THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION

14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
TTY: (301) 952-4366
www.mncppc.org/pgco

PGCPB No. 11-62 File No. CDP-1001

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Prince George's County Planning Board is charged with the approval of Comprehensive Design Plans pursuant to Part 8, Division 4 of the Zoning Ordinance of the Prince George's County Code; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on June 16, 2011, regarding Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-1001 for Edwards Property the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request**: The request in this case is for construction of 22,288 square feet of retail development in a visually-integrated, 13,013-square-foot freestanding pharmacy and a 9,275-square-foot two-tenant building on approximately 4.14 acres in the L-A-C Zone.

2. **Location**: The subject project is located on a triangular piece of land bounded by Riggs Road (MD 212) to the south, Edwards Way to the west, and Adelphi Road to the east.

3. **Surroundings**: Across the respective rights-of-way identified above are located: Metzerott Plaza shopping center to the south, George Washington Memorial Cemetery and a church to the northeast, and multifamily residential land use to the west.

4. **Development Data—**

| | EXISTING | APPROVED |
|---|---|---|
| Zone | L-A-C | L-A-C |
| Gross tract area | 4.14 acres | 4.14 acres |
| Area within the 100-year floodplain | 0.48 acre | 0.48 acre |
| Net tract area | 3.67 acres | 3.67 acres |
| Variance | No | Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) |

5. **Design Features**: The CDP proposes a 22,288-square-foot retail development, including a 13,013-square-foot freestanding CVS drug store and a 9,275-square-foot two-tenant building connected by a drive-through architectural archway, which would connect the two buildings on the second story. Though the applicant has provided illustrative drawings of the proposed architecture and site details, these items will be approved later by the Planning Board in the specific design plan phase of the project.

   The plan proposes two vehicular access points to the site, one from Adelphi Road and one from Riggs Road (MD 212). Parking for the project is located on three sides of the building, along the Riggs and Adelphi road frontages and on the right side of the building, adjacent to a landscaped area at the intersection of Edwards Way and Adelphi Road. A focal feature is provided for the project at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road including enhanced landscaping, a trellis, and two brick wall features flanking a sign that reads "Welcome to Adelphi."

The wall motif utilized in the focal feature is continued around the site in a specialized streetscape treatment. More particularly, two streetscape treatments are proposed: "Streetscape A" and "Streetscape B." Streetscape A is proposed for either side of the community focal feature at the intersection of Riggs and Adelphi Road, along Riggs Road to the vehicular entrance to the project, and along Adelphi Road for approximately the same distance. Streetscape A is defined as a decorative wall including masonry piers, a knee wall with a fence on top of it, and a linear hedge with perennial plantings. Streetscape B is identified for the project's Edwards Way road frontage. It is a vegetated buffer specified to include a diversity of plant types of seasonal interest. Streetscape B is specified from that point where Streetscape A ends then along Adelphi Road, extending to that point where a monument sign is indicated at the edge of the vehicular access to Adelphi Road. Streetscape B is defined to include a knee wall, benches, and decorative light fixtures. The remainder of the Adelphi Road frontage (to its intersection with Edwards Way) and that portion of the frontage extending from the western side of the vehicular entrance to Riggs Road to the intersection of Riggs Road and Edwards Way are specified as Streetscape C, defined to include brick masonry piers (11 along Adelphi Road and 8 along Riggs Road) and a linear hedge. Approximately 21 decorative pedestrian-scale light fixtures (eight along Adelphi Road, six along the Edwards Way frontage, and eight along the Riggs Road frontage), four benches (one at the corner of Adelphi and Riggs Road, one to the south, and two to the north of the vehicular entrance to the site from Adelphi Road) and two bus stops (one on the Riggs Road frontage and one on the Adelphi Road frontage) are provided as part of the streetscape.

6. **Approval History and other Pending Applications:** The site is the subject of approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 2925-2005-01, dated April 2, 2008 and reapproved on March 18, 2010. Basic Plan A-9954 was approved for the project and, subsequently, its approval was formalized by the adoption of PGCPB Resolution No. 02-102 on September 9, 2004. Also in the approval history for the project are Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-06029, which was withdrawn on May 20, 2008, and Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-0502, which was withdrawn January 29, 2009. In addition, Preliminary Plan of Subdivision 4-10019 was approved at the same Planning Board meeting as the subject comprehensive design plan and Specific Design Plan SDP-1001, currently tentatively scheduled for public hearing on July 28, 2011.

7. **Basic Plan A-9954:** Basic Plan A-9954 was approved for the project and its approval formalized in PGCPB Resolution No. 02-102 on September 9, 2004. Each condition of that approval is listed in boldface type below:

   **(1) The Basic Plan shall be revised to show the following rights-of-way along the frontages of the subject property: MD 212 – 40 feet from center line (towards the ultimate right-of way of 80 feet): Adelphi Road – 50 feet from center line (toward the ultimate right-of way of 100 feet); Edwards Way – 35 feet from center line (in accordance with Zoning Ordinance requirements adjacent to a commercial zone).**

   This condition has not been met. Dedication is shown correctly on Riggs and Adelphi Roads, but dedication 35 feet from the centerline on Edwards Way is also required. The applicant shall

dedicate 35 feet of right-of-way from the centerline of Edwards Way, and shall correctly show it on the preliminary plan. This requirement has been brought forward as a condition of the subject approval.

(2) **The Applicant will provide a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound MD 212 at the approach to Adelphi Road. Timing of this improvement will be determined at the preliminary plan of subdivision.**

The Planning Board finds that the intersection at LOS C (CLV 1,299) during the AM peak hour and LOS D (CLV 1,420) during the PM peak hour under future traffic conditions. LOS refers to level-of-service and CLV refers to critical lane volume. The subject property is located within the Developed Tier as defined in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan.* The threshold for the Developed Tier is LOS E (CLV 1,600). The intersection will operate below this threshold during the AM and PM peak hours. However, this improvement is listed in the approved basic plan; therefore, the applicant is responsible for it unless it is rescinded by the District Council. A condition of this approval requires a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound Riggs Road (MD 212) at the approach to Adelphi Road. Timing for this approval shall be established at the time of approval of a preliminary plan for the project.

(3) **Prior to the approval of the Specific Design Plan for the subject property, the Applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the County Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. The applicant shall use a new 12-hour count and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic.**

Such traffic study was submitted using, as specified, a new 12-hour count, which analyzed signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic. However, conformance to the requirement of Condition 3 is triggered at the time of specific design plan review, not comprehensive design plan review.

(4) **During the review of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, the Applicant shall provide more detailed operational analyses at the intersections of MD 212/Edwards Way and MD 212/site entrance. The scope of these analyses will be determined after approval of the proposed Basic Plan and in consideration of the permitted access to the site.**

Compliance with this condition was judged sufficient, at the time of approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision after the subject approval.

(5) **Total commercial development of the subject 4.14 acre site shall be limited to a maximum of 40,000 square feet.**

The development proposed in the subject application is 18,899 square feet, which is well within the cap of 40,000 square feet specified in this condition.

(6) **During the Comprehensive Design Plan and Subdivision review, the Applicant shall address the addition of public streets to accomplish access from Adelphi Road or obtain a variance from Section 24-121 of the Subdivision Regulations.**

Due to the size of the development and the creation of lease parcels as opposed to individual lots, the design for the project utilizes private driveways instead of public roads to access the project from Adelphi Road.

(7) **Development of the subject property shall have a woodland conservation threshold of 20 percent. If off-site mitigation is proposed, the first priority for mitigation sites shall be within the Anacostia Watershed.**

A Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) has been submitted with the application, which uses a threshold calculation of 20 percent as required by the condition. According to the worksheet on the TCP1, the requirement will be met with 2.46 acres of off-site woodland conservation to mitigate for the loss of on-site woodlands.

