

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Detailed Site Plans pursuant to Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on January 15, 2008 regarding Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 for Woodmore Towne Centre at Glenarden (Commercial), the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is for approval of a detailed site plan for 108 multifamily dwelling units, 705,227 square feet of retail, and 24,854 square feet of office space. Also included as a companion to this case is a departure from design standards DDS-591 for a reduction in the size of parking spaces for a portion of the property, and an application for alternative compliance AC-08036 for Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual.
2. **Development Data Summary**

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

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

4. **Surroundings and Uses:**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

On September 25, 2008, a hearing was held before the Prince George's County Planning Board and they approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 for the residential portion of the project,

including a community center and 204 single-family detached, 197 single-family attached, and 100 two-family dwelling units.

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

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

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

#### ARCHITECTURE

The plans include architectural elevations for the following buildings:

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

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

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

Behind Building A is the parking structure which appears to be fully enclosed by the façade and bulk of Building A. The east side of the main retail center block is occupied by Buildings B and C. Building B is proposed as a two-story structure that will provide in-line retail space at the

first floor, space for the City of Glenarden Community Center, and possibly a commercial fitness center. The building's exterior finish material is primarily brick at the first floor; brick and stucco are shown above the first floor in an alternating pattern. Behind Building B will be the five-story parking garage, the third through fifth stories of which will probably be visible above Building B.

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

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

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

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

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

Costco is also proposed as an independent big box retail pad site located west of the main retail center at the western edge of the project. The structure is approximately 34 feet in height and is 146,000 square feet of space. The building is located with frontage on Evarts Street and is not

integrated into the main street system of the town center. The exterior finish materials of the building comprise CMU, stone veneer, and EIFS.

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

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

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

7. **Zoning Ordinance Section 27-548:** M-X-T Zone regulations establish standards for the development in this zone. The detailed site plan's conformance with the applicable provisions is discussed as follows:

- (a) **Maximum floor area ratio (FAR):**
  - (1) Without the use of the optional method of development—0.40 FAR; and
  - (2) **With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

- (c) Except as provided for in this Division, the dimensions for the location, coverage, and height of all improvements shown on an approved Detailed**

**Site Plan shall constitute the regulations for these improvements for a specific development in the M-X-T Zone.**

This requirement is applicable to this detailed site plan.

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

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

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

The floor area ratio calculations for the development do not include the parking structures and the DSP complies with this requirement.

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

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

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

The site's compliance with this requirement was established at the time of the review of the preliminary plan of subdivision. The Planning Board determined that the plans need to be revised to clarify the number of lots, access, and the provision of public utility easements (PUE), which must be shown to comply with Subtitle 24. The Planning Board therefore added Condition 5(h). Applicant's Exhibit #12 establishes conformance with Section 24-128(b)(15).

- (h) Townhouses developed pursuant to a Detailed Site Plan for which an application is filed after December 30, 1996, shall be on lots at least one thousand eight hundred (1,800) square feet in size...**

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

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

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

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

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

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



possible.

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

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

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

Condition 3 of the detailed site plan ensures its enforcement.

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

This condition requires that a status report of the amount of approved development and the status of the corresponding transportation conditions be provided. The Planning Board found that each detailed site plan conforms to the staging requirements and that roadway improvements be designed to minimize the site's traffic impact on Lottsford Road. The status report was submitted at the Planning Board hearing as Applicant's Exhibit #15. The determination in the report that all improvements are under design is acceptable. With the improvements being constructed, there is a stronger reliance on directing traffic toward the MD 202/St. Joseph's Drive intersection with less reliance upon the use of Lottsford Road to access the uses on this site.

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

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

preliminary plans of subdivision. See *County Council of Prince George's County, Md. v. Dutcher*, 365 Md. 399, 780 A.2d 1137 (2001)

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

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

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

**900 to 1,100 residential units**

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**development of different types and their relationships and design.**

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

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

The subject detailed site plan encompasses the entire area shown on the conceptual site plan as Pod D. Development proposed in this detailed site plan conforms to the approved ranges in the CSP-03006 to insure future conformance with phasing requirements, this condition is carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement. See Condition 4 of this approval.

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

The subject detailed site plan encompasses the entire area shown on the conceptual site plan as Pod D. Development proposed in this detailed site plan conforms to the approved ranges in the CSP-03006. To insure future conformance with phasing requirements, this condition is carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement. See Condition 4 of this approval.

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

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

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

This condition is carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

- v. Permits for at least 150,000 square feet of office space shall**

**have been issued, prior to release of the 500th residential permit.**

This condition is carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

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

This condition is carried over to the approval of the subject plan to ensure its enforcement, since the subject application contains residential development.

- b. In order to expedite the construction of office uses, within 60 days from the final approval of the conceptual site plan by the District Council, the applicant shall enter into an agreement with a nationally recognized brokerage firm having expertise in the marketing of commercial office space. The applicant shall consult with and consider recommendations from local civic associations along the MD 202 corridor, as well as the City of Glenarden, in identifying and selecting this broker, although the final decision concerning which broker will be retained shall be exclusively a determination of the applicant. Once retained, the selected broker shall focus on attracting quality office users to the project. The broker shall provide monthly progress reports to the Prince George's County Economic Development Corporation, the City of Glenarden, and the District Council. The applicant shall also meet monthly with an advisory panel comprised of up to four designated representatives from the City of Glenarden, as well as up to four designated representatives from the civic associations along the MD 202 corridor in order to provide progress reports on marketing efforts and solicit input and suggestions concerning office marketing strategies. The brokerage agreement, reporting requirement and monthly meeting requirement shall remain in force and effect until no less than 250,000 square feet of office space is purchased and/or leased by an office developer. In lieu of entering into a brokerage agreement, within sixty days from the final approval of the conceptual site plan by the District Council, the applicant may directly enter into an exclusive agreement with an office developer in order to provide for construction of office uses within the project.**

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

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

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

This detailed site plan provides for all three of the uses required.

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

**The applicant shall be entitled to all proceeds which may result from any sale or construction which occurs as a result of this public/private venture.**

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

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

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

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

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

The application proposes signage for the subject site, and DSP-07057 provided signage for the residential portion of this site. The signage proposed for DSP-07011/01 includes an extensive signage proposal for both the freestanding signage and the building-mounted signage.

The signage plan was also submitted to the City of Glenarden. The Planning Board generally finds the signage plan to be satisfactory. However, the Board has required a further line of sight study to determine the needed height for the two freestanding signs currently proposed to be 60 feet and 75 feet in height. See Condition 27 of this approval.

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

This condition requires that the applicant submit a full traffic study at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision. This study was done, and includes two major intersections within or adjacent to the City of Glenarden. Further work was required at the time of the initial detailed site plan to perform a study showing the effects of the proposed connection between the project and Glenarden Parkway. This study was submitted June 29, 2007, during review of DSP-07011, and the findings were acceptable and consistent with the findings made at the time of preliminary plan. No transportation adequacy findings are required as a part of this detailed site plan.

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

The lighting associated with this detailed site plan is not under the purview of DPW&T because none of the streets in this portion of the development are public roads. The details and specifications for public roads were approved with the DSP for infrastructure (DSP-07011). The Planning Board found that the applicant should provide upgraded light fixtures and that full cut-off light fixtures should be used to minimize nighttime light pollution. See Condition 5(f) of this approval.

