THE MARYLAND-NATIONAL CAPITAL PARK AND PLANNING COMMISSION
14741 Governor Oden Bowie Drive
Upper Marlboro, Maryland 20772
www.pgplanning.org

PGCPB No. 2022-129 File No. CSP-88020-03

R E S O L U T I O N

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

WHEREAS, a new Zoning Ordinance, Subtitle 27, Prince George's County Code went into effect on April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, the subject property is within the Residential, Multifamily-48 (RMF-48) and Residential, Single-Family-65 (RSF-65) Zones; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 27-1903(c) of the Zoning Ordinance, development applications submitted and accepted as complete before April 1, 2024, may utilize the prior Zoning Ordinance or Subdivision Regulations for development of a property; and

WHEREAS, therefore, the Prince George's County Planning Board of The Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission reviewed this application under the Zoning Ordinance in existence prior to April 1, 2022; and

WHEREAS, in consideration of evidence presented at a public hearing on December 8, 2022, regarding Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020-03 for Glenwood Hills, the Planning Board finds:

1. **Request:** The subject application is a revision to the previously approved conceptual site plan (CSP) for Glenwood Hills to replace the previously approved mixed-use development consisting of 319 single-family units, 278 multifamily units, and 203,000 square feet of office/retail space, with a mixed-use development consisting of 126 townhouses, 550 multifamily dwelling units, 775,000 square feet of industrial space, and 50,000 square feet of commercial/retail space. Approximately 121.42 acres of the subject property is zoned prior Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T). The subject application also adds approximately 12.03 acres of prior One-Family Detached Residential (R-55)-zoned land to the CSP, as permitted by approval of Prince George's County Council Bill CB-51-2021. This Council bill revised Section 27-441 of the prior Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance, for the purpose of permitting townhouse uses in the R-55 Zone, under certain circumstances. These specified circumstances are provided in Footnote 145 of Section 27-441(b)(7) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which is the Table of Uses for Residential Zones:

Footnote 145

Permitted use, provided that:

> **When added to a Detailed Site Plan for mixed use development in an abutting M-X-T Zone that includes other townhouse, industrial, and commercial retail development. The M-X-T regulations will be applicable to townhouses within the R-55 zoned land.**

This Council bill also revised Section 27-547, of the prior Zoning Ordinance, for the purpose of permitting certain warehouse and distribution uses in the M-X-T Zone, under certain circumstances. These specified circumstances are provided in Footnote 145 of Section 27-547(b)(2) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which is the Table of Uses for Mixed Use Zones:

Footnote 23

Permitted use, provided that:

(a) **Provided the proposed Detailed Site Plan application property is at least 100 acres and is part of a previously approved Detailed Site Plan with residential and commercial development. The new Detailed Site Plan shall amend the previously approved Conceptual Site Plan for all uses pursuant to Section 27-282(g) of the Zoning Ordinance;**

(b) **Industrial uses may not exceed 60% of the gross acreage of the land shown on the proposed Detailed Site Plan; and**

(c) **Industrial development must be separated from any existing or proposed residential development by a minimum of 75 feet.**

The development of property will need to demonstrate compliance with the above requirements with a subsequent preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS) and detailed site plan (DSP).

2. **Development Data Summary:**

	EXISTING	APPROVED
Zone(s)	M-X-T/R-55/M-I-O	M-X-T/R-55/M-I-O
Use(s)	Vacant	Multifamily/Residential/ Commercial/Retail/Industrial
Gross Acreage	133.45	133.45
Total Gross Floor Area	-	775,000 sq. ft. industrial space 50,000 sq. ft. commercial/retail space
Total Single-Family Dwelling Units (Townhouses)		126
Total Multifamily Dwelling Units	-	550

	Approved CSP-88020	Approved CSP-88020-01	Approved CSP-88020-02	Approved CSP-88020-03
Dwelling Units Total	1,794	785	597	676
Single-Family Detached		105	202	-
Townhouses		310	117	126
Multifamily		370	278	550
Commercial – Office/Retail (sq. ft.)	2,231,800	203,000	203,000	50,000
Hotel	300-room	-	-	-
Industrial/Warehouses	-	-	-	775,000
Floor to Area Ratio (FAR)			0.36 – 0.40	0.31

Floor Area Ratio (FAR) in the M-X-T Zone

Base Density Allowed:	0.40 FAR
Residential Optional Method:	1.25 FAR
Total FAR Permitted:	1.40 FAR*
Total FAR Approved:	0.31 FAR

Note: *The maximum density allowed, in accordance with Section 27-545(b)(4) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, Optional method of development, for providing 20 or more residential units.

3. **Location:** The subject property is located on the south side of MD 214 (Central Avenue), approximately 800 feet west of its intersection with Shady Glen Drive, in Planning Area 75A and Council District 6.