(8) **During the Comprehensive Design Plan and the Specific Design Plan review, the Applicant shall address the following issues:**

A. **Architectural design shall be distinctive in order to create an image of quality and permanence.**

The proposed architecture, as evidenced in the illustrative drawings, may be said to be distinctive in order to create an image of quality and permanence. It would be completed largely in brick, utilize pleasing form, massing, and architectural detail so as to create a pleasing architectural aspect. The solution of the use of the archways between the two buildings on-site to create a nexus between the two buildings is imaginative, simulates a build-to line, and creates additional visual interest. Final conformance with this requirement and other basic plan conditions below will ultimately be made at the specific design plan phase, when architecture and final site design will be approved.

B. **A build-to line shall be considered in order to create an inviting streetscape.**

A build-to line was considered by the applicant, but was not implemented in this case, apparently because it was not believed to be practical for this project. An effort was made to suggest a build-to line by the connection of the two buildings by an arched element parallel to the street and by treatment of the streetscape, which includes a wall along the periphery of the site.

C. **The streetscape shall create a pedestrian-friendly environment with consideration of the following elements:**

(1) **Street furniture including pedestrian lighting**
(2) **Trash receptacles**
(3) **Bike racks**
(4) **Pedestrian crosswalks should be a contrasting paving material**
(5) **Need for bus stop**

Streetscape elements include street lighting, benches, a trash receptacle, bike racks, and two bus stops. Pedestrian crosswalks in a contrasting paving material and the number of trash receptacles have been required by conditions of this approval.

**D. Massive surface parking facilities adjacent to either Riggs Road or Adelphi Road shall be prohibited.**

A "massive" aspect for surface parking has been avoided by providing some of the parking on each side of the buildings. The parking will be largely screened by landscaping and by a proposed decorative wall planned to surround the site.

**E. An architectural focal point and/or sculpture located within a green area shall be provided at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road.**

A focal feature is provided for the project at the intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Road including enhanced landscaping, a trellis, two brick wall features flanking a sign that reads "Welcome to Adelphi," a brick pier on either side of the trellis, and an evergreen hedge behind it. The architectural focal point serves as an expression of civic pride for the Adelphi locality.

**F. No loading and/or dumpster areas shall be visible from adjacent roadways.**

The site has been designed so that loading and the dumpster enclosure are located on the Edwards Way frontage, which is most heavily landscaped. The loading space and dumpster enclosure should not be visible from Edwards Way and will be screened in conformance with the requirements of Section 4.4 of the *Prince George's County Landscape Manual.*

**G. The design plans shall address the entire property, so that the final development of the individual lots creates a visually cohesive development, compatible in regard to architectural treatment and site layout.**

Architectural style (ornamentation, massing, and detail) are well coordinated between the buildings. They appear to be one and the materials and architectural design of the two buildings are in harmony.

9. **Other conditions of approval:**

A. **The leadership of the Buck Lodge Citizens Association, White Oak Manor Civic Association, and Hampton's Association will each nominate two representatives and one alternate to participate with the developer of the subject property in regular meetings, scheduled by the developer, during each of the phases of development (including but not limited to the Preliminary Plan of Subdivision, Comprehensive Design Plan, and Specific Design Plan) of the property.**

To demonstrate conformance with this condition, the applicant provided evidence of having corresponded and met with representatives of the Buck Lodge Citizens Association, White Oak Manor Civic Association, and the Hampton's Association, with a history dating back to March 2005. Most notably among this correspondence is a letter signed by Ken Morgan of the Buck Lodge Citizens' Association, Larry Sledd of the White Oak Manor Civic Association, and Lisa Arrington of the Hampton's Association, which included the following understanding:

- They understand the project to include two buildings; one for a drugstore and the second to have a maximum of two tenants.

- They feel that the project generally meets the zoning conditions except those that cannot be met due to site constraints.

- They support the revised architecture as being distinctive, and that it will create an image of quality and permanence both in terms of its exterior, which is specified as predominantly brick, extensive glazing around the building entries, and a bricked archway connecting the two buildings which gives the appearance of respecting a build-to line along the street frontage.

- They feel that the revised plans create a pedestrian-friendly environment by the addition of street furniture, pedestrian lighting, trash receptacles, bike racks, and bus stop areas.

- They like the entry feature as a focal point at the Adelphi/Riggs Road intersection.

- They feel that massive parking areas and visible loading and dumpster areas have been eliminated by building and parking placement and by moving the loading and dumpsters closer to Edwards Way, where landscaping is the heaviest.

- They think the changes show good improvement and warrant moving forward with the approval of the comprehensive design plan for the project.

B. **At the time of the Preliminary Plan application, the developer of the subject property shall include the intersection of Metzerott Road and Riggs Road in its traffic study, to demonstrate the adequacy of transportation facilities in the surrounding area,**

Compliance with this requirement was subsequently evaluated at the time of preliminary plan of subdivision approval.

C. **Any required widening and improvements to the public rights-of-way for Riggs Road, Adelphi Road, and Edwards Way shall include five-foot wide sidewalks, in accordance with applicable State and County standards.**

Sidewalks along Riggs and Adelphi Roads measure eight feet in width and that those along Edwards Way measure five feet in width by a condition of this approval. The applicant has met and exceeded this condition.

D. **The developer of the subject property shall work with the Maryland State Highway Administration on the improvements to Riggs Road, Maryland Route 212, to provide a center turn lane to allow northbound traffic to make left turns into the subject property without impeding through traffic.**

In a letter dated March 29, 2011, the State Highway Administration (SHA) noted that the traffic consultant proposed to widen eastbound Riggs Road (MD 212) to provide an exclusive left turn lane, and that they generally concurred with the proposed improvements at MD 212. Therefore, it may be said that the developer of the property is working with SHA on the improvements to Riggs Road to provide a center turn lane to allow northbound traffic to make left turns into the subject property without impeding through traffic.

E. **The developer of the subject property shall be responsible for payments for all road and intersection improvements necessary to mitigate any failing traffic condition caused by the on-site development. Such improvements will be determined at the time of Preliminary Plan Review.**

Compliance with this condition was evaluated at the time of approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision for the project.

F. **The developer of the subject property shall work with the various transit authorities and agencies to maintain the locations of the existing bus stops along Riggs Road and Adelphi Road. The developer shall construct a bus pull-off area to allow the loading and unloading of passengers out of the travel lanes of the roadways, within the public rights-of-way.**

Two bus stops are indicated along the Adelphi Road and the Riggs Road frontage.

**G. The developer of the subject property shall work with the Prince George's County [sic] Department of the Environment, to utilize low impact stormwater management techniques to the degree practicable.**

The applicant has used low impact stormwater management techniques to the degree practicable. See Finding 8 for a more detailed discussion of the applicant's stormwater management for the site.

**H. The developer of the subject property shall take all reasonable actions to alleviate and reduce the possibility of crime occurring on or adjacent to the property.**

The site will be well lit including lighting on the periphery of the site along the street frontages. Additionally, the solid portion of decorative wall to be located at the street edge of the project is by design low, to provide needed visibility in accordance with Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles.

**J. The developer shall keep clean all areas of the subject property, during and after development.**

A condition of this approval requires that trash receptacles and the dumpster be emptied as needed and that the site and its landscaping be regularly maintained. All dust free surfaces shall be washed and swept as needed.

**K. The developer shall incorporate trees, shrubs, open areas, flowers, walkways, and lighting into the site plan. The property shall be cleared of poorly lit or secluded areas, and adequate safety lighting shall be installed to improve visibility into the site and deter illegal activity.**

Trees, shrubs, walkways, and lighting have been incorporated into the plans. The addition of perennial and annual flowering plants to the landscape plan is required by a condition of this approval.

**10. The developer shall make its best efforts to include a restaurant as an ancillary tenant on the subject property.**

The developer has proffered evidence that he has made efforts to include a restaurant as an ancillary tenant on the subject property. However, the size of the site and the volume of passing traffic were mentioned as two of the reasons that made these efforts ultimately unsuccessful.

8. **The Prince George's Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance**—The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet and there

are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site. A Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) is approved herewith together with two findings that bring the project into conformance with the requirements of the Prince George's Woodland and Wildlife Conservation Ordinance. Therefore, it may be said that the subject application is in conformance at this time with the requirements of the Woodland Conservation Ordinance.

9. **Further Planning Board Findings and Comments from Other Entities:** The subject application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are summarized as follows:

a. **Historic Preservation**—The proposed 22,288-square-foot retail development would have no effect on identified historic sites, resources, and districts.

b. **Archaeology**—A Phase I archeological survey was completed on the 4.14-acre Edwards Property in September 2006. Four copies of the final report, *A Phase I Archeological Survey of the Edwards Property: A 4-Acre +/- Parcel Located at the Intersection of Adelphi and Riggs Roads in Adelphi, Prince George's County, Maryland (Development Case No. CDP-0502),* identified one early to mid-20th century sanitarium park or garden, 18PR841. However, the site does not contain significant information and no further archeological work is necessary on the Edwards Property.

c. **Community Planning**—

- The application is consistent with the 2002 General Plan Development Pattern policies for the Developed Tier;

- The application conforms to the 1989 *Approved Master Plan for Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt and Vicinity and* 1990 *Adopted Sectional Map Amendment for Planning Areas 65, 66 and 67* for a village activity center. It also conforms to the recommendation of the corresponding sectional map amendment (SMA) for the development of the property through a comprehensive design zone.

- The proposal does not conform to all of the conditions of its approval for its rezoning to the L-A-C Zone.

See Finding 7 for a detailed discussion of the project's conformance to the requirements of the approval of A-9954-C.

d. **Transportation Planning**—See Finding 7 for a detailed discussion of transportation related requirements. The Planning Board's analysis of traffic impacts:

**Analysis of Traffic Impacts**
Based on Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance, one of the required findings for approval of a comprehensive design plan is that the proposed development will be

compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings and that the staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities.

**Growth Policy—Service Level Standards**
The subject property is located within the Developed Tier as defined in the *Prince George's County Approved General Plan.* As such, the subject property is evaluated according to following standards:

> **Links and signalized intersections:** Level-of-service (LOS) E, with signalized intersections operating at a critical lane volume (CLV) of 1,600 or better. Mitigation, as defined by Section 24-124(a)(6) of the Subdivision Regulations, is permitted at signalized intersections subject to meeting the geographical criteria in the "Guidelines for the Analysis of the Traffic Impact of Development Proposals."
>
> **Unsignalized intersections:** *The Highway Capacity Manual* (Transportation Research Board) procedure for unsignalized intersections is not a true test of adequacy, but rather an indicator that further operational studies need to be conducted. Vehicle delay in any movement exceeding 50.0 seconds is deemed to be an unacceptable operating condition at unsignalized intersections. In response to such a finding, we have generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

A traffic impact study was submitted for two signalized intersections and three unsignalized intersections. They included the intersections of Adelphi Road/Edwards Way, Riggs Road (MD 212)/Edwards Way, Riggs Road (MD 212)/Proposed Site Access, Riggs Road (MD 212)/Adelphi Road, and Riggs Road (MD 212)/Metzerott Road. The traffic counts in the study were taken in October 2010.

| EXISTING TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)** | | **Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)** | |
| Adelphi Road and Edwards Way | 84.1* | 238.5* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way | 28.1* | 48.6* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Proposed Site Access | 11.3* | 14.5* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Adelphi Rd | 1,256 | 1,363 | C | D |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Metzerott Road | 971 | 1,209 | A | C |

*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.

Under existing conditions, delay at the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way exceeds 50.0 seconds during both peak hours indicating inadequate traffic operations. In response to such a finding, we have generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

For background traffic conditions, the applicant used a growth rate of 1.5 percent for high or through volume movements. The growth rate was projected for two years, the expected build-out date for the site. Background conditions are shown in the chart below.

| BACKGROUND TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)** | | **Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)** | |
| Adelphi Road and Edwards Way | 102.9* | 283.4* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way | 29.7* | 54.3* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Proposed Site Access | 11.1* | 14.8* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Adelphi Rd | 1,295 | 1,404 | C | D |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Metzerott Road | 999 | 1,244 | A | C |

*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.

Under background conditions, delay at the unsignalized intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way exceeds 50.0 seconds during both peak hours indicating inadequate traffic operations. During the PM peak hour, the unsignalized intersection of Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way exceeds 50.0 seconds.

The applicant's traffic consultant added the new trips expected to be generated by the proposed retail space to background traffic to obtain future traffic conditions. A pass-by trip rate of 50 percent was used. This accounts for trips already using MD 212 and Adelphi Road and stopping at the retail center. In the AM peak hour there will be 23 total trips (14 in/9 out) and in the PM peak hour 268 total trips (134 in/134 out). Total net new trips will be 12 AM peak hour trips and 134 PM peak hour trips.

Under future or total traffic conditions, the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way exceeds 50.0 seconds. During the PM peak hour, the unsignalized intersection of MD 212 and Edwards Way exceeds 50.0 seconds. In response to such a finding, we have generally recommended that the applicant provide a traffic signal warrant study and install the signal (or other less costly warranted traffic controls) if deemed warranted by the appropriate operating agency.

| FUTURE TRAFFIC CONDITIONS | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Intersection** | **Critical Lane Volume (AM & PM)** | | **Level of Service (LOS, AM & PM)** | |
| Adelphi Road and Edwards Way | 104.3* | 368.9* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way | 29.8* | 63.5* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Proposed Site Access | 11.4* | 15.8* | -- | -- |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Adelphi Rd | 1,299 | 1,420 | C | D |
| Riggs Road (MD 212) and Metzerott Road | 1,002 | 1,273 | B | C |

*In analyzing unsignalized intersections, average vehicle delay for various movements through the intersection is measured in seconds of vehicle delay. The numbers shown indicate the greatest average delay for any movement within the intersection. According to the Guidelines, delay exceeding 50.0 seconds indicates inadequate traffic operations. Values shown as "+999" suggest that the parameters are beyond the normal range of the procedure, and should be interpreted as a severe inadequacy.

In terms of adequacy, two intersections exceed the threshold of 50.0 seconds during the PM peak hour. Several traffic signal warrant studies have already been completed for the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way indicating that a traffic signal is warranted at this location. However, the applicant will be responsible for the submittal of a new traffic signal warrant study prior to approval of the specific design plan for the subject property. The Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) has recommended a traffic signal at this location. Intersection delay also exceeds 50.0 at the intersection of Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way under future traffic conditions. A traffic signal warrant study will also be required for this intersection.

**Site Access and Circulation**

The right-in/right-out access point on Adelphi Road, a roadway designated as an arterial in the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT), will require a variance from Section 24-121(a)(3) of the Subdivision Regulations. The variation request was submitted with the preliminary plan and will be addressed at that stage. Section 24-121(a)(3) states that "When lots are proposed on land adjacent to an existing or planned roadway of arterial or higher classification, they shall be designed to front on either an interior street or a service road."

A full movement access point is proposed on Riggs Road (MD 212). SHA is in agreement with this and will allow a full movement intersection. However, SHA is requiring that the applicant complete a traffic queuing analysis at this location to assess any adverse impacts on nearby intersections.

Overall, traffic circulation on the site and the location of the drive-through service appear reasonable. Driveways on the site are adequate. One of the driveways will be one-way to avoid conflicts with vehicles exiting the drive-through service.

**SHA and DPW&T Comments**
DPW&T recommends the widening of Adelphi Road at Riggs Road (MD 212) and the provision of an exclusive left turn lane on southbound Adelphi Road. DPW&T will have to work with the applicant on this improvement. This was not a condition of Basic Plan A-9954-C; in addition, the intersection operates below the threshold of LOS E (CLV 1,600) for the Developed Tier. DPW&T also recommends double left-turn lanes along southbound/westbound MD 212 at the approach to Adelphi Road. This is a condition in Basic Plan A-9954-C. The applicant will be responsible for this improvement unless rescinded by the District Council. In addition, an operational improvement providing a crosswalk with pedestrian signals is recommended by DPW&T at the intersection of MD 212 and Adelphi Road.

The applicant is proposing a full movement intersection on MD 212 opposite Metzerott Plaza. SHA will allow a full movement intersection at this location. A traffic queuing study will be required. In addition, SHA is requesting dedication of additional right-of-way beyond what is recommended in the MPOT. Riggs Road (MD 212) is listed as a collector with four lanes and 80 to 100 feet of right-of-way. SHA recommends a 150-foot right-of-way on MD 212 and dedication of 75 feet from the centerline of MD 212. SHA based this recommendation on their Highway Needs Inventory that proposes widening MD 212 at some point to a four-lane divided roadway with a median. They also recommended acceleration and deceleration lanes on Adelphi Road at the proposed site entrance. SHA had some concerns with the applicant's traffic study and traffic counts. SHA recommended the use of a February 15, 2011 traffic count which was higher than the traffic count submitted by the applicant taken in October 2010. Operational improvements, i.e. crosswalk improvements, are also recommended by SHA at MD 212/Edwards Way and MD 212/Adelphi Road.

**Master Plan Roadways**
Riggs Road (MD 212) is listed in the MPOT as a collector with four lanes and 80 to 100 feet right-of-way. Adelphi Road is listed as an arterial with four to six lanes and 100 to 120 feet of right-of-way. Edwards Way is not listed as a master plan road. Basic Plan A-9954-C conditions rights-of-way of 40 feet from the centerline of Riggs Road, 50 feet from the centerline of Adelphi Road, and 35 feet from the centerline of Edwards Way.

**Conclusion**
Adequate transportation facilities would exist to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance because the application is hereby approved with the following conditions:

(1) Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 23 AM and 268 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any development generating greater than this amount shall require an amended comprehensive design plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities.

(2) Access to the site shall be limited to a right-in/right-out access on Adelphi Road and to a full movement intersection on Riggs Road (MD 212) opposite Metzerott Plaza. Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property, the applicant shall complete a traffic queuing analysis for SHA at the proposed site access point on MD 212. The applicant will be responsible for any improvements required by SHA, including the provision of a center turn lane, at this location.

(3) Prior to approval of the specific design plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to DPW&T for signalization at the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. 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 responsible operating agency. If a signal or other traffic control improvements are deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by the agency.

(4) Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property, the applicant will be responsible for the installation of double left-turn lanes on the southbound/westbound approach of Riggs Road (MD 212) at Adelphi Road. This is a requirement of Basic Plan A-9954-C until rescinded by the District Council. The applicant will be responsible for any associated pavement markings, signage, traffic signal modifications, etc. at this location. These improvements are under the purview of and permitting by SHA.

(5) Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA for signalization at the intersection of Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way. 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 responsible operating agency. If a signal or other traffic control improvements are deemed warranted at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by the agency.

(6) Dedication of 35 feet from the centerline of Edwards Way, 40 feet from the centerline of Riggs Road (MD 212), and 50 feet from the centerline of Adelphi Road is required via Basic Plan A-9964-C.

e. **Public Facilities**—The Planning Board hereby makes the finding required by Section 27-521(a)(7) that "The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities." The following supports this finding:

- Police Facilities: The proposed development is within the police service area of District I in Hyattsville. Using the established ratio of 141 square feet of police facilities per 1,000 residents, 117,672 square feet of space would be required. The current 267,660 square feet of police facilities available in Prince George's County meets and exceeds this requirement.

- Fire and Rescue: The project will be within established travel time guidelines of service for the stated Fire/EMS stations:

| Fire/EMS Company # | Fire/EMS Station Name | Service | Address | Actual Travel Time (minutes) | Travel Time Guideline (minutes) | Within/ Beyond |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 34 | Chillum-Adelphi | Engine | 7833 Riggs Road | 2.94 | 3.25 | Within |
| 34 | Chillum-Adelphi | Ladder Truck | 7833 Riggs Road | 2.94 | 4.25 | Within |
| 12 | College Park | Paramedic | 8115 Baltimore Ave. | 4.47 | 7.25 | Within |
| 34 | Chillum-Adelphi | Ambulance | 7833 Riggs Road | 2.94 | 4.25 | Within |

- Capital Improvement Program (CIP): The Capital Budget and Program Fiscal Years 2011–2016 proposes no CIP projects for public safety facilities in the vicinity of the subject site.

- Water and Sewerage Findings: As per Section 24-122.01(b)(1) of the Subdivision Regulations, "the location of the property within the appropriate service area of the Ten-Year Water and Sewerage Plan is deemed sufficient evidence of the immediate or planned availability of public water and sewerage for preliminary or final plat approval." Therefore, the subject property being placed in water and sewer Category 3, Community System, by the 2008 *Water and Sewer Plan*, is sufficient to find that the staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available water and sewer public facilities.

f. **Subdivision**—Pursuant to Section 24-107(C)(7) of the Subdivision Regulations, a preliminary plan of subdivision is required. Preliminary Plan 4-10019 was accepted on March 15, 2011. The plan was heard at the Subdivision and Development Review Committee on April 1, 2011 and was approved by the Planning Board on June 16, 2011.

g. **Trails**—This proposal has been reviewed for conformance to Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance and the *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT) for pedestrian and bicyclist improvements. The site is also subject to the recommendation

contained in the approved Langley Park-College Park-Greenbelt Master Plan (area master plan).

**Basic Plan Approval Conditions**
The basic plan was approved with conditions related to bikeways and sidewalks. Conditions 8c and 9c require streetscape improvements to create a pedestrian-friendly environment. Walkways must be included in the site plan per Condition 9k. The subject comprehensive design plan proposes five-foot-wide sidewalks. The specific details of these improvements will be reviewed for conformance with the basic plan requirements at the time of the review of the specific design plans. The plans must show five-foot-wide sidewalks along Adelphi Road, Riggs Road (MD 212), and Edwards Way. The streetscapes must contain street furniture, pedestrian lighting, trash receptacles, bike racks, contrasting pavement material in sidewalks (internal), and a bus stop location.

The proposal does conflict with the conditions of approved Basic Plan A-9954-C. Condition 9c of the basic plan approval requires a five-foot-wide sidewalk along Adelphi Road. The applicant's proposal includes five-foot-wide sidewalks along Adelphi Road. The location of the sidewalk will be reviewed at the time of specific design plan review.

Condition 9c of the basic plan approval requires a five-foot-wide sidewalk along Riggs Road and Condition 8c requires streetscape elements along the road. Condition 8c of the basic plan does not specifically reference Riggs Road, but this is the main entrance to the site. Riggs Road is the subject of Condition 8c and a five-foot-wide sidewalk is shown with the location of the sidewalk and streetscape elements that are required by the basic plan approval will be reviewed at the time of specific design plan review.

**Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation (MPOT)**

**Adelphi Road**
Bicycle warning signage to warn motorists of the presence of bicyclists on this road shall be required along the frontage of Adelphi Road at the time of preliminary plan review. Adelphi Road is recommended in the MPOT for a sidepath between New Hampshire Avenue (MD 650) to University Boulevard (MD 193). This road is owned and operated by DPW&T and provides pedestrian and bicyclist access to the University of Maryland. The location of a sidepath on Adelphi Road has not been determined by the county, and no analysis by DPW&T regarding the provision of a bikeway or a sidepath has been provided.

**Riggs Road (MD 212)**
The MPOT recommends that Riggs Road (MD 212) contain sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities from Powder Mill Road (MD 212) to Washington D.C. No analysis by SHA regarding the provision of bicyclists has been provided. The MPOT recommends that continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle accommodations are necessary along this

corridor. Currently, sidewalks are fragmented or missing along some segments of the road. Right-of-way constraints may prohibit bike lanes.

The MPOT specifically recommends that crosswalk improvements and other pedestrian safety features along Riggs Road may be appropriate at some locations. Staff will recommend that the applicant provide crosswalk locations along Riggs Road at the main site entrance and at its intersection with Edwards Way, which can be reviewed at the time of specific design plan review.

As with Adelphi Road, bicycle warning signage shall be required to be placed along the frontage of Riggs Road at the time of preliminary plan review.

**Edwards Way**

Edwards Way is not specifically described in the MPOT; however, as with all roads contained within the Developed Tier, Edwards Way should not be overlooked when it comes to providing accessible and safe roads. Complete Streets Policy 5 contained in the MPOT recommends that new development proposals in the Developed and Developing Tiers be evaluated for conformance with the complete streets principles. The principles recommend increasing road crossing opportunities, encouraging medians and pedestrian refuge islands, and encouraging pedestrian-scaled land use and urban design while reducing crossing distances for pedestrians. The applicant shall provide crosswalk locations along Edwards Way that provide access to the subject property from properties across from Edwards Way. The specific locations can be reviewed at the time of specific design plan review.

Bicycle facilities are not specifically recommended along Edwards Way in the MPOT; however, because bicyclists currently utilize this road and increased bicycle use can be expected because of the proposed development. Bicycle warning signage shall be placed along the frontage of Edwards Way at the time of preliminary plan review. This also fulfills the MPOT's Complete Streets Policy 2 (p. 10), which recommends that "All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical."

**Conclusion**

Based on the preceding analysis, in terms of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, the subject project includes design elements, facilities, and amenities, such as adequate bicycle and pedestrian transportation facilities, to serve the proposed subdivision as required under Section 27-521 of the Zoning Ordinance. More details shall be provided by the applicant at the time of specific design plan review, including striped crosswalk locations and bicycle safety signage locations recommended herein.

h. **Environmental Planning**—The project is subject to the requirements of Subtitle 27 that became effective September 1, 2010 because the site does not have a previously approved development application. The project is subject to the current requirements of Subtitle 25, Division 2, the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the project site is greater than 40,000 square feet in size, contains more than 10,000 square feet of woodland, and does not have a previously approved tree conservation plan.

The site is characterized by terrain gradually sloping toward the north of the property and drains into unnamed tributaries of the Northwest Branch in the Anacostia River basin. The predominant soil types on the site are Chillum Urban Land, Codorus-Hatboro, Croom-Urban Land, and Glenelg-Wheaton-Urban Land. Current aerial photographs indicate that the site is predominantly wooded and undeveloped. Based on information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources, Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species found to occur in the vicinity of this site. A review of the available information indicates that streams, 100-year floodplain, and steep slopes occur on the site; however, wetlands are not found to occur on this property. There are no Marlboro clays or scenic or historic roads located on or adjacent to the subject property. It is adjacent to Adelphi Road, an arterial roadway, which is generally regulated for noise, but only for residential type uses.

For a review of the environmental-related condition (Condition 7) of Basic Plan A-9954, see Finding 7.

Further, the following environmental review is offered:

(1) The comprehensive design plan application has an approved Natural Resources Inventory (NRI-063-05-01) dated November 9, 2010, which was included with the application package. The NRI shows a stream and 100-year floodplain in the northern section of the site. The stream is piped above and below the subject property. It appears the reason for the piping is because the site is bounded by public roadways on all sides (Adelphi Road, Edwards Way, and Riggs Road (MD 212)).

The site is 4.14 acres in size and contains approximately 3.35 is mature hardwood forest dominated by white oak and southern red oak. The understory contains a high percentage of invasive species, including greenbrier, English ivy, and multiflora rose. According to the NRI, there are 24 specimen trees on-site. The required features are correctly shown on the NRI and TCP1.

(2) The property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance because the gross tract area is in excess of 40,000 square feet, there are more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland on-site, and it does not have a previously approved tree conservation plan. A TCP1 (TCP1-015-06) has been submitted for review.

The current zoning (L-A-C) of the property has a woodland conservation threshold of 15 percent. The zoning condition of approval sets the required threshold at 20 percent of the net tract or 0.73 acre, which is correctly reflected in the TCP1 worksheet. The TCP1 proposes to clear the entire 3.35 acres of on-site woodland resulting in a woodland conservation requirement of 2.46 acres. The requirement is proposed to be met with off-site woodland conservation credits.

(3) Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance requires that "Specimen trees, champion trees, and trees that are part of a historic site or are associated with a historic structure shall be preserved and the design shall either preserve the critical root zone of each tree in its entirety or preserve an appropriate percentage of the critical root zone in keeping with the tree's condition and the species' ability to survive construction as provided in the Technical Manual."

A companion variance request from Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) for the removal of 24 specimen trees located on the subject property, per Section 25-119(d) requires six findings (text in bold below) to be made before a variance from the Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance can be granted. An evaluation of this variance request with respect to the required findings is provided below.

**(A) Special conditions peculiar to the property have caused the unwarranted hardship.**

The site has a triangular shape, bounded on the east side by Adelphi Road, an arterial roadway, on the west side by Edwards Way, and on the south side by Riggs Road (MD 212). The site is within the Developed Tier and is surrounded by development on all sides, characteristics which render this project as infill development. Two of the trees are within the primary management area (PMA). The remaining two-thirds of the property, outside of the PMA, contains 14 specimen trees that are centrally located in the most developable portion of the site, and 8 trees that are located closer to the east and west boundaries of the site.

The proposed project is providing road dedication to all three rights-of-way adjacent to the site. The required road dedication, in addition to the requirements for parking and stormwater management, will significantly constrain the developable area and create difficulty in developing the site in accordance with L-A-C zoning requirements.

**(B) Enforcement of these rules will deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas.**

Enforcement of these rules would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas as a recommendation for approval of the requested variance would be suggested for other similarly constrained properties.

**(C) Granting the variance will not confer on the applicant a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants.**

If other constrained properties encountered protected trees in similar conditions and locations on a site, the same considerations would be made during the review of the required variance application.

**(D) The request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant.**

There are no records of any development on this site, it is currently undeveloped, and has been primarily forested since 1938, according to aerial photos from PGAtlas.com. Therefore, the request is not based on conditions or circumstances which are the result of actions by the applicant.

**(E) The request does not arise from a condition relating to land or building use, either permitted or nonconforming, on a neighboring property.**

The request to remove the trees does not arise from any condition on a neighboring property.

**(F) Granting of the variance will not adversely affect water quality.**

Granting the variance to remove the specimen trees will not directly affect water quality because the applicant has proposed to provide stormwater measures, such as bioretention and a vegetated outfall, to address water quality. The reduction in tree canopy because of the specimen tree removal is minimal.

(4) The site contains an area of PMA that is required to be preserved to the fullest extent possible (Section 24-130 of the Subdivision Regulations). The design should avoid any impacts to regulated environmental features, which includes the PMA, unless the impacts are essential for the development as a whole. The Planning Board will generally not support impacts to regulated environmental features that are not associated with necessary road crossings or the installation of public utilities that are required to serve the development as a whole. If the impacts cannot be avoided, every attempt must be made to minimize the area of impact. For designs that result in a significant area of impact (more than 200 linear feet of stream beds or on one-half acre of wetlands and wetland buffers), mitigation must be provided.

The PMA includes a stream valley that flows onto the site on the east side of the site from a storm drain pipe under Adelphi Road, and exits the site on the northwest side into a storm drain pipe. The TCP1 proposes to disturb the entire area (1.02 acres) within the delineated PMA for vehicular entrance to the site, parking, building placement, bioretention, and stream realignment.

The design relocates the stream into a more defined channel, with an improved habitat area using native planting, as well as adjacent bioretention areas that would allow natural infiltration for some of the runoff similar to the infiltration that is occurring today. Exhibits were submitted showing alternative designs based on minimization and avoidance of the PMA. The conclusion of the applicant's analysis is that the relocation of the stream to a natural channel with bioretention forebays is the best option for minimizing the impacts proposed. The Planning Board agrees this is the best solution in order to improve the habitat area on the site, allow some natural infiltration, and control water temperature before it reaches the confluence with another open channel on the west side of Edwards Way.

DPW&T has requested that the entire 309 linear feet of the existing steam on the subject site be piped as part of the proposed development. On April 27, 2011, DPW&T raised concerns regarding maintenance of an open channel on the site and prefers a design where the stream is piped, because the potentially large volume of stormwater that enters the site during a significant rain event, in addition to the increased runoff from the proposed development, may cause degradation of the relocated stream channel. According to the applicant, the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE) and the Army Corps of Engineers determined that piping the stream is not an appropriate design.

It was agreed that the alternative design discussed of diverting large storm events into a piped system and maintaining some level of base flow of water into the channel will be brought by the applicant to MDE for their input.

Whether the stream is piped or relocated, the resulting design would require the entire PMA to be impacted. The design as shown on the TCP1, stamped as received on March 14, 2011, preserves the PMA in a natural state to the fullest extent possible by disturbance to the entire PMA and relocation and re-establishment of the natural channel.

(5) A Stormwater Management Concept Approval Letter and Plan (2925-2005-01) dated March 18, 2010 was submitted indicating that extended detention and an infiltration system is required for water quality and quantity control. The concept plan shows an underground storage system and associated piping. The concept is not consistent with the conceptual TCP1 which proposes a re-aligned stream and

bioretention areas. Because DPW&T is requiring a design to pipe the stream, additional discussion is anticipated with regard to stomwater conveyance, and the proposed concept plan will be subject to revision in the future.

Additional comments regarding stormwater management and the associated stream will be provided in subsequent reviews of this application.

The Planning Board makes the following findings with respect to the approval of CDP-1001 and TCP1-015-06:

(1) The required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of Specimen Trees 1 through 24.

(2) The design as shown on the TCP1, stamped as received on March 14, 2011, preserves the PMA in a natural state to the fullest extent possible by disturbance to the entire PMA and relocation and re-establishment of the natural channel.

i. **Zoning**—There are no zoning issues identified in connection with the subject project.

j. **Prince George's County Fire and Emergency Management Services Department**—The Prince George's County Fire and Emergency Management Services Department offered comment on private road design, needed accessibility, and the location and performance of fire hydrants.

k. **Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T)**—DPW&T offered the following:

- Adelphi Road (a collector) and Edwards Way (an arterial) are county-maintained roads. Right-of-way dedication and roadway improvements should be done in accordance with DPW&T's appropriate standards.

- All improvements within the public right-of-way as dedicated to the county are to be in accordance with the County Road Ordinance, DPW&T Specifications and Standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

- Property frontages are improved, but any required widening and the replacement of any deteriorated concrete curb and gutter, sidewalks, street tree and street lighting standards, and commercial entrances must be completed in accordance with DPW&T Specifications and Standards, which include full-width, two-inch mill and overlay.

- All storm drainage systems and facilities are to be designed in accordance with DPW&T requirements.

- Existing utilities may require relocation and/or adjustments in accordance with DPW&T's Utility Policy and coordination with the various utility companies. Proper temporary and final patching and the related mill and overlay in accordance with the established DPW&T Specification for Utility Installation and Maintenance Permits are required.

- The proposed site plan is not consistent with approved Stormwater Management Concept Plan 2925-2005-01, dated April 2, 2008 and reapproved March 18, 2010. The existing storm drain is to be extended to the proposed receiving storm drain system.

- An access study must be conducted by the applicant and reviewed to determine the adequacy of access points and the need for acceleration/deceleration and turning lanes.

- Sidewalks are required in accordance with Sections 23-105 and 23-135 of the County Road Ordinance.

- Any proposed master plan roadways that lie within the property limits must be addressed through coordination between The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) and DPW&T, and may involve right-of-way reservation, dedication, and/or road construction in accordance with DPW&T Specifications and Standards.

- All existing/proposed culverts located under the roadway should be designed and replaced to handle the 100-year frequency storm runoff.

- Due to capacity problems associated with a shared through/left turn lane, DPW&T requires widening on Adelphi Road to create an exclusive left turn on southbound Adelphi Road at Riggs Road (MD 212).

- The right-in/right-out location should be placed far enough from the intersection of MD 212, so as not to cause any conflict with the proposed left-turn lane to east MD 212.

- A crosswalk with pedestrian indications should be added as part of the signal modifications across MD 212 at Adelphi Road.

- Traffic from the west on Adelphi Road using the right-in/right-out entrance will use Edwards Way to return to West Adelphi Road. This will increase traffic at the nonsignalized intersection of Adelphi Road at Edwards Way which is a level-of-service (LOS) F. DPW&T will require that the developer install a signal at this location. A bond for $250,000 must be submitted for the new signal.

- Due to the high volume of left turns from southbound MD 212 to Adelphi Road, a double-left turn would improve the level of service. Since the signal falls under the jurisdiction of SHA, they will make the final decision as to the design of the signal.

- There are currently no bus routes along the property frontage on Adelphi Road. Coordination with the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA) will be required for the proposed bus pullouts. Bus shelters will also be required.

- Coordination with SHA and WMATA will be required for the proposed bus pullout on MD 212. DPW&T has no objections to this bus pullout.

Please note that DPW&T's concerns will be addressed through their separate permitting process.

l. **Washington Suburban Sanitary Commission (WSSC)**—WSSC offered the following comments:

- The application will be reevaluated at time of application for water /sewer service.

- WSSC requires coordination as specified with other buried utilities.

- All WSSC rights-of-way are required to remain free and clear unless otherwise approved.

- Unless otherwise noted, all extensions of WSSC's system require a request for hydraulic planning analysis and need to follow the System Extension Permit process.

In separate comments transmitted to the applicant at the Subdivision and Development Review Committee Meeting on April 1, 2011, the applicant offered the following hydraulic and design comments:

- Site utility system reviews are required for projects with proposed water connections greater than two inches or sewer connections greater than four inches.

- An 8-inch and/or 14-inch water main as well as an 8-inch and 12-inch gravity sewer main is available to serve the proposed site.

- The applicant should contact the WSSC Permit Services Unit or consult WSSC's website for submittal requirements and details regarding applying for service connections.

- No connections should be proposed to the existing 60-inch-wide water main in Adelphi Road, nor should the main be disturbed in any way.

- Water service to this property should be provided from the 320A water pressure zone and no connection(s) should be shown to existing water mains in the 495A water pressure zone.

- Special water and sewer design measures and setback requirements will be necessary due to this project's proximity to the existing 60-inch water main in Adelphi Road.

- The proposed pipeline alignment(s), with water house connections, should be added to the plans. Additionally, if easements are required, their limits and locations must be shown.

- Existing mains on the plans should be shown and labeled with the correct pipe size and WSSC contract number.

- Public safety concerns may require special considerations and modifications of proposed development near large diameter transmission pipelines.

- Right-of-way limits should be shown on the plans for all existing and proposed water and sewer mains.

- Proposed water systems involving pipes greater than three inches in diameter and to be developed at a length more than 80 feet will require an outside meter setting in a vault. The vault and required right-of-way for such vault should be shown and labeled on the plans.

- A single-service connection for two or more buildings in a single lot/parcel requires a covenant. Should the property be subdivided or sold in the future, individual water/sewer connections for each building would be required.

- WSSC easements must be free and clear of other utilities with the exception of allowed crossings designed in accordance with the WSSC Pipeline Design Manual.

- The minimum horizontal clearance from a building to the outside diameter of a WSSC pipeline is 15 feet. The minimum spacing between adjacent buildings with both water and sewer lines between them must be 40 feet. In some cases where connections, fire hydrants, or deep water/sewer lines are involved, additional easement width and/or abandonment of existing WSSC facilities will be required. All work and related expense is the responsibility of the applicant/owner.

Some of WSSC's comments above are more appropriately addressed during the subsequent approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision and specific design plan for the project. In all cases, WSSC issues are not addressed herein, but through their separate permitting process.

m. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—SHA offered the following comments:

- The applicant should coordinate with SHA's Access Management Division (AMD) regarding the provision of a full movement access and the associated improvements from Riggs Road (MD 212).

- An access permit will be required for the proposed access and associated improvements. Plans should be submitted for review and comment. SHA is concerned that the proposed full movement site access is too proximate to the MD 212/Adelphi Road signalized intersection. Traffic queuing analysis should be prepared to insure that it will not adversely impact surrounding intersections. The roadway improvement plans for widening, grading, and paving shall be prepared according to SHA standards and in compliance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) (*A Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets, Current Edition).*

- Truncations and right-of-way dedications/donations need to be designed/accomplished in accordance with the Master Plan of Highways. Plats designed in accordance with SHA standards must be submitted in hard copy format for review, checking, and final issuance.

- Any proposed entrance onto any public roadway system must be designed with proper sight lines for the design speed of the road. Both intersection and stopping sight distance are required that demonstrate that adequate sight distance is provided at the proposed entrance.

- Any utility relocation, adjustment, or connection with SHA rights-of-way requires a permit from the SHA District 3 utility engineer.

- A traffic impact study has been reviewed for the subject project. See the Transportation Planning Section's referral comments above regarding SHA comments on the traffic impact study for the project.

Please note that SHA's concerns will be addressed through their separate permitting process.

n. **Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority**—WMATA noted that the project will be served by bus route C8 along Adelphi Road and R1, R2, and R5 along Riggs Road

(MD 212), offered numerous technical comments regarding the frontage improvements that will be necessary at the two bus turnout locations that will be incorporated in the review of the specific design plan for the project. In closing, WMATA also requested that the developer consider improving bus stops on the opposite side of the street on Edwards Way and Riggs and Adelphi Road due to what they termed "a natural nexus to this project for transit passengers going in the opposite direction." As these are off-site improvements outside the scope of the subject project, they may not be properly considered here but have been, however, passed on to the applicant for their consideration.

o. **The City of College Park**—The City of College Park offered no comment.

p. **Buck Lodge, White Oak Manor, and the Hamptons Civic Associations**—No comment has been received directly from the Buck Lodge, White Oak Manor, and the Hamptons civic associations. However, the Planning Board is in receipt of an undated letter provided by the applicant's representative and signed by Ken Morgan of the Buck Lodge Citizens Association, Larry Sledd of the White Oak Manor Citizens Association, and Lisa Arrington of the Hamptons Civic Association. The letter included the following statements:

- They understand the project to include two buildings; one for a drugstore and the second to have a maximum of two tenants.

- They feel that the project generally meets the zoning conditions except those that cannot be met due to site constraints.

- They support the revised architecture as being distinctive and that it will create an image of quality and permanence both in terms of its exterior, which is specified as predominantly brick, extensive glazing around the building entries, and a bricked archway connecting the two buildings which gives the appearance of respecting a build-to line along the street frontage.

- They feel that the revised plans create a pedestrian-friendly environment by the addition of street furniture, pedestrian lighting, trash receptacles, bike racks and bus stop areas.

- They like the entry feature as a focal point at the Adelphi/Riggs Road intersection.

- They feel that massive parking areas and visible loading and dumpster areas have been eliminated by building and parking placement and by moving the loading and dumpsters closer to Edwards Way, where landscaping is the heaviest.

- They think the changes show good improvement and warrant moving forward with the approval of the comprehensive design plan for the project.

q. **Adelphi Hills Civic Association**—The Adelphi Hills Civic Association offered no comment.

10. **Section 27-521. Required findings for approval—**

**(a) Prior to approving a Comprehensive Design Plan, the Planning Board shall find that:**

**(1) The plan is in conformance with the Basic Plan approved by application per Section 27-195; or when the property was placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment per Section 27-223, was approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, is in conformance with the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change;**

The proposed plan, if approved as recommended below, conforms to the requirements of the approved Basic Plan (A-9954) to the extent possible.

**(2) The proposed plan would result in a development with a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations;**

The proposed plan would result in a development that creates a better environment than could be achieved under other regulations. The submitted plans, as revised by the recommended conditions below will represent a high quality of development of this site. The main features of the site design, such as creation of a decorative wall along the street line in lieu of a build-to line for the building, would rarely be provided under conventional zoning regulations. The proposed architecture represents a substantial upgrade of the basic CVS building type most often seen under other regulations.

**(3) Approval is warranted by the way in which the Comprehensive Design Plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities, and satisfies the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project;**

Approval is warranted by the way in which the comprehensive design plan includes design elements, facilities, and amenities, and satisfies the needs of the residents, employees, or guests of the project. The project is expected to successfully create the enhanced environment envisioned by the District Council at the time of rezoning. The design of the project, facilities, architecture, and amenities offered by the project are superior to that which would have otherwise been developed on the site without the benefit of being located in a comprehensive design zone.

**(4) The proposed development will be compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings;**

The project is compatible with existing land use, zoning, and facilities in the immediate surroundings, which include a variety of commercial and residential uses.

**(5) Land uses and facilities covered by the Comprehensive Design Plan will be compatible with each other in relation to:**

**(A) Amounts of building coverage and open space;**
**(B) Building setbacks from streets and abutting land uses; and**
**(C) Circulation access points;**

Building coverage and open space appear to be compatible with each other and parking areas are sufficiently set back from Adelphi and Riggs Road, as specified in Condition 8(D) of A-9954-C, which prohibits "massive" parking facilities adjacent to either Riggs Road (MD 212) or Adelphi Road. The Planning Board and the DPW&T generally supported the placement of the access points as shown on the comprehensive design plan.

**(6) Each staged unit of the development (as well as the total development) can exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability;**

The project is planned to be constructed in a single phase which, in light of careful site design and preservation and reconstruction of environmental features on the site, will exist as a unit capable of sustaining an environment of continuing quality and stability.

**(7) The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities;**

The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available transportation facilities if the application is approved subject to certain conditions. The staging of development will not be an unreasonable burden on available public facilities. Therefore, it may be said that the staging of proposed development would not create an unreasonable burden on available public facilities.

**(8) Where a Comprehensive Design Plan proposal includes an adaptive use of a Historic Site, the Planning Board shall find that:**

**(A) The proposed adaptive use will not adversely affect distinguishing exterior architectural features or important historic landscape features in the established environmental setting;**

**(B) Parking lot layout, materials, and landscaping are designed to preserve the integrity and character of the Historic Site;**

**(C) The design, materials, height, proportion, and scale of a proposed enlargement or extension of a Historic Site, or of a new structure within the environmental setting, are in keeping with the character of the Historic Site;**

Since the subject project does not include the adaptive use of a historic site, this requirement is inapplicable.

**(9) The Plan incorporates the applicable design guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9, of this Subtitle, and except as provided in Section 27-521(a)(11), where townhouses are proposed in the Plan, with the exception of the V-L and V-M Zones, the requirements set forth in Section 27-433(d);**

The project conforms to the applicable guidelines set forth in Section 27-274 of Part 3, Division 9 of the Zoning Ordinance with respect to parking, loading and circulation, views, green area, site and streetscape amenities, service areas, and architecture. More specifically, the project conforms to the following:

- Minimizing the visual impact of surface parking by locating parking lots to the rear or sides of structures.
- Making loading areas visually unobtrusive and locating them to minimize conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians.
- Utilizing site design techniques to preserve, create, or emphasize views from public areas.
- Designing on-site green areas to complement other site activity areas and make them appropriate in size, shape, location, and design to fulfill their intended use.
- Designing site and streetscape amenities to contribute to an attractive, coordinated development that will enhance the use and enjoyment of the site.
- Designing service areas to be accessible but unobtrusive.
- Providing architecture that offers a variety of building forms, with a unified, harmonious use of materials and style.

**(10) The Plan is in conformance with an approved Tree Conservation Plan;**

The Planning Board approves herewith a Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-015-06, and has included two findings in the approval needed to bring the plan into conformance with the requirement of the approved tree conservation plan. Therefore, it may be said that the subject plan is in conformance with an approved tree conservation plan.

**(11) The Plan demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible;**

The design shown on the TCP1, stamped as received March 14, 2011, preserves the PMA in a natural state to the fullest extent possible by disturbance to the entire PMA and relocation and re-establishment of the natural channel. The PMA contains the only regulated environmental features on the site. Therefore, it may be said that the plan demonstrates the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible.

**(12) Notwithstanding Section 27-521(a)(9), property placed in a Comprehensive Design Zone pursuant to Section 27-226(f)(4), shall follow the guidelines set forth in Section 27-480(g)(1) and (2);**

The subject project does not fit within the narrow parameters of this requirement.

**(13) For a Regional Urban Community, the plan conforms to the requirements stated in the definition of the use and satisfies the requirements for the use in Section 27-508(a)(1) and Section 27-508(a)(2) of this Code.**

Since the subject comprehensive design plan is not for a regional urban community, this requirement is not applicable to the subject project.

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 Comprehensive Design Plan CDP-1001, Edwards Property for the above described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to signature approval of the plans, the applicant shall revise the plans as follows or provide the additional specified documentation:

   a. Provide a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound Riggs Road (MD 212) at the approach to Adelphi Road or such other modification approved by DPW&T and SHA.

   b. The following shall be added as a note in the general notes of the comprehensive design plan:

      "Total development within the subject property shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 23 AM and 268 PM peak-hour vehicle trips. Any

development generating an impact greater than this amount shall require an amended comprehensive design plan with a new determination of the adequacy of transportation facilities."

c. The plans shall clearly indicate that access to the site shall be limited to a right-in/right-out access on Adelphi Road and to a full movement intersection on Riggs Road (MD 212) opposite Metzerott Plaza and revised to replace the grey arrows with blue, indicating only pedestrian access to Edwards Way.

d. Indicate clearly on the comprehensive design plan a dedication of 35 feet from the centerline of Edwards Way, 40 feet from the centerline of Riggs Road (MD 212), and 50 feet from the centerline of Adelphi Road as required by Basic Plan A-9964-C.

e. Procure from DPW&T a written statement that the subject project is in conformance with the requirements of the approved stormwater management concept or its revisions, should the applicant be required by DPW&T to revise the concept. Such statement shall be submitted to the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

f. Additional trash receptacles shall be added to the site and provided interior to the site and along all street frontages. Final design of this additional pedestrian streetscape element shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

g. A note shall be added to the plans stating that trash receptacles and the dumpster shall be emptied as needed; that the site and its landscaping shall be regularly maintained; and that all dust free surfaces shall be washed and swept as needed.

h. Perennial and annual flowering plants shall augment the offerings of the landscape plan. Final design of such additional landscaping shall be approved by the Urban Design Section as designee of the Planning Board.

2. Prior to issuance of the first building permit within the subject property, the following transportation improvements shall (a) have full financial assurances, (b) have been permitted for construction through the operating agency's access permit process, and (c) have an agreed on time table for construction with the appropriate operating agency.

a. Complete a traffic queuing analysis for SHA at the proposed site access point on Riggs Road (MD 212) and any improvements required by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA), at this location.

b. Double left-turn lanes on the southbound/westbound approach of Riggs Road (MD 212) at Adelphi Road, together with any associated pavement markings, signage, traffic signal modifications, or similar items necessary at this location, as determined by the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA).

c. An acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA) for signalization at the intersection of Riggs Road (MD 212) and Edwards Way and any signal or other traffic control improvements that are deemed warranted at that time. The applicant shall utilize a new 12-hour count, and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the responsible operating agency.

3. Prior to approval of the first specific design plan for the subject property, the applicant shall:

a. Submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to the Department of Public Works and Transportation (DPW&T) for signalization at the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way. The applicant shall utilize a new 12-hour count, and shall analyze signal warrants under total future traffic as well as existing traffic at the direction of the responsible operating agency. If any signal or other traffic control improvements is/are deemed warranted by the traffic signal warrant for signalization at the intersection of Adelphi Road and Edwards Way, the applicant shall bond the signal with the appropriate agency prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property, and install it at a time when directed by the agency.

b. Proffer detailed dimensioned color drawings to scale, including all materials describing the exact construction of all streetscape and focal point amenities, including but not limited to the "Welcome to Adelphi" sign, all types of walls to be utilized around the periphery of the site and in the focal point, benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, and decorative light fixtures. The location on all such details and amenities shall be indicated on the specific design plan.

c. Provide a detailed landscape plan including trees, shrubs and annual and perennial flowers creating a diversity of seasonal interest and a vegetative buffer along Edwards Way.

d. Provide a through analysis of all specimen trees whose removal have been approved by the companion variance to CDP-1001 to determine if preservation of any of the specimen trees can be achieved through adjustment of grading, use of retaining walls or other measures.

4. At the time of approval of the preliminary plan for the project:

a. The applicant shall show a dedication of 35 feet from the centerline of Edwards Way.

b. Timing of the required installation of a double left-turn lane along southbound/westbound Riggs Road (MD 212) at the approach to Adelphi Road.

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 Cavitt, seconded by Commissioner Clark, with Commissioners Cavitt, Clark, Vaughns, Squire and Parker voting in favor of the motion at its regular meeting held on Thursday, June 16, 2011, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 7th day of July 2011.

Patricia Colihan Barney
Executive Director

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PCB:JJ:RG:arj

APPROVED AS TO LEGAL SUFFICIENCY.
M-NCPPC Legal Department
Date 6/29/11