- d. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate access**

**areas, such as, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily development, and the office/retail development.**

The hardscape plans provide for what appear to be special paving areas within the town center. However, the graphics on the plans are not sufficiently legible to allow determination of which details are being utilized in the various locations. Therefore, Condition 5(a) was required.

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

Pedestrian connections are shown within the subject DSP, and the Planning Board has evaluated the internal connections (off the main infrastructure) in more detail, particularly with regard to pedestrian access through the major parking lots, and found the following additional connections included:

- a. Complete the sidewalks along both sides of Market Street (Sheet 14 and Sheet 21).
- b. Provide a sidewalk pedestrian walkway and crosswalk through the main parking lot immediately to the southeast of Costco connecting to the Wegman's store.
- c. Provide a sidewalk through the parking area immediately to the east of the main commercial core.
- d. Identify locations for bicycle parking throughout the retail component.

See Condition 5(d) of this approval.

The plan shows proposed bus stops along the first block within the town center along Towne Centre Boulevard from Ruby Lockhart Boulevard; however, no shelter has been provided on the plan. Prior to certification, the applicant should revise the DSP to show covered bus shelters with transparent side panels. The location and design of the bus stops shall be subject to WMATA approval. See Condition 21 of this approval.

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

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



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

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

time of building permit for Phase I, while improvement (i) was determined to be required with Phase II. Transportation adequacy findings are not required or appropriate part of the review and approval of a detailed site plan.

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

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

Road cross sections for all internal roads have been approved through Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006. Standard or wide sidewalks are included along both sides of all roads except for a portion of Market Street, and the widths have been generally adhered to except where the sidewalks have been reduced in some areas along Towne Centre Boulevard. Further, the CSP approved cross sections have been changed with this application, but appear to be an improvement over the original design, except for the loss of street tree planting along some of the pedestrian corridors and sidewalks on the plans. In areas where sidewalks have not been provided, sidewalks should be added and there is also a need for additional areas for street tree planting. Roads designated as "boulevards" have wide sidewalks and in some cases designated bike lanes. Additional shade tree planting within the parking compound areas and sidewalks is necessary. In order to address these issues, Conditions 5(b), (c) and (d) have been added to this approval.

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

Road cross sections for all internal roads have been approved through Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006. Standard or wide sidewalks are generally included along both sides of all roads; however, conditions of approval are recommended in order to provide a continuous pedestrian system along the two main streets within the development and to provide additional connections within the site to accommodate pedestrian movement. See Condition 5(d) of this approval.

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

Sidewalk facilities have been further evaluated during the review of the subject site plan in order to provide a safe and recognizable pedestrian system throughout the site. Condition 5 requires additional pedestrian systems within the site.

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

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

Therefore, the mitigated and unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contours should be shown on the plans and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards should be demonstrated. Conditions 8 and 9 of this approval requires this to be implemented at time of permit review.

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

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

**Detailed Site Plan Consideration:**

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

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

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

The Planning Board agrees with, and adopts, the applicant’s statement.

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

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

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

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

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

**infrastructure) within the subject property.**

This condition requires a traffic signal warrant study along with needed studies of lane usage and control for the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard. This condition is to be accomplished prior to submittal of the initial detailed site plan within the subject site. Through discussions with the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T), it has been determined that the needed studies were submitted as required by this condition. Rather than a roundabout, DPW&T has determined that a signalized intersection is appropriate at this location.

It has been determined that prior to the issuance of any building permits (not including infrastructure permits), the following improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, or (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's permit process, and have an agreed-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate agency at the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard:

- The south leg (northbound St. Joseph's Drive approach) shall have a minimum of four approach lanes, including dual left-turn lanes, and three receiving lanes.
- The north leg (southbound St. Joseph's Drive approach) shall have a minimum of three approach lanes and two receiving lanes.
- The west leg (eastbound Ruby Lockhart Boulevard approach) shall have a minimum of three approach lanes and three receiving lanes.
- The east leg (westbound Ruby Lockhart Boulevard approach) shall have a minimum of two approach lanes and two receiving lanes.
- Provision of signalization.

The Planning Board finds that these requirements are duly noted and will be enforced at the time of building permit issuance since transportation adequacy issues are not required or appropriate for the review of a detailed site plan.

- 6. The two crossings of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard over the environmental features on the site, as shown on the preliminary subdivision plan, shall provide for four travel lanes, five-foot bike lanes in each direction, and a five-foot sidewalk on each side. This shall be confirmed at the time of detailed site plan, and the right-of-way for Ruby Lockhart Boulevard shall be adjusted accordingly if necessary.**

The road cross section for the bridges was approved by DPW&T as part of Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011. They were revised by DPW&T to include a twelve-foot-wide

sidewalk/sidepath for bicycles and pedestrians, as opposed to designated bike lanes.

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

See Plan Comments below.

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

This condition establishes an overall trip cap for the subject property of 3,112 AM and 3,789 PM peak-hour trips. The trips associated with the current plan plus past approvals is summarized in a discussion below. However, it is noted that development is within the overall trip cap. While this information is noted, transportation adequacy issues are not reviewed as part of the approval of a detailed site plan.

A total of 705,227 square feet of retail space, 24,854 square feet of office space, and 108 residences are proposed by this plan. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 proposed 204 single-family detached residences, and 197 single-family attached and two-family residences, which was approved by the Planning Board. The table below is taken directly from the Preliminary Plan 4-06016 findings. It is adjusted to indicate the numbers associated with the current proposal and the previously-approved site plan. Internal and pass-by numbers are adjusted for differences between the plan as it stands if approved today and the ultimate proposal. Rows are added to indicate the overall trip cap and the Phase I cap. It is noted that the hotel component is yet to be realized along with the great majority of the office space. Also, approximately 40 percent of the residential component has yet to be proposed via a detailed site plan.

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

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

It is noted herein for the record that, in conjunction with a review of Condition 16(a)(vii) of Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006, the improvements required of the applicant, and the overall MD 202 corridor requirements, it was determined that the off-site transportation improvements required of this applicant were a sufficient contribution to the overall road program in the MD 202 corridor, exclusive of any additional pro rata fees. Condition 16(a)(vii) allowed the road club fee to be offset by the improvements established by Conditions 16(a)(i) through 16(a)(vi). The preliminary plan analysis on pages 37 and 38 of PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212 finds that the value of the proffered improvements exceeds the value of the pro rata fees that would have been collected. Therefore, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016 recommends no pro rata payment for



this overall site in conjunction with the satisfaction of the preliminary plan conditions.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The TCPI associated with the preliminary plan approved for this site showed the provision of bridges for the two stream crossings. The rights-of-way associated with the stream crossings are public roads which will be maintained by the Prince George's

County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T). In letters dated December 9, 2008 from Mr. Edward J. Binseel, P.E., an Associate Director with DPW&T and December 30, 2008, from Dawit Abraham, Associate Director with DPW&T, their department did not support the construction of the road crossings as public bridges that would require public maintenance. As a result, the construction of bridges is not an option.

Because the DPW&T is not allowing a bridge design, the plans were revised to show box culverts. The Planning Board found that culvert design is consistent with the required finding of Section 24-130(b)(5) of the Subdivision Regulations. The Planning Board also found that a bottomless culvert design should be considered and that this is also a viable option that is to be explored with staff from DPW&T and M-NCPPC.

At the Planning Board hearing, testimony was received from witnesses suggesting that the Planning Board should not approve stream crossings utilizing a culvert design as opposed to the previously-approved bridges. In response to this testimony, the Planning Board received testimony from its Environmental and Subdivision Section staff members. This testimony indicated that while the use of bridges had originally been proposed, the staff was recommending approval of the use of culverts in this instance as a compromise position between the Department of Public Works and Transportation, staff and the applicant. The applicant agreed to utilize a bottomless culvert if deemed appropriate by the Environmental Planning Section and the Department of Public Works and Transportation. A bottomless culvert has a natural bottom and does not restrict the flow of natural wildlife. The applicant had designed the plans to a construction standard which would not involve the construction of end walls by utilizing retaining walls which would have the effect of keeping most of the disturbance within the original approved right-of-way area.

Subdivision staff indicated that the original Planning Board approval of disturbance at the time of preliminary subdivision plan approval was not conditioned on use of a bridge for the crossing. Rather, the approval authorized the disturbance and the impact but did not specify any actual building materials for how the construction would occur.

The applicant presented testimony from a witness who testified that he had personally inspected the stream and in his opinion, the stream was in very good condition and that the use of the extensive culvert system being proposed by the applicant (two 10' by 6' culverts and two 10' by 5' culverts) was environmentally appropriate and would not result in an overall degradation to the environment. This witness also testified that a number of culverts had been used immediately downstream from the crossings being proposed in this project. The Planning Board found that the use of culverts in this instance was appropriate and that if deemed feasible, a bottomless culvert should be used. Condition 10 was added to this approval in order to address this issue.

In addition, as noted in condition 11, the applicant proffered to provide additional wetland credits above what is necessary to meet the requirements of the state and federal

wetland permit to mitigate the proposed impacts to the stream and associated wetlands. The Planning Board accepted this proffer as part of the approval of the application.

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

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

This condition will be addressed at time of final plat.

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

This condition will be addressed at time of permit review.

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

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

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

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

This condition will be addressed at time of final plat.

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

In order to address this condition, a Phase II noise study was submitted with DSP-07057. The noise study submitted for DSP-07057 for the residential portion of the property, north of the subject DSP, indicates that a portion of the property is located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Because residential dwellings are proposed off-site, and because the Phase I noise study indicated that noise mitigation would be provided on this portion of the overall property in the form of shielding from proposed buildings as well as retaining walls acting as fixed barriers, a revised noise study is needed for the overall site and the mitigation measures must be shown and accounted for on this plan. The plan must show the unmitigated and mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour as well as the mitigation measures. To address this matter, Condition 7 was attached to this approval.

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

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

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

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

#### **Private Access Easements**

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

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

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

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

**Subtitle 27.**

At the time of the hearing, the applicant submitted information from its transportation engineer, Applicant's Exhibit # 12 confirming that the requirements of Section 24-128(b)(15) are satisfied in this instance. The Planning Board agrees and adopts the said information.

**Plan Comments**

- a. The applicant should provide a clear exhibit of the required and existing easements on the property, including the 50-foot-wide water main right-of-way (ROW), which appears to be outside of the ten-foot PUE along the Capital Beltway. The easement locations and extent should be verified by the appropriate utility company prior to approval of the DSP.
  - b. The site plan should be revised to label all public and private rights-of-way, the center line, and ultimate ROW dedication. The preliminary plan indicated that right-of-way dedication would be to either the Town of Glenarden or DPW&T. That distinction should be made on the plan if appropriate.
  - c. Each sheet of the site plan should be revised to label each parcel and lot as approved with the preliminary plan of subdivision. For example, on Sheet 19, the land to be dedicated to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) should be labeled and the parcel designation with total acreage indicated on each sheet that the land extends onto. In order to determine conformance with the preliminary plan, the applicant should demonstrate that the proposed lotting/parcel pattern does not exceed the approved number. Access easements and the required ten-foot PUEs should be clearly shown on the DSP.
  - d. It is not clear how many lots the applicant is proposing within the commercial development. The plan does not provide for all of Lots 2 and 4, which appear to extend to the east.
  - e. Prior to signature approval, the applicant should revise the detailed site plan to demonstrate general conformance with the lotting approved with the preliminary plan, ensure an appropriate lotting pattern to accommodate the development proposed. The number of lots approved shall not exceed the number of lots approved with the preliminary plan for commercial development, and should be demonstrated. Condition 5(h) has been attached to this approval to address this issue.
11. **Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011:** The subject detailed site plan is in conformance with the previously approved detailed site plan for infrastructure that was approved by the District Council on October 10, 2007. The following conditions of approval warrant discussion:
2. **Prior to the approval of any future detailed site plans, impacts to the Patuxent River Primary Management Area and expanded buffers other**

**than those conceptually approved by the Planning Board with Preliminary Plan 4-06016, shall require a revised preliminary plan application.**

As previously discussed, the current application shows the use of a series of culverts to provide the road crossing for Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and a single culvert for the crossing of Evarts Street; however, the proposed grading necessary for the development is not shown. The net impacts for these culverts are significantly more than what was approved on the preliminary plan. As discussed earlier, the design results in an additional 21,779 square feet of impacts to the PMA. The change in design is a result of DPW&T's desire to have the crossings as culverts and not as bridges.

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

This condition was addressed in DSP-07011. This DSP revised the plan to remove the bridge design and proposed culverts, which the Planning Board found to be appropriate, however, Condition 10 requires the use of bottomless culverts if deemed appropriate by DPW&T and the Environmental Planning Section.

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

The previously reviewed noise study indicates that a portion of the review area for this DSP is located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. Because residential dwellings are proposed on-site, and because the report indicated that noise mitigation would be provided on this portion of the property in the form of shielding from proposed buildings as well as retaining walls acting as fixed barriers, the mitigation measures must be shown and accounted for on this plan. The plan must show the unmitigated and mitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour as well as the mitigation measures. Condition 7 addresses this issue.

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

The plans should be revised to show stormwater management pond landscaping on the DSP and the TCPII, as stated in Condition 2.

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

The TCPII shows a phased worksheet that has been updated to reflect the information pertaining to the current DSP. The design concept shows more clearing for the construction of the culverts than was previously approved. Condition 12 addresses this issue.

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

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

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

The Planning Board accepted the applicant's proposal and reviewed and approved the substitute signage located along the Capital Beltway.

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



The woodland conservation threshold (WCT) for this 244.63-acre property is 15 percent of the net tract area or 34.76 acres. The total woodland conservation requirement based on the amount of clearing proposed is 84.14 acres. This requirement will be satisfied with 24.52 acres of on-site preservation, 16.65 acres of off-site mitigation, and 43.38 acres of fee-in-lieu and/or as amended by Condition 12. The off-site mitigation has been met and the fee-in-lieu has been paid as part of the rough grading and infrastructure permit approval.

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

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

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

For clarity, the sheet index located on the coversheet needs to be revised to indicate the TCPII plan sheet numbers that are associated with the various DSP approvals. On the key map sheet, the plan needs to be shaded or hatched to indicate the area covered by the current DSP and the area covered by previous DSPs (similar to DSP Sheet 2). TCPII Sheet 20 previously showed a water line crossing the stream below the road crossing. The previously approved TCPII indicated the use of the jack and bore installation method for the water line. Sheet 20 needs to be revised to show the water line crossing and to provide the previously approved note regarding the installation method. The detail sheet needs to be revised. When the -01 revision to the TCPII receives signature approval, the TCPII approval block needs to be updated to include this signature information. After all of the revisions listed in Condition 12 have been made, the qualified professional who prepared the plan should sign and date it.

13. ***Prince George's County Landscape Manual:*** The detailed site plan is subject to the *Prince*

*George's County Landscape Manual*. Alternative compliance is requested from Section 4.2, Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip, of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* along the south side of Evarts Street, where a minimum ten-foot-wide landscaped strip planted with a minimum of one shade tree and ten shrubs per 35 linear feet of frontage is required to be planted. The applicant is requesting alternative compliance to this requirement because the application does not provide shade trees within the required ten-foot-wide landscape strip due to a retaining wall and the proposed construction techniques.

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

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

PROVIDED: 4.2 Commercial and Industrial Landscape Strip

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

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

more attractive and recommended that the sight-tight fence be replaced with a visually permeable railing. The Committee felt that the proposed combination of planting, within the right-of-way and landscape strip, makes this proposal equal to or better than normal compliance with the requirements of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual*.

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

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

The Planning Board adopted the conditions above with modifications as stated in Conditions 5 (l) and (m).

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

- a. **Transportation Planning Section**—Access to the site and circulation within the site are acceptable. A parking analysis, performed consistently with Section 27-574 of the Zoning Ordinance, is a part of the subject plan. The information in the analysis has been reviewed and it is determined to be generally reasonable. It is noted that the uses proposed would require 3,866 parking spaces if computed in accordance with Section 27-568. The analysis considers the fluctuation of demand during the day for parking, and computes a base requirement in accordance with Section 27-574 of 3,672 spaces. Reductions of a total of 271 spaces were considered to account for the following:
  - The likelihood of multipurpose trips (one vehicle accessing multiple commercial uses).
  - The likelihood of residents within the residential component of the use to not use automobiles to access nearby uses.
  - The likelihood of commercial patrons to arrive by means of transit via a shuttle bus from the Largo Town Center Station.

With the reductions, the total required parking would be 3,401 spaces. The applicant

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

The subject property was the subject of a 2005 traffic study, and was given subdivision approval pursuant to a finding of adequate transportation facilities made in 2006 for Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06016. Those requirements are being complied with. Further, this detailed site plan is not proposing any development not contemplated and/or approved as part of the preliminary subdivision plan. Transportation adequacy determinations are not required for detailed site plans. However, this detailed site plan is in conformance with the transportation findings made at the time of preliminary subdivision plan approval. Given that the basis for the preliminary plan finding is still valid and the preliminary plan finding was made less than six years prior, and in consideration of the materials discussed earlier in this report, the Planning Board finds that the subject property complies with the necessary findings of previous approvals.

- b. **Environmental Planning Section**—On September 21, 2006, the Planning Board approved the preliminary plan with conditions found in PGCPB Resolution No. 06-212. A Type I Tree Conservation Plan, TCPI/13/05, was included in the approval of CSP-03006 and underwent an -01 revision during the review of Preliminary Plan 4-06016. The Planning Board approved Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011 on July 19, 2007, for rough grading and infrastructure. A Type II Tree Conservation Plan, TCPII/053/07, was included in the approval of DSP-07011. The Board's conditions of approval are found in PGCPB Resolution No. 07-144. The Notice of Final Decision of the District Council for DSP-07011 is dated October 2, 2007. Detailed Site Plan DSP-07057 was approved for the development of the residential section of Woodmore Towne Centre with 204 single-family dwellings, 197 townhouses, and 100 two-family dwellings. An -01 revision to Type II Tree Conservation Plan TCPII/053/07-01 was included in the approval of DSP-07057.

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

The 141.8 acres covered on DSP-07011/01 is part of a larger 244.63-acre site in the M-X-T Zone, which is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of Landover Road (MD 202), and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). The entire site is approximately 94 percent wooded. Regulated environmental features are associated with the site including: streams, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, steep slopes with highly erodible soils, and

severe slopes. Landover Road (MD 202), future Ruby Lockhart Boulevard, a planned arterial road, and the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) have been identified as transportation-related noise generators and noise impacts are anticipated. Nine soil series are found to occur at the site according to the *Prince George's County Soil Survey*. These soils include: Adelpia, Bibb, Collington, Monmouth, Ochlochnee, Shrewsbury, Silty, Clayey Land, and Sunnyside. Although some of these soils have limitations with respect to drainage and infiltration, those limitations will have the greatest significance during the construction phase of any development on this property and will not impact the layout of the proposed uses. Based on available information, Marlboro clay is not found at this location. There are no designated scenic or historic roads in the vicinity of the site. According to available information from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, rare, threatened, and endangered species are not found in vicinity of the site. According to the *Approved Countywide Green Infrastructure Plan*, the site is not within the designated network. The site is located in the headwaters of Beaverdam Creek in the Anacostia River Basin; and also in the Bald Hill Branch and Southwestern Branch watersheds of the Patuxent River Basin. The site is also in the Largo-Lottsford planning area and in the Developing Tier as reflected in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan*.

- c. **Department of Parks and Recreation**—The following conditions of previous approvals are applicable to the above application:

Conceptual Site Plan CSP-03006, Condition 18 states:

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

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

Preliminary Plan 4-06016, Condition 25 states:

**The applicant shall make a monetary contribution of \$250,000 in 2006 dollars toward the reconstruction of athletic fields at Glenarden Community Center Park. The applicant shall make a first installment of \$60,000 for design, engineering and permit fees prior to February 1, 2008. The remaining balance of \$190,000 (or more if adjusted for inflation) shall be**

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

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

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

- d. **Community Planning**—The application conforms to the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern Policies for the Developing Tier. The application is in conformance with the land use recommendations of the *Approved Master Plan and Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* for mixed-use transportation-oriented development at this site.

The application is generally in conformance with the master plan recommendations for land use. The proposed street grid eliminates the industrial road (I-1) shown on the master plan, but we see no negative master plan impacts resulting from this change.

The development proposal does not contain a commitment to ensure that the applicant either builds the planned Evarts Street overpass across the Capital Beltway (I-495/95) or contributes funds toward the building of this critically needed master plan facility. Condition 2 of the preliminary plan of subdivision addresses the Evarts Street overpass. The overall development of the property is subject to this condition, which will require the construction of the bridge over the Capital Beltway. If the applicant, the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees or others acquire funding for the construction of that facility, the project can move forward beyond the trip cap established above. However, there is no requirement for incremental funding for the overpass construction. The existing and proposed traffic network was found to be adequate to support development up to this phase, so funding of the construction by the applicant or others to allow development beyond the trip cap is a private matter.

This detailed site plan does nothing which would prevent the Evarts Street connection from ultimately being made and the conceptual site plan (CSP-03006) and Infrastructure

site plan (DSP-07011) both show an alignment for the connection, in conformance with the Master Plan. Detailed site plan approval does not involve a transportation adequacy test. Construction and/or funding of the bridge is governed by a subdivision condition which is enforced through a limitation on the issuance of building permits. In any event, this detailed site plan does not propose development which would exceed the subdivision plan trip cap condition. In regard to the phasing to the community facilities and amenities, the conditions of the CSP relating to those conditions have been addressed through a revised condition of approval for this detailed site plan as discussed above.

- e. **Urban Design**—The site plan covers the entire land area associated with the commercial portion of this project; however, the structures that are proposed to be built pursuant to this site plan are only those for which architectural elevations have been provided. Many of the footprints shown on the site plan and the associated parking facilities are not accompanied by architectural elevations. Those areas of the plan must be resubmitted to the Planning Board, or its designee, at a later date for review of the architectural elevations and the surrounding site plan for that immediate area.

#### **Shade Trees**

The plans should be improved through additional attention to the elements that enhance the pedestrian experience such as streetscape, special paving areas accenting corners and crosswalks, additional vegetation such as shade or ornamental trees, where appropriate, and the addition of focal points. A staff exhibit was prepared and included in the back-up. The need for additional shade trees in the parking areas in both linear planting beds and in additional planting islands within the parking lots should be addressed. Provisions for these additional shade trees will impact parking spaces and may actually reduce the number of parking spaces ultimately provided on the site. Condition 5(c) has been added to address this issue.

#### **Lighting Fixtures**

The proposed pedestrian lighting fixtures for the development should be upgraded to a more decorative type than is proposed. The specifications show a plain pole in white that should be upgraded to a more decorative pole type. Condition 5(f) addresses this issue.

#### **Signage**

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

1. A four-sided, 75-foot-high by 30-foot-wide pylon sign located on the west side of the development near the Capital Beltway.
2. A four-sided, 60-foot-high by 25-foot-wide pylon sign located on the east side of the development near the Capital Beltway.

3. Four project identification clock tower entry features, 23 feet high by 12 feet wide, located within the three traffic circles on Ruby Lockhart Drive and the circle at Towne Centre Boulevard and Campus Way North.
4. Two identification vertical project entry features, 12 feet high by 4 feet wide.
5. A monument sign, 4 feet high and 7.5 feet wide, located at the entrance of the project at the intersection of St. Joseph's Drive and Ruby Lockhart Boulevard.
6. Other vehicular directional, parking identification, pedestrian directory, light pole banners, street names, service court identification, and directional and regulatory signage.

The signage proposed for the site appears to be of good quality. None of the freestanding signage proposes exposed poles. The height of the signage appears to be in keeping with the height of other signage for similar projects along the Capital Beltway. Condition 27 addresses the height of signage along the Capital Beltway.

### **Architecture**

The subject application includes architectural elevations for some of the buildings shown on the detailed site plan as indicated within the exhibits for this case.

After initial review, the staff determined that the architecture could be improved. After consultation, the applicant agreed and made numerous changes, most often resulting in the additional of brick in several locations. New architecture was submitted to the Planning Board and staff at the time of the hearing. Both the Planning Board and staff agreed the changes represented a substantial improvement. The Planning Board determined that the new architecture would serve as the design parameters and, pursuant to Condition 16 of this approval, the Board agreed that future architectural approvals for new retail building, revisions to approved retail architecture, and approvals which will result in LEEDS certified buildings, may be approved by the Planning Director as the designee of the Planning Board.

The Planning Board found that the following buildings could be improved beyond the Applicant's Exhibit #15:

**Building C** reflects the architectural design of the retail component of Building A, as described above, with CMU at the base and brick above, level with the windows. Above that area stucco is shown. The planning Board found that the plans should be revised to provide brick at the upper portion of the building to enhance that corner of the retail center. The south and north elevations should also be revised to substitute the stucco insets with brick or spandrel windows. Condition 17(1) addresses this issue.



**Building F** is the structured parking garage which will be visible over Building B from the east and will also be visible from the south between Buildings D and E until another anchor store is built behind those two buildings. The parking garage is proposed as precast concrete. The Planning Board found that in order to improve the appearance of the parking garage from these vantage points, the plans should be revised to incorporate an attractive finish material on the spandrels and columns of the parking garages, such as a combination of stucco and brick or an aesthetically similar product to produce a brick-like appearance. Condition 17(b) addresses this issue.

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

The Planning Board found that the elevation adjacent to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard should be improved with the additional of the stone veneer to the most eastern panel of the building above the proposed brick area. Any fire doors on these elevations should be removed or the color should be adjusted to blend with the color of the surrounding brick. Condition 17 (c) addresses this issue.

**Building K** is a pad site located outside of the main retail component, with frontage on both Market Street and Towne Centre Boulevard. The building, in this prominent location will be viewed from all four sides by visitors to the shopping center. The northeast elevation has a very attractive corner feature. The Planning Board found that the façade adjacent to Market Street should be improved to include additional masonry up to the tenant signage demarcation on the north elevation. The façade adjacent to Towne Centre Drive is acceptable. The south elevation should also substitute masonry where stucco is shown above the tenant signage demarcation and above the tenant signage panel on the store front located centrally. The west elevation should either be revised to provide a comparable attention to detail as the other façades or architectural elevations for the adjacent building to the west shall have been approved by the Planning Board or its designee. Conditions 17(d) and 18 addresses this issue.

It should be noted that the anchor for the main retail center is not included in the set of architectural elevations. Other architectural elevations for footprints of buildings shown on the plans have not been submitted, so prior to issuance of any building permits for

those buildings, the plans will be required to be reviewed and approved by the Planning Director as designee of the Planning Board.

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

- f. **The City of Glenarden**— The City generally supports the M-NCPPC staff recommendation as to the DSP, modified by the following conditions:
1. Prior to signature approval of the plans, additional information shall be shown as follows:
    - a) Revise signage plans to include on-site residential.
    - b) Revise guidelines to: reflect standards for future pad sites, hotel, office, and residential to include the same right of way and directional signage as currently shown on plans and encourage future user signs to be compatible with current user signage. It is understood that major future users may require their trade signage.
    - c) Revise guidelines to include seasonal signage.
    - d) The words “At Glenarden” should be Halo Lit on signs receiving that treatment on Woodmore Towne Center.
    - e) Precast Concrete base and culture stone for two monument signs should be same color(s), and texture(s) as used in the center of the retail strip, and in the major roadways traffic circles.
    - f) Sign plan to be revised to reflect site grade at base of signs. Evaluation of the height of the sign to be reviewed and approved by the City of Glenarden prior to signature approval of the DSP. FFE at Pylons- Primary pylon FFE= 176.00, Secondary Pylon FFE= 181.00.
  2. The Architectural plans are to be revised prior to signature approval to provide for a community/public service/ police substation space of at least 2500 square feet of floor space on the second floor of Building B with the following requirements:

- a) ADA access to space must be provided.
  - b) The space is to be finished, painted and carpeted, and is to have a kitchenette with a minimum of standard refrigerator, garbage disposal if allowed by law, microwave oven, counter top space with cabinets, and bathrooms.
  - c) Interior allocation of space between community center and police sub-station must be approved by the City of Glenarden at time of building permit review and approval of permit for Building B.
  - d) Space is to be complete at the use and occupancy of Building A.
  - e) Signage to be provided on Towne Center Boulevard at entryway to Building B with approval by City of Glenarden.
  - f) All plans are subject to City of Glenarden approval and permits for the space are to be applied for at or prior to Building Permit for Buildings A and B.
  - g) Use and Occupancy (U & O) to be issued simultaneously for Buildings A and B.
  - h) Designated spaces for police cars shall be provided at the front of Building B and at the 2<sup>nd</sup> story ramp.
3. The hardscape plans are to be revised and submitted to City of Glenarden for approval prior to signature by M-NCPPC.
- a) Provide covered Bus Stops with visible side panels.
  - b) Architecture for the shelters to be approved by the City of Glenarden,
  - c) Bus Shelter to be permitted in conjunction with adjoining roadway and completed prior to the release of bonds for construction of internal roadways.
  - d) All items are subject to approval by WMATA (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority); City of Glenarden to receive copies of all submissions to WMATA regards this matter.
4. The City otherwise supports the hardscape plans revisions and conditions recommended by M-NCPPC staff, particularly Staff Exhibit A.

5. Prior to signature approval the plans shall be revised to provide for a “Turning vehicles ahead” or like sign areas in which there is parking on the Ring Road, subject to approval of DPW&T as to type of sign and placement.
6. Samples of colored concrete, bricks and paints for approval of the City of Glenarden prior to signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan by M-NCPPC.
7. Traffic circles on this DSP are to be coordinated with traffic Circles on Ruby Lockard to use same type of paving materials for cross walks, and pavement in circle.
8. Landscape Plans to be revised to eliminate Bradford Pears. Plans are to be revised to reflect the tree lined drives as shown on the street cross sections with emphasis being placed on Market Street, Towne Centre Boulevard, and Ring Road. Shade tree maximum spacing for a 2 ½ “caliper tree is an average 35’.
9. Revise Plans prior to signature approval to reflect architecture for cart corrals. Cart corrals to be approved by the City of Glenarden prior to signature approval of the DSP by M-NCPPC.
10. The City supports the current Architectural Plans recommended by M-NCPPC staff.
11. Prior to signature approval by M-NCPPC provide fountain detail to City of Glenarden for approval for all fountains on site.

The Planning Board, with input from the City of Glenarden, modified the propped conditions. The modified conditions appear as Conditions 19 through 27 of this approval.

15. At the Planning Board hearing, testimony was received that suggested that the Board could not find conformance to the master plan. The “Employment Areas” chapter of the *Approved Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment for Largo-Lottsford, Planning Area 73* includes a number of policies regarding an area identified as Employment Area 3, of which the subject application is a part. Specifically, the final point requires that “Each Detailed Site Plan shall include a status report identifying the amount of approved development and status of corresponding required highway improvements.” The plan continues by recommending that “the Planning Board shall find the Plan is in conformance with the approved staging requirements.” It is noted that this requirement is almost identical in wording to Condition 5 of A-9613, and this condition was directly addressed in the Transportation Planning Section referral dated November 12, 2008. The Detailed Site Plan was accompanied by a report indicating the amount of approved development along with the status of the required highway improvements. It was found by the Planning Board that the application conformed to the condition, and that the site plan would be in conformance with the approved staging requirements established under the Conceptual Site Plan and the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and to the specific employment area policies outlined in the underlying master plan.

At the hearing, testimony was also provided indicating that the Largo-Lottsford Master Plan Circulation and Transportation Goal and Objectives had not been satisfied. That is incorrect. Most of the testimony provided concerning the Circulation and Transportation Objectives has no application to a detailed site plan. Master Plan and General Plan provisions are mere guides absent implementing authority to the contrary. The required findings for an approval of a detailed site plan do not require findings on this issue. Findings regarding transportation adequacy were made during the preliminary subdivision plan approval for this project. The approval of a detailed site plan is not the appropriate time to analyze such adequacy issues.

Testimony was also received concerning conformance to the 2002 General Plan. Once again, the Community Planning Division in its referral memorandum noted that the property is in the Developing Tier pursuant to the 2002 General Plan. Land located in the Developing Tier is contemplated for development. The Community Planning Division specifically found that this detailed site plan is not inconsistent with the General Plan policies for the Developing Tier. It should also be noted that the property is located at a major Beltway interchange where significant transportation improvements will be constructed. The area is a hub of development activity. Further, the property itself has been designated for high-intensity mixed-use development since 1988 when it was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone. The Planning Board finds that the development being proposed conforms with the development patterns and recommendations contemplated by the General Plan.

Testimony was also received indicating that a finding should be made relative to the environmental infrastructure objective that the Developing Tier should meet or exceed the forest and tree cover goal of 38 percent by 2025. There is no requirement within the Zoning Ordinance that such a finding be made at the time of detailed site plan approval. The testimony was given within the context of an objection being registered to the approval of a fee-in-lieu payment for tree conservation. However, that determination was made at the time of preliminary subdivision plan approval for this project and is not the subject of review at the time of detailed site plan approval.

Specific testimony was also received concerning a development pattern General Plan objective to capture less than 66 percent of the County's dwelling unit growth by 2025 within the Developing Tier. Again, there is no requirement that a finding be made as to this specific percentage designation within the context of an individual detailed site plan approval.

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

There are numerous facts contained in the record which support these findings, including:

- a. The detailed site plan is in general conformance with the approved conceptual site plan. The conceptual site plan showed a retail commercial town center development concept.

For the most part, the conceptual site plan showed the town center area being located west and south of the residential portion of the project. The town center had a main street concept which has been faithfully reproduced on the detailed site plan. The conceptual site plan included storefront retail units oriented along an internal grid street system. Big box anchors were shown oriented along the Beltway frontage of the property. Parking was proposed in both parking structures and surface parking. Pad sites were also proposed. The detailed site plan incorporates all of these design techniques. In addition, generous landscaping and pedestrian access points were proposed in the conceptual site plan and those items have been provided on the detailed site plan.

- b. The detailed site plan also conforms to the site design guidelines for site plans set forth in Section 27-274. In particular, parking and interior circulation roads have been designed in such a manner so that safety for both vehicles and pedestrians will be preserved. The visual impact of a substantial number of parked cars will be minimized through the provision of parking structures on site in addition to surface parking.
- c. Large expanses of pavement have, to a large extent, been avoided by the provision of extensive landscaping, green areas and the installation of street trees. Loading areas associated with the town center have been sensitively located so as to avoid direct views. Also, provision has been made, where appropriate, for screening of loading areas both from the view of patrons and from motorists along the Capital Beltway.
- d. Lighting will be adequate to provide for safe illumination for motorists and pedestrians. Also, light intrusion will be kept to a minimum.
- e. Viewsheds into the site will be visually pleasing due to the combination of attractive architecture, sensitive siting of buildings, and the provision of green areas including shade trees.
- f. Numerous pedestrian connections have been proposed throughout the town center in order to safely convey pedestrians and visitors to the town center from one use to another. Streetscape design has been maximized through the sensitive use of light fixtures, street trees and sidewalks.
- g. The architecture which is being proposed incorporates interesting design elements while avoiding repetition. The overall architecture proposes a sensitive blending and mixing of brick, stone, stucco and some EIFS. Attention has been given to details including window treatments, cornice treatments, and changes in horizontal elevation. In total, the architecture, as amended, proposes the use of high-quality building materials including brick, stone, concrete, stucco, EIFS and other architectural treatments which will provide a retail center which will create visual interest and a sustaining vitality.
- h. In total, the site plan has been designed so as to foster the purposes and goals of the M-X-T Zone.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that pursuant to Subtitle 27 of the Prince George's County Code, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission adopted the findings contained herein and APPROVED the Type II Tree Conservation Plan (TCPII/053/07-02) and APPROVED Alternative Compliance AC-08036, and further APPROVED Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011/01 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to the issuance of any permits which impact jurisdictional wetlands, wetland buffers, streams, or Waters of the U.S., the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.
2. The applicant shall propose enhanced landscaping and fencing (with safety considerations) around the stormwater management pond to DPW&T for their review and approval. Prior to submission to DPW&T, the applicant shall review the enhanced landscaping and fencing proposal with the Urban Design Section.
3. All buildings shall be fully equipped with automatic fire suppression systems in accordance with applicable National Fire Protection Association standards and all applicable County laws.
4. The following phasing schedule shall apply to the development of the subject site:
  - a. Prior to the release of the 151<sup>st</sup> residential building permit for Pod F as shown on the CSP-03006 , permits for 100,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued. Of this 100,000 square feet of retail space, at least one-third shall be for tenants occupying space consisting of 30,000 square feet or less.
  - b. Prior to the release of the 301<sup>st</sup> residential building permit for Pod F as shown on the CSP-03006 , permits for an additional 100,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued.
  - c. Prior to the release of building permits for the 393<sup>nd</sup> residential building permits for Pod F as shown on the CSP-03006 or prior of the issuance of permits for the 500<sup>th</sup> residential unit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), a minimum of 108 residential units located within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued.
  - d. Prior to the release of building permits for the 701<sup>st</sup> residential unit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for an additional 150,000 square feet of retail space within the land area of the subject DSP shall have been issued, and a permit shall have been issued for one of the hotel sites.

- e. Prior to the release of building permits for the 500<sup>th</sup> residential unit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for at least 150,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued.
- f. Prior to the release of building permits for the 900<sup>th</sup> residential unit for the overall site (the entire 244.67-acre Woodmore Towne Centre site), permits for at least 400,000 square feet of office space shall have been issued.

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

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

- 5. Prior to signature approval of this detailed site plan, the following revisions shall be made:
  - a. Special paving materials shall be provided for the sidewalks at the corners associated with the traffic circles within the development.
  - b. Shade trees shall be provided along the sidewalks adjacent to the retail areas of Towne Centre Boulevard and Market Street and shall be placed, 35 feet on center, on average in a minimum four-foot-wide by five-foot-long planting box. Columnar varieties shall be used where necessary.
  - c. Shade trees shall be added within parking compounds along all pedestrian routes in a continuous four-foot-wide linear planting bed or individual tree planting areas of a minimum size of four-foot-wide by five-foot-long parallel to the sidewalks along Towne Centre Boulevard, Market Street, and any other major drive on the site, where parking and/or a drive aisle is located directly on both sides of the sidewalk. This requirement shall not apply in areas where installation of the shade trees would conflict with stormwater management facilities.
  - d. Sidewalks and crosswalks, as shown on Staff Exhibit A and as modified below, as follows:



- (1) Provide continuous sidewalks along both sides of the entire length of Market Street, including an extension of the sidewalk system to the east.
  - (2) Provide a sidewalk/pedestrian walkway through the parking lot immediately to the southeast of Costco connecting to the Wegmans store.
  - (3) Provide a sidewalk through the parking lot immediately to the east of the main commercial core.
  - (4) Mark and label the locations for bicycle parking throughout the retail component of the Woodmore Towne Centre.
  - (5) All crosswalks, as shown on Staff Exhibit A, shall be colored concrete pavers.
- e. All retaining wall details shall be revised to reflect the details and specifications shown on Detailed Site Plan DSP-07011.
- f. Provide alternative lighting fixtures acceptable as upgrade, by the City of Glenarden and the Urban Design Section. The lighting plan shall indicate the use of full cut-off light fixtures to minimize light pollution.
- g. The applicant shall provide a clear exhibit of the required and existing easements on the property, including the 50-foot-wide water main right-of-way which appears to be outside of the ten-foot PUE along the Capital Beltway (I-495/95). Public utility easement locations and extent shall be verified by the appropriate utility company prior to certification of the DSP.
- h. Revise the detailed site plan to demonstrate general conformance with the lotting approved with the preliminary plan, ensure an appropriate lotting pattern to accommodate the development proposed, and demonstrate conformance to Section 24-128(b)(15) for the use of access easements. The number of lots approved shall not exceed the number of lots approved with the preliminary plan for commercial development.
- i. Label all public and private rights-of-way, the center line, and the ultimate right-of-way.
- j. Label each proposed parcel and/or lot with ownership and acreage indicated on each sheet that the land extends onto.
- k. The sight-tight fencing along the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a visually permeable railing so that the plant materials at the top of the wall will be visible from Evarts Street.
- l. A portion of the 369 cherry laurels proposed at the top of the retaining wall shall be revised to a low maintenance weeping shrub that will cascade over the edge of the

retaining wall, where appropriate.

- m. The plans shall be revised to incorporate a vegetative screen along the rear of the Wegmans pad site and an opaque, natural color, non-wood fence around the loading area associated with the Costco pad site in order to screen the loading areas from the views from the Capital Beltway, if determined to be necessary by additional line-of-sight studies.
6. If, after the pad sites labeled as Costco and Wegman's on the subject DSP are built, the rear loading areas associated with said buildings are visible from the Capital Beltway, then additional screening shall be added to the site, such as those stated in Condition 5(m) above, or other screening techniques acceptable to the Planning Board or its designee.
7. Prior to signature approval of the DSP, a Phase II noise study for the overall site of the Conceptual Site Plan, CSP-03006, which has been signed and dated by the engineer who prepared it shall be submitted. This study shall address the specific site features of the current DSP application.
8. Prior to signature approval of the DSP, the TCPII and a separate sheet within the DSP shall show the mitigated and unmitigated 65 dBA Ldn noise contour and the mitigation techniques used to meet the state noise standards. The layout of the features on the subject DSP and the noise study shall be consistent.
9. Prior to the release of building permits for residential buildings located within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, a certification by a professional engineer with competency in acoustical analysis shall be placed on the building permit stating that building shells of structures within the prescribed noise corridor have been designed to reduce interior noise levels to 45 dBA Ldn or less.
10. Prior to certification of the DSP and TCPII, the plans and all relevant information shall be evaluated to ensure that the design of the stream crossings have resulted in the minimization of impacts to the fullest extent possible. The use of bottomless culverts shall be considered by the Environmental Planning Section and the department of Public Works and Transportation.
11. Prior to issuance of the first building permit associated with this detailed site plan, the applicant shall provide evidence that wetland mitigation credits, above that required by all state and federal permits, have been secured. The wetland credits shall cover a minimum of 21,779 square feet and priority given to wetlands within Prince George's County, if available.
12. Prior to certificate approval of DSP-07011/01, the TCPII shall be revised as follows:
  - a. Show all existing and proposed utilities and associated easements, including, but not limited to, stormwater management, stormdrain, and water and sewer structures.
  - b. Revise the LOD to account for utility installation and all newly proposed impacts.

- c. Revise all woodland conservation areas to account for additional clearing due to proposed utility installation and all newly proposed impacts.
  - d. Revise the worksheet as necessary to reflect revisions to woodland conservation areas due to the proposed location of utilities and all newly proposed impacts.
  - e. Show critical root zones for all specimen trees and tree protection fence/signs for the trees slated to remain (Trees 1, 16, and 18).
  - f. Clearly identify and label all woodland conservation areas on each sheet.
  - g. Provide labels on each sheet for all existing and proposed roads.
  - h. Show all proposed grading and infrastructure necessary for culvert installation consistently on both the TCPII and the DSP.
  - i. On the coversheet, list the TCPII sheet numbers associated with the various DSP plan approvals for the site by providing the following additional information under the sheet index heading:
    - (1) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07011/01
    - (2) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07011 (the park property)
    - (3) TCPII detail sheet numbers
    - (4) TCPII plan sheet numbers for DSP-07057
  - j. On the key map sheet provide shading or hatching to indicate the area covered by current and previous detailed site plans (similar to DSP Sheet 2).
  - k. The plans shall be revised to show the waterline to be placed within the right-of-way of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard
  - l. On the detail sheet(s), provide the following:
    - (1) Specimen tree preservation sign detail
    - (2) Edge management notes
  - m. When the -01 revision to TCPII/053/07 receives signature approval, the approval information shall be typed-in on the TCPII approval block.
  - n. After all these revisions have been made, have the qualified professional who prepared the plan sign and date it and update the revision box with a summary of the revision.
13. Construction of the park shall be completed prior to the issuance of building permits for 50 percent of residential dwelling units including single-family and multifamily dwelling units on

the entire site.

14. Prior to signature approval, the elevations for the freestanding clock tower proposed to be located at the intersection of Ruby Lockhart Boulevard and campus Way North shall be revised to delete the self contained fountain.
15. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to provide the details and specifications of a fountain to be located at the intersection of Market Street and Towne Centre Boulevard for approval by the Urban Design Section and the Town of Glenarden.
16. The architectural elevations as approved shall constitute the established design and review parameters that will serve as the basis for review of subsequent revisions to the DSP for future retail buildings (including banks), but not including hotel or offices may be approved by the Planning Director as designee of the Planning Board. Revisions which result in a LEEDS certified building may also be approved by the Planning Director as designee of the Planning Board.
17. Prior to signature approval, the architectural plans shall be revised as follows:
  - a. **Building C** shall be revised to provide brick at the upper portion of the building to enhance that corner of the retail center. The south and north elevations shall be revised to substitute the stucco inset located at the pedestrian level with brick or spandrel windows.
  - b. **Building F**, the parking garage, shall be revised to incorporate an attractive finish material of stucco and brick or an aesthetically similar product to produce a brick-like appearance on the spandrels and columns of the parking garages in the areas of the structure that will be visible and not concealed by other buildings.
  - c. **Best Buy** - The elevation adjacent to Ruby Lockhart Boulevard shall be revised to indicate the addition of stone veneer on the most eastern panel of the building above the proposed brick area. Fire doors on these elevations shall be removed or the color should be adjusted to blend with the color of the surrounding brick. The plans shall be revised as above and as shown on Applicant's Exhibits. (get numbers from Joyce)
  - d. **Building K** shall be revised to indicate that the façade adjacent to Market Street shall include additional masonry up to the tenant signage demarcation. The south elevation shall substitute masonry where stucco is shown on the plan up to the tenant signage demarcation and above the tenant signage panel on the store front located centrally.
18. Prior to the issuance of the use and occupancy permit for Building K, either the architectural elevations for the adjacent building to the west shall have been approved by the Planning Board or it's designee, or the applicant shall have submitted elevations for the west façade for Building K that provides a comparable amount of attention to detail as the other facades.

19. Prior to signature approval of the plans, additional information shall be shown as follows:
  - (a) Revise plans to include on-site residential signage.
  - (b) Revise guidelines to: reflect standards for future pad sites, hotel, office, and residential to include the same right of way and directional signage as currently shown on plans and encourage future user signs to be compatible with current user signage. It is understood that major future users may require their trade signage.
  - (c) Revise guidelines to include seasonal signage.
  - (d) The words "At Glenarden" should be Halo Lit or face lit on signs receiving that treatment on Woodmore Towne Center.
  - (e) Precast Concrete base and culture stone for two monument signs should be same color(s), and texture(s) as used in the center of the retail strip, and in the major roadways traffic circles.
  
20. The architectural plans are to be revised prior to signature approval to provide for a community/public service/police substation space of at least 2,500 square feet of floor space on the second floor of Building B with the following requirements:
  - a) ADA access to space must be provided.
  - b) The space is to be finished, painted and carpeted, and is to have a kitchenette with a minimum of standard refrigerator, garbage disposal if allowed by law, microwave oven, counter top space with cabinets, and bathrooms.
  - c) Interior allocation of space for each use (community center and police sub-station) must be approved by the City of Glenarden at time of building permit review and approval of permit for Building B.
  - d) Space is to be complete at the use and occupancy of Building A and B.
  - e) Signage to be provided on Market Street at entryway to Building A with approval by City of Glenarden.
  - f) All plans are subject to City of Glenarden approval and permits for the space are to be applied for at or prior to issuance of a Building Permit for Buildings A and B.
  - g) Use and Occupancy (U & O) for the 2,500 square feet (community center and police station) shall be applied for simultaneously with use and Occupancy permits for Buildings A and B.

- h) Designated spaces for police cars shall be provided at the front of Building A and at the 2<sup>nd</sup> story ramp.
21. The hardscape plans are to be revised and submitted to City of Glenarden for approval prior to signature by M-NCPPC.
- a) Provide covered Bus Shelters with transparent side panels.
  - b) Architecture for the shelters to be approved by the City of Glenarden,
  - c) Bus Shelter to be permitted in conjunction with adjoining roadway and completed prior to the release of bonds for construction of internal roadways.
  - d) All items are subject to approval by WMATA (Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority); City of Glenarden to receive copies of all submissions to WMATA regarding this matter.
22. Prior to signature approval, the plans shall be revised to provide for a “Turning vehicles ahead” or like signage where there is parking along the ring-road subject to approval of DPW&T as to type of sign and placement.
23. Applicant to provide samples of colored concrete, bricks and paints for approval of the City of Glenarden prior to signature approval of the Detailed Site Plan by M-NCPPC.
24. Traffic circles on this DSP are to be coordinated with traffic Circles on Ruby Lockhart to use same type of paving materials for cross walks, and pavement in circle.
25. Landscape Plans to be revised to eliminate Bradford Pears. Plans are to be revised to reflect the tree lined drives as shown on the street cross sections with emphasis being placed on Market Street and Towne Centre Boulevard. Shade tree maximum spacing for a 2 ½ “caliper tree is an average of 35’ on center.
26. Revise the plans prior to signature approval to reflect architecture for cart corrals. Cart corrals to be approved by the City of Glenarden prior to signature approval of the DSP by M-NCPPC.
27. Prior to certification, the applicant shall prepare a line-of-sight study to determine the extent to which the 60-foot high and 75-foot high freestanding signs are visible above the tree line. If signs less than 60 feet and 75 feet in height, respectively will provide adequate identification, the height of the signs will be adjusted accordingly. If not, the sign will remain 60 feet or 75 feet in height, as appropriate.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that an appeal of the Planning Board’s action must be filed with the District Council of Prince George’s County within thirty (30) days following the final notice of the Planning Board’s decision.

\* \* \* \* \*

This is to certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the action taken by the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission on the motion of Commissioner Squire, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Squire, Clark, Cavitt, Vaughns and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, January 15, 2009, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 29th day of January 2009.

Oscar S. Rodriguez  
Executive Director

By Frances J. Guertin  
Planning Board Administrator

OSR:FJG:SL:bjs