4. **Surrounding Uses:** The adjoining properties and uses are as follows:

North— The property is bounded on the north by MD 214. The site has approximately 1,100 linear feet of frontage on MD 214, which is a master-planned arterial roadway. Across MD 214 is vacant land and a church in the Residential, Multifamily-20 (RMF-20) Zone, and single-family detached dwellings in the Residential, Single-Family-65 (RSF-65) Zone.

East— The property is bounded on the east by land zoned Residential, Rural (RR), Residential, Single-Family-95 (RSF-95), and Residential, Multifamily-48 (RMF-48), which is owned by the Potomac Electric Power Company (PEPCO) and used for overhead power transmission lines and a substation. Across this PEPCO-owned land, is a townhouse development in the Residential, Single-Family-Attached (RSF-A) Zone, and the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC)-owned Millwood Neighborhood Recreation Center in the RSF-95 Zone.

South— The property is bounded on the south by Walker Mill Middle School in the RSF-65 Zone.

West— To the west of the property lies residential development consisting of single-family detached dwellings and Central High School in the RSF-65 Zone, and vacant land owned by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority in the RR and RMF-48 Zones.

The property is bisected by the RR-zoned, 66-foot-wide PEPCO right-of-way, which traverses in an east-west direction, approximately 250 feet south of MD 214. Similar to the subject property, the adjoining properties to the north, east, and south are also located in the Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone for height.

5. **Previous Approvals:** A 121.42-acre portion of the subject property was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone in the 1986 *Approved Suitland/District Heights and Vicinity (Planning Areas 75A and 75B) Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment.* CSP-88020, entitled Meridian, was approved by the Prince George's County Planning Board on September 8, 1988 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-303). That original approval included 2,146,700 square feet of office space; 1,794 residential dwelling units; a 300-room hotel; and 85,100 square feet of retail space. The development approved under that CSP never came to fruition, and subsequent approvals were never pursued.

   CSP-88020 was amended, renamed Glenwood Hills, and approved by the Planning Board on March 31, 1994. The amended CSP-88020-01 was approved with 785 dwelling units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail space. PPS 4-94066 was approved by the Planning Board on November 10, 1994 (PGCPB Resolution No. 94-351), subsequent to this CSP. The development, however, again did not proceed for the M-X-T-zoned portion of the subject property, in accordance with these approvals.

   On January 10, 2005, the Prince George's County District Council approved CSP-88020-02, for the M-X-T-zoned portion of the subject property, with 597 dwelling units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail space. PPS 4-04081 was approved by the Planning Board on October 28, 2004 (PGCPB Resolution No. 04-252), subsequent to this CSP. The PPS approved 316 lots and 19 parcels for development of 594 dwelling units and 203,000 square feet of office/retail use. Several DSPs were approved, subsequently, including DSP-07003 for Phase I, DSP-07046 for Phase II, and DSP-07048 for Phase III of the mixed-use development. This portion of the property was platted in 2012, in accordance with these approvals in the Prince George's County Land Records in Plat Book MMB 235, plat numbers 22 to 40.

   A new PPS (4-21051), to reflect the proposed change in this CSP, is pending approval by the Planning Board.

6. **Design Features:** The application approves a mixed-use development consisting of 126 townhouses, 550 multifamily dwelling units, 775,000 square feet of industrial space, and 50,000 square feet of commercial/retail space, within multiple parcels and buildings. The site is

currently vacant. The site will be developed as a mixed-use community, to be served by Karen Boulevard, a master plan collector road, which will be extended in the north-south direction across the entire site.

The site will contain two buildings fronting MD 214, and north of the east-west PEPCO right-of-way, approximately 700,000 square feet in gross floor area, which includes retail/dining space (50,000 square feet), up to 550 multifamily residential dwelling units, and structured parking. This mixed-use development pod will be accessed from MD 214 through two driveways, and will also have access to Karen Boulevard. The two buildings will consist of commercial and retail uses on the ground floor, and residential use above. South and west of the existing PEPCO rights-of-way, and away from the MD 214 corridor, will be the industrial employment use consisting of several warehouse/distribution buildings. West of the proposed Karen Boulevard, 126 townhouses are proposed around two on-site community amenity spaces. The various development pods are interspersed with perimeter woodland retention areas that preserve the existing environmentally sensitive features.

A significant Identity Feature is proposed at the new community's entrance at its Karen Boulevard/MD 214 intersection. Site signage is included on the CSP sheets for the townhouse development, the retail/multifamily area, the community entrance, and the industrial use entry feature, including wayfinding/directional signage for the overall development. This includes ground mounted signage as well as a distinctive pylon not to exceed 24 feet near the retail along MD 214. All of the signage is sized and designed with architectural elements to reflect the uniqueness of the new integrated community. Parking is provided in close proximity to each use, consisting of both structured and surface parking. Each development pod is also provided with stormwater management (SWM) facilities. