land use and development pattern concepts and recommendations.

No historic sites are on the subject site or in the close vicinity of the site. The application's compliance with environmental infrastructure and transportation system concepts and recommendations has been discussed in detail in the attached memoranda from the Transportation Planning and Environmental Planning Sections, respectively.

The sector plan and sectional map amendment superimpose a D-D-O-Z over designated subareas including Subarea 5 in the Largo Town Center Metro Core Areas to ensure that the development of land meets the sector plan's goals. The development district standards follow and implement the recommendations in the sector plan and sectional map amendment. The development district standards are organized into three parts, to address site design, building design and public areas for development within the district.

Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that in approving the detailed site plan, the Planning Board shall find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards. In general, the subject detailed site plan meets the applicable development district standards. If the applicant intends to deviate from the development district standards, the Planning Board must find that the alternative development district standards will benefit the development and the development district, and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan. In this application the applicant has requested modifications of the development district standard as follows:



**Site Design**  
**Building Siting and Setbacks**

- A. Buildings shall front the street edge and shall be located within an appropriate distance from the edge of the curb. Appropriate ranges for front build-to lines from the street edge are as follow:**

- 1. In Subareas 3 and 5 of the Largo Town Center core area, and Subareas 1, 2, and 3 of the Morgan Boulevard core area, all new buildings shall be located within 15-25 feet of the edge of the curb, with the exception of residential development with frontage on Morgan Boulevard (in Subarea 1), which shall be located within 20 to 35 feet of the edge of the curb**

**Comment:** The proposed DSP establishes a building setback 26 to 33 feet from the edge of the curb on Largo Drive West. Largo Drive West was platted and constructed many years ago. As currently constructed, the edge of the curb is 12 feet from the property line. The record plat then establishes a ten-foot public utility easement (PUE), which the applicant is required to maintain free of structures. Thus, the closest the building could be located to the edge of the curb is 22 feet. To allow for some construction room, the applicant has placed the building 26 feet from the face of the curb at its closest point. However, the building does not have a flat front façade. Architectural variations and offsets are provided to create visual interest, resulting in portions of the building that are set back up to 33 feet from the face of the curb. With a build-to line of 26–33 feet from the face of the curb, the proposed detailed site plan does not conform to the 15-25 foot build-to line D-D-O-Z standard. A modification of this standard is requested. The location of the PUE is an existing condition which cannot be altered. The applicant is still conforming to the vision of the D-D-O-Z by locating the building as close to the face of the curb as possible. However, to fully conform with the standard would mean that the building would have to be located so close to the PUE that construction would not be possible without encroaching into the PUE and no architectural variation along the front facade could be provided, which would not benefit the development or be consistent with the other building standards in the D-D-O-Z. Modifying the standard to allow a build-to line which is 26-33 feet from the face of the curb will benefit the development by allowing the architectural variations along the front façade needed to provide an attractive streetscape, and will not substantially impair the implementation of the sector plan. In conclusion, the design treatment of the site is acceptable. The requested modification of the D-D-O-Z standard will benefit the development and the development district by providing an impressive street wall along the site’s entire frontage of Largo Drive West and will not impair, but will in fact significantly promote the implementation of the approved sector plan.

**Site Design**  
**Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening**

- F. The bufferyard requirement within the development district may be reduced to facilitate a compact form of development compatible with the recommendations of the Urban Design chapter. The minimum bufferyard requirements (landscape yard) for incompatible uses in the Landscape**

**Manual (Section 4.7) may be reduced by 50 percent. The plant units required per 100 linear feet of property line or right-of-way may also be reduced by 50 percent. A four-foot high, opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment shall be provided in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard between office/retail/commercial uses and residential uses.**

**Comment:** As indicated above, the proposed mixed-use development is adjacent to an industrial building along its northern property line, and an office building along the southeastern property line. The applicant is proposing a building setback/buffer of 15 feet along each property line. For purposes of establishing the required bufferyard, the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* would classify the proposed vertical mixed use buildings based on the predominant use, which is multifamily residential. The office building to the southeast would be considered a low impact use, normally requiring a 20-foot building setback and a ten-foot bufferyard, which the sector plan would then reduce by half. Reducing this requirement by 50 percent would require a ten-foot building setback and a five-foot bufferyard. This setback/bufferyard would therefore satisfy the Sector Plan requirement. However, the sector plan standard also requires a four-foot-high, opaque masonry wall or other opaque screening treatment in conjunction with the reduced width of the bufferyard. In this case, no such wall is proposed. Rather, a retaining wall is to be constructed within the bufferyard, and the building is set above the retaining wall. However, the retaining wall does not qualify as a four-foot-high opaque masonry wall as described in the standard. As such, an amendment to this requirement is requested. In this case, the wall would simply serve no purpose. It would not provide any meaningful screening for a building that is five stories high.

Along the northern property line is a warehouse, which is classified as a high impact use, normally requiring a 50-foot building setback and a 40-foot-wide bufferyard. A 50 percent reduction would allow a 25-foot building setback and a 20-foot-wide bufferyard. In this case, the 15-foot-wide setback/bufferyard is less than required, and a four-foot-high masonry wall is also not provided. The applicant is requesting amendment to the Sector Plan Standard along this property line as well.

Along the southeastern property line, the adjacent property is improved with an office building. The building is angled on the lot due to the encroachment of the same swath of floodplain impacting Parcels B and C. At its closest point, the building is setback about 55 feet. The space between the property line and the building is improved with drive aisles and parking. Given the topography between the properties, providing a four-foot-high wall will serve no practical function. It would not screen a parking lot on Parcels B and C, nor would it screen the building. It would also not screen any views from Parcels B and C into the adjacent property. Therefore, waiving the requirement to provide the four-foot wall will not impair implementation of the sector plan in any way. Along the northern property line, the existing building is not in conformance with the D-D-O-Z standard and is itself a candidate for future redevelopment. The property sits on Parcel M which is directly across Harry S Truman Drive from the metro station. The northern property line of Parcel B is the closest point to the metro station. Requiring a setback based on an incompatible use which will likely be redeveloped will not benefit the development or the implementation of the sector plan. The adjacent building is not tall, and the units above the first floor will largely have views over the adjacent building. In the short term, providing landscaping along the first floor level should be the focus, primarily in the area where the buildings are closest. The landscaping proposed at this

location is appropriate for this purpose. Setting the building back further and/or providing a four-foot-tall masonry wall would not improve or enhance the proposed buffering. As a result, the applicant requests amendment to Bufferyard Standard F to reflect the building setbacks, buffers and landscaping proposed on the DSP. The alternative building setbacks and bufferyards proposed in this case will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the Sector Plan.

**Building Design**  
**Height, Scale and Massing**

**E. The average size of all multifamily dwelling units in a development project shall be a minimum of:**

- 1. 750 square feet for a 1-bedroom unit**
- 2. 1,050 square feet for a 2-bedroom unit**
- 3. 1,275 square feet for a 3-bedroom unit.**

**If the unit includes a den, the average minimum size increases by 100 square feet.**

**Comment:** The DSP proposes five different room types in order to serve a broad market as shown below:

| <b>Type of BR</b>      | <b>Studio</b> | <b>1 BR</b> | <b>1 BR/ w<br/>Den</b> | <b>2 BR</b> | <b>2 BR/w<br/>Den</b> | <b>Total</b> |
|------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| <b>Number of Units</b> | 20            | 224         | 41                     | 217         | 30                    | 532          |
| <b>Percentage</b>      | 3.8%          | 42.1%       | 7.7%                   | 40.8%       | 5.6%                  | 100.0%       |
| <b>Average size</b>    | 566           | 777         | 860                    | 1,106       | 1,197                 |              |

In accordance with Section 27-107.01(a)(23) of the Zoning Ordinance, in the definition of the term “Bedroom,” a “den” is categorized as another bedroom if it is intended to be a habitable room. Therefore, one-bedroom units with den are considered two-bedroom units, and two-bedroom units with den are considered three-bedroom units, according to the Zoning Ordinance. The one-bedroom and two-bedroom units in this application meet the minimum square footage of the D-D-O-Z standards, but the three-bedroom units do not meet the minimum square footage of the D-D-O-Z standards. The applicant also argues that there is no minimum size standard set up for the Studio units. An amendment request has been provided to allow the applicant to maintain the types and sizes of dwelling units proposed in this DSP.

The applicant in the Statement of Justification argues that subject site is located in the metro core area of Largo Town Center. More room types than the three specified in the sector plan have been provided in this DSP in order to meet diverse demands of various segments of the population that may be attracted to a transit-oriented community like this one. Historically in Prince George’s County, one-bedroom apartments and efficiency apartments have been encouraged. The bedroom percentage restrictions that apply in many zones, though not on this site, allow an unlimited number of one-bedroom and efficiency apartments and limit the number of two-bedroom or larger units to 50 percent, as stated in Section 27-419, Bedroom Percentages. In this DSP, one-bedroom and two-bedroom units account for more than 82 percent of the units. The only unit type that is smaller than 750 square feet is the Studio unit, which only accounts for 3.8 percent of

all units. In addition, according to the most recent newsletter of Bozzuto Construction Company, which is a leading multifamily builder in the Washington Metropolitan area and is ranked the 11<sup>th</sup> largest multifamily apartment builder nationwide, the average apartment size has shrunk to 866 square feet on average for the 4,100 units which Bozzuto currently has under construction, as a result of a several factors including demographic trends, unit mix, and of course, costs of construction. By providing more unit types than the D-D-O-Z standards call for with comparatively smaller unit sizes to meet various demands of the rental market, the subject application is consistent with the intent of the Largo Town Center plan. The Urban Design staff agrees with the applicant that more than 80 percent of the proposed units meet the D-D-O-Z standards, while less than 20 percent of the units have a smaller unit size that will reduce the rental cost for future residents. The alternative standards will benefit the development and the development district and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

8. **Zoning Ordinance in the M-U-I (Mixed Use-Infill) Zone and the Development District Overlay Zone (D-D-O-Z):** The M-U-I Zone was introduced in May 2001. The general purpose of the M-U-I Zone is to permit, where recommended in applicable plans, in this case the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas*, a mix of residential and commercial uses as infill development in areas which are already substantially developed. The DSP application has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-U-I Zone of the Zoning Ordinance as follows:

- a. The proposed residential and commercial/retail uses are permitted uses pursuant to the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* (M-U-I in D-D-O-Z, Use Table).
- b. The proposal is also in conformance with the applicable setback requirements for the proposed uses. Section 27-546.18 indicates that where an owner proposes a mix of residential and commercial uses on a single lot or parcel in the M-U-I Zone, the site plan as approved shall set out the regulations to be followed. For the frontages of the site along Largo Drive West, the D-D-O-Z build-to line standards govern. For Subarea 5, the D-D-O-Z build-to line range is 15–25 feet from the curb edge. An amendment has been requested to allow a larger setback in the range of 26-33feet due to the public utility easement (PUE). For other setbacks, D-D-O-Z site design Standard C specifically states that:

**To facilitate the intent to increase development intensity near Metro stations, the side and rear yard requirements specified in Sections 27-442, 27-462 and 27-546.18 of the Zoning Ordinance, and the minimum building setbacks specified in Section 4.7 of the Landscape Manual are waived.**

The DSP provides a 15-foot setback from the north and south property lines and thus satisfies the alternative standards.

- c. Section 27-548.25(b) of the Zoning Ordinance requires that the Planning Board shall find that the site plan meets applicable development district standards in order to approve a detailed site plan. As discussed in Finding 7, this DSP complies with most of the applicable D-D-O-Z standards except for the three standards as amended. Staff recommends approval of the alternative development standards because they will benefit the development and the development district, and will not substantially impair implementation of the sector plan.

- d. The application also requires a departure from design standards (DDS) because the applicant has provided parking spaces that are 9 feet wide by 18 feet long in the garage with a 24-foot-wide drive aisle instead of the required standard space of 9.5 feet in width by 19 feet in length with a 22-foot-wide drive aisle.

Section 27-548.25(e) of the Zoning Ordinance provides that if a use would normally require a variance or departure, separate application shall not be required, but the Planning Board shall find in its approval of the site plan that the variance or departure conforms to all applicable development district standards. In the justification statement, the applicant notes that current parking space dimensions in the Zoning Ordinance are for surface parking and do not factor in the issues unique to structured parking. The narrower parking space will enable the applicant to provide more spaces in the parking garage to better justify the expense of structured parking. The Planning Board in its previous approvals including structured parking space has several times found it acceptable to have smaller parking spaces in a parking garage as long as the dimensions of parking spaces such as the width and length of parking stall and the width of drive aisle meet the requirements of Guidelines for Parking Geometrics (by the National Parking Association). In this case the width (9 feet), length (18 feet) and drive aisle width (24 feet) are all within the permissible range of the standards.

Providing structured parking is highly encouraged in the Metro Core Area in accordance with the sector plan. The departures from parking and loading standards that reduce the width of parking spaces in the parking garage from the required 9.5 feet to 9 feet, length from 19.5 feet to 18 feet, with a 24-foot drive aisle are consistent with the intent of the sector plan. The departure is also in general conformance with the applicable D-D-O-Z standards. The Urban Design Section recommends approval of the departure from design standards to allow smaller parking spaces in the parking garage.

9. **Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Record Plat:** Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-79179 for Largo Center West covered 30.9 acres of land including Parcels B and C and was approved by the Planning Board on November 29, 1979. The final plat for Parcel B (NLP 115-35) was approved on December 27, 1982 and for Parcel C (NLP 135-69) was approved on November 13, 1987. Important conditions of approval attached to 4-79179 were carried forward as final plat notes.

None of the final plat notes is specifically related to the review of this DSP.

10. **Prince George's County Landscape Manual:** Section 27-548.23(d), Development District Standards, requires that landscaping, screening, and buffering of development shall conform to the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (Landscape Manual) requirements. Specific landscaping, screening, and buffering also may be required by the development district standards. Development district standards may require specific landscaping, screening, and buffering, but only to meet the goals of the development district and the purposes of the D-D-O-Z.

Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening Standards (J) (pg. 103) under the Site Design Section of the Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment explicitly states that Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6 and 4.7 of the Landscape Manual do not apply within the development district. Since the proposed uses are commercial and residential uses, the DSP is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements of the Landscape Manual.

- a. **Section 4.1 Residential Requirements**—The subject development is within the Developing Tier for multifamily residential use with a total of 39,000 square feet of green area provided. According to the requirements, a total of 25 shade trees is required. The Landscape Plan provides a combination of three shade trees, 70 ornamental trees and 28 evergreen trees that meet the requirements.
- b. **Section 4.9 Sustainable Landscaping Requirements**—In accordance with Section 4.9, a certain percentage of plants within each plant type (including shade trees, ornamental trees, evergreen trees and shrubs) should be native species (or the cultivars of native species). The minimum percentage of plants of each plant type required to be native species and/or native species cultivars is specified below:

|                  |     |
|------------------|-----|
| Shade trees      | 50% |
| Ornamental trees | 50% |
| Evergreen trees  | 30% |
| Shrubs           | 30% |

The Landscape Plan provides 69 percent, 81 percent, 30 percent and 59 percent native plants for all tree and shrub categories respectively to be installed on the site, which meets and exceeds the corresponding requirements of Section 4.9.

- c. **Section 4.6 Buffering Development from Streets**—The landscape plan also shows the site's conformance to the requirements of Section 4.6 and Section 4.7. However, since the D-D-O-Z standards that govern the development of this site specifically indicate that those two sections do not apply, the applicant should revise the landscape plan to remove the Section 4.6 schedule. However, the standards of Section 4.6 should still be used as a guide in providing the needed bufferyard. The Urban Design Section recommends a note be provided to state that the D-D-O-Z standards govern and indicating that Section 4.6 standards have been referenced as a guide in deciding the bufferyard between the Capital Beltway (I-95) and the rear of the two buildings.
- d. **Section 4.7 Buffering Incompatible Uses**—For Section 4.7, the applicant has provided a 15-foot-wide bufferyard and has requested an amendment to the D-D-O-Z standard that governs the landscaping between incompatible uses on the adjacent sites. The Urban Design Section agrees with the applicant's request for amendment of the standard. A condition has been included in the Recommendation Section to require the applicant to revise the Landscape Plan prior to certification.

#### 11. **Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance and Tree Canopy Coverage**

**Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet. There are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site, and there is a previously approved Type II tree conservation plan covering Parcels B and C.

- a. The subject property has an approved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI), NRI-118-12, which was approved on October 5, 2012. The NRI does not include previous encumbrances to the site which are the result of the use of the property as an off-site mitigation bank. The NRI must be revised to show those areas of the site which are subject to the Declaration of Conservation Easement and Covenants for Woodland Conservation Areas recorded at L. 11840 F. 226 for the benefit of Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-051-97.

- b. The previously approved TCPII for this site was for an off-site woodland conservation bank for TCPII-051-97 for 3.00 acres of afforestation within the 100-year floodplain. The forest stand delineation (FSD) submitted with the NRI indicates that the afforestation for off-site mitigation was successfully implemented. The TCPII will require revisions to delineate and label the off-site woodland conservation easements located on the subject property, and the woodland conservation worksheet must also reflect woodland conservation being provided on the site.

The revised TCPII indicates that the net tract area of 8.82 acres is subject to a woodland conservation threshold of 1.09 acres based on a 15 percent requirement in the M-U-I Zone. Due to the clearing of 1.32 acres of woodland on the net tract and 0.03 acre of 100-year floodplain, the total woodland conservation requirement for the site is 2.18 acres.

The plan proposes to fulfill the woodland conservation requirement for the site with 0.12 acre of on-site preservation and 2.06 acres of off-site mitigation credits. In addition, 3.00 acres of off-site woodland conservation provided for developing property in floodplain afforestation makes a total of 5.18 acres of woodland conservation provided.

The Type II tree conservation plan with the required revisions is in compliance with the environmental infrastructure recommendations and specific development district standards of the May 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas*.

- c. The Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance (TCC) came into effect on September 1, 2010. All activities that require a grading permit after September 1, 2010 must provide the tree canopy coverage (TCC) percentages required by Section 25-128 of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance. The required tree canopy for this site in the M-U-I Zone is ten percent of the site area or a total of 1.61 acres. The existing woodland on the site provides approximately 7.7 acres and the proposed landscaping accounts for 0.74 acres of TCC, for a total of 8.44 acres (approximately 52 percent of the site), which exceeds the requirement for the site.

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

- a. **Community Planning Division**—In a memorandum dated January 7, 2013, the Community Planning Division offered the following major determinations:
- Conformance with the 2002 *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*: This application is consistent with the 2002 Prince George's County Approved General Plan Development Pattern policies for mixed-use residential areas within the Developing Tier and does not violate the General Plan's growth goals for the year 2025 based upon a review of the Prince George's County's current General Plan Growth Policy Update.
  - Conformance with the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas*: This DSP conforms to the mixed-use residential development land use

*recommendation of the 2004 Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map  
Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas.*

The Community Planning Division also supported the amendment to the build-to line standard due to the presence of the mandatory public utility easement between Largo Drive West and the proposed buildings that results in a greater building setback from the curb than is required by the build-to line standard.

- b. **Transportation Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated January 2, 2013, the Transportation Planning Section stated that the site was reviewed as a preliminary plan of subdivision in 1979 and a traffic impact study was reviewed in accordance with the required findings at that time. All needed transportation improvements were made, and this site has been included as background development for all subsequent traffic studies in the area. No traffic-related findings are required under this review. The Transportation Planning Section also provided a review of all applicable D-D-O-Z vehicular access and circulation related standards and standards for parking and concluded that the standards are met. The Transportation Planning Section concluded that the subject application does conform to the approved subdivision plan and the applicable D-D-O-Z standards. Two minor issues were identified by the Transportation Planning Section regarding project name and a driveway at the eastern end of the site.

**Comment:** The applicant has changed the project name to the one used at the time of subdivision, i.e. Largo Center West, to eliminate any possible confusion with another nearby property. The driveway at the eastern end of the site leads to a trash chute room which is the collection place for household trash for that part of the building. The proposed curb cut is intended to facilitate the movement of a trash bin and is not to allow any vehicular access to the room.

- c. **Trails**—In a memorandum dated February 15, 2013, the trails coordinator indicated that both the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) and the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* (area sectional map amendment) include two master plan trail/bikeway recommendations that impact the subject site. The submitted site plan includes a widened eight-foot sidewalk along Largo Drive West. Stripped crosswalks are also indicated at all ingress/egress points. The site plan also includes standard sidewalks on both sides of the access drive between the two buildings, and a five-foot-wide sidewalk in the open space behind the buildings. A narrow sidewalk three feet in width is also proposed for a limited area of the site due to topographical constraints. The other master plan trail recommendation is for a pedestrian bridge over the Capital Beltway (I-95) that is still being studied for feasibility and is not closely related to this development. There is a master plan recommendation for bicycle parking as well. A condition that requires provision of bicycle parking in front of the proposed commercial/retail space has been included in the Recommendation Section of this report.
- d. **Subdivision Review Section**—In a memorandum dated January 30, 2013, the Subdivision Review Section provided a comprehensive review of all applicable conditions that were included as record plat notes that govern this site. The Subdivision Review Section concluded that Detailed Site Plan DSP-12025 is in substantial conformance with the approved Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-79179 and with the record plat subject to one minor revision. This recommended revision has been included as a condition of approval prior to certification included in this report.



- e. **Environmental Planning Section**—In a memorandum dated February 22, 2013, the Environmental Planning Section recommended approval of this DSP and the companion Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan TCP11-067-97-01 subject to conditions regarding the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI), Type 2 Tree Conservation Plan (TCP2-016-11), stormwater management and noise. The conditions have been incorporated in the recommendation section of this report.
- f. **Permit Review Section**—The Permit Review Section in a memorandum dated January 4, 2013, provided twelve comments on this DSP. The relevant comments regarding parking calculation, building height and number of stories, setbacks, floodplain delineation, handicapped accessibility of the proposed building and gross floor area (GFA) breakdowns for each use have been addressed by the applicant during the review of this DSP. Comments regarding dimensions of the drive aisles that have not been addressed have been incorporated into the Recommendation Section as conditions.
- g. **Prince George's County Health Department**—The Health Department in a memorandum dated January 4, 2013, provided eight comments on food sources including grocery stores and restaurants, noise, pedestrian access, light pollution, air pollution prevention, active recreational facilities, water conservation, community garden and mitigating noise and dust impacts during the construction of the project. The Health Department also asked for additional information regarding potential stormwater reuse.

**Comment:** The DSP proposes to collect the stormwater runoff from the site to irrigate the landscaping included in this proposal. The comments on food sources, community garden, and air pollution prevention are pertinent components of a master plan or a sector plan when larger area is involved, but they are not required findings for approval of a DSP. Those issues are beyond the scope of the review of a DSP as prescribed by the Zoning Ordinance. The DSP also provides pedestrian loop trails at the rear of the two buildings and recreational facilities within the courtyards. The recreational package provided meets the requirements. Full cut-off lighting fixtures will also be used in this DSP and will minimize any light spill over the adjacent property to the extent possible. Light pollution will be prevented to the extent feasible.

A phase II noise study has been required by the Environmental Planning Section prior to certification of this DSP to make sure that interior noise levels will be mitigated to be below 45 dBA Ldn. In addition, a professional engineer trained in acoustic analysis should also certify the proposed building at the time of building permit to ensure that the interior noise level is acceptable. Comments 7 and 8 from the Health Department on dust and noise reduction during the construction process have a direct impact on the health, safety, and welfare of the adjacent residents and will be addressed through conditions attached to the approval of this DSP.

- h. **Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—DPR in a memorandum dated February 21, 2013 recommended private recreational facilities including eight-foot-wide trails, exercise stations and picnic areas outside of the two buildings.

**Comment:** A private recreational facility package has been provided with this DSP to fulfill private recreational facility requirements for this development. Because the entire site is within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour line, the facilities in the package are either located within the buildings or within the courtyards enclosed by the buildings.

Additional private facilities such as a trail, picnic areas and an outdoor play field have been provided in the rear of the site facing the Capital Beltway (I-95) and are not counted toward fulfillment of the private recreational facility obligation of the site.

- i. **Prince George's County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—DPW&T in a memorandum dated January 7, 2013 provided a standard memorandum commenting on issues such as frontage improvement, sidewalks, street trees and lighting, improvement within rights-of-way, sight distance, site access easement, soil investigation, existing utilities relocation, storm drainage systems and facilities in order to be in accordance with the requirements of DPW&T. DPW&T further stated that the DSP is consistent with the approved stormwater management concept plan for the site.
13. Based upon the foregoing analysis and as required by Section 27-285(b)(1) of the Zoning Ordinance, the subject detailed site plan satisfies the site design guidelines as contained in Section 27-274 and represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines, without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use. In addition, as required by Section 27-285(b)(4) of the Zoning Ordinance, the Planning Board must also find that the regulated environmental features on a site have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirements of Subtitle 24-130 (b) (5). The DSP proposes to develop less than half of the total site area and to preserve the regulated environmental features in their original states and therefore fulfills this required finding for approval.

## 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 the application as follows:

- A. **APPROVAL** of the alternative development district standards for:

**Site Design, Building Siting and Setbacks**, Standard A to allow a build-to line of 26–33 feet (instead of the required 15-25 feet) due to the presence of a ten-foot public utility easement (PUE) between the proposed buildings and the existing curb of Largo Drive West.

**Site Design, Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening**, Standard F to allow 15-foot landscaped yard and building setbacks to be located at both the north and south boundary lines.

**Building Design, Height Scale and Massing**, Standard E to allow five unit types including Studio and to allow less than 20 percent of the units (including 3.7% of Studio units, 7.7% of 2-Bedroom units and 5.6 % of 3-bedroom units) smaller than the minimum bedroom sizes of the respective unit categories.

- B. **APPROVAL** of the departure from design standards to reduce the dimensions of parking spaces in the parking garage from the required 9.5 by 19 feet to 9 by 18 feet with a 24-foot-wide drive aisle.

C. **APPROVAL** of Detailed Site Plan DSP-12025 for Largo Center West, Parcels B and C, and Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII-067-97-01, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of this detailed site plan, the applicant shall:
  - a. Provide the general dimensions of the proposed building-mounted signs for the retail spaces on the first floor of the two buildings.
  - b. Revise the site plan to include a bicycle rack to accommodate the parking needs of a minimum of ten bicycles to be located convenient to the commercial spaces of the subject buildings.
  - c. Provide the following notes to be referenced on the detailed site plan:

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project will conform to construction activity dust control requirements as specified in the 2011 Maryland Standards and Specifications for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control.”

“During the demolition and construction phases, this project, will conform to construction activity noise control requirements as specified on Subtitle 19 of the Prince George’s County Code.”
  - d. Revise the TCPII as follows:
    - (1) Show the protection of 70 percent of the critical root zone (CRZ) of Specimen Tree ST-2 by revising grading to reduce impacts to the CRZ to less than 30 percent, the design and placement of the retaining wall to minimize impacts to the CRZ to less than 30 percent, and identify appropriate management techniques to maximize the potential for survival of the ST-2 tree and incorporate details and specification onto the plan sheets.
    - (2) Revise the type II tree conservation plan (TCPII) to incorporate any recommendations based on an assessment of off-site afforestation/reforestation provided on the site, and further revise the TCPII as follows:
      - (a) Remove the Tree Canopy Coverage Schedule from the TCPII, and place it on the Landscape and Lighting Plan.
      - (b) Add the TCPII number in the correct format and previous approvals to the approval block.
      - (c) Revise the woodland conservation worksheet to reflect the off-site woodland conservation being provided on the site.
      - (d) Add the notes and tables required for an off-site woodland conservation bank to the plan.
      - (e) Provide all details and notes necessary for the implementation of the TCPII including but not limited to temporary tree protection

devices, woodland conservation signage, planting requirements and details, edge management notes, and other techniques or requirements in accordance with the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Manual.

- (f) Delineate the off-site woodland conservation easement areas by metes and bounds on the plan and label by methodology and area.
  - (g) Add a separate graphic to the legend for off-site woodland conservation provided in afforestation, and use to indicate appropriate areas on the plan.
  - (h) Provide a root pruning detail and indicate areas where it will be used, wherever grading impacts the critical root zone of a specimen tree.
  - (i) Include a legend on all plan sheets.
  - (j) Include a woodland conservation table on each sheet, and provide a summary woodland conservation table on the details and notes sheets.
  - (k) Use the term “woodland retained – not credited” in the legend and on the plan sheets .
  - (l) Add the term “off-site woodland conservation in afforestation” to the legend and use on the appropriate plan sheets.
  - (m) A legend shall be provided on all plan sheets.
  - (n) Have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared it.
- e. Revise the delineation of the 100-year flood plain on the site plan to be consistent with that on the record plat.
- f. Provide dimensions of the drive aisles in the parking garage.
- g. Provide a breakdown of the number of parking spaces including size, type of parking spaces, and parking spaces for the physically handicapped to be in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).
- h. Provide a note indicating that under the Site Design Section of the 2004 *Approved Sector Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for the Morgan Boulevard and Largo Town Center Metro Areas* as stated in D-D-O-Z Landscaping, Buffering, and Screening Standards (J) (pg. 103), Sections 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 4.6 and 4.7 of the 2010 *Prince George’s County Landscape Manual* do not apply within the development district.
- i. Revise the Landscape Plan to remove the Section 4.6 schedule.

- j. Revise the Landscape Plan detail sheet to provide a full cut-off pole lighting fixture and specification sheet.
- k. Provide a Phase II noise study. If indicated by the requirements of the Phase II noise study, the architecture of the building may require revisions to accommodate required mitigation measures. Mitigation measures which require significant revision to the appearance of the architectural façade or change in materials may require approval by the Planning Board or their designee prior to certification of the architecture under review with the DSP.
- l. Provide a confirmatory declaration of covenants for the off-site woodland conservation bank to be recorded in the land records of Prince George's County which includes a metes and bounds description of the encumbered areas, and the liber and folio shall be provided on the approved TCPII plans.
- m. Provide information about how the proposed buildings have applied green building techniques to the extent possible, and have incorporated innovative environmental technologies in the building and site design for the subject property whenever possible. If none have been provided, a statement regarding why these techniques were not used shall be submitted.
- n. Address the condition of the on-site stream associated stream buffers as follows:
  - (1) A stream assessment of the regulated stream and associated buffers on-site shall be evaluated for physical degradation and opportunities for restoration through bioengineering techniques. A stream assessment along with appropriate photographic documentation shall be submitted to the Environmental Planning Section along with recommendations for stream restoration for this segment of the stream.
  - (2) The Environmental Planning Section in consultation with the Department of Public Works and Transportation shall identify what, if any, restoration efforts shall be addressed with the currently proposed development.
  - (3) A stream restoration plan, if determined necessary in the stream assessment, shall be approved prior to certification of the DSP, and implemented with the development activity proposed on this site.
- o. Revise the NRI and TCPII to show the existing easement encumbrance area for 3.00 acres of off-site woodland conservation provided as afforestation on the site.
- p. Record a confirmatory declaration of covenants for the off-site woodland conservation bank in the land records of Prince George's County which includes a metes and bounds description of the encumbered areas, and the liber and folio shall be provided on the approved TCPII
- q. Revise all pertinent plans to show the proposed location of all stormwater management features including outfalls that are proposed on the site.

- r. Submit an evaluation of afforestation/reforestation within the floodplain previously encumbered as an off-site woodland conservation easement for TCPII-051-97 to the Environmental Planning Section. The evaluation shall be addressed the following:
- (1) A delineation of the areas which are part of the recorded woodland conservation easement on the NRI and revised TCPII
  - (2) A careful evaluation of the area through detailed sampling to determine which areas have fully satisfied the definition of woodlands, which areas are successfully regenerating based on sampling, and what areas have failed to regenerate
  - (3) An evaluation of what on-site factors are impeding or preventing successful natural regeneration on the site
  - (4) Management techniques which could be used, such as change of species, which would provide successful regeneration on site
  - (5) A recommendation as to whether the 3.0 acres of afforestation/reforestation can be satisfied within the previously designated areas on-site.
  - (6) If the previously designated sites are deemed inappropriate for perpetual woodlands due to site conditions that cannot be altered or managed successfully, a determination of the quantity and an alternative location for afforestation/reforestation on the subject property.

The recommendation of this report shall be incorporated into the TCPII and implemented with the current development proposal.

2. Prior to the issuance of building permits for the structures on this site, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building plans stating that building shells of structures within prescribed noise corridors have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45dBA (Ldn) or less, and citing the Phase II noise study approved with certification of the DSP, or as revised in the future.
3. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits if required, along with evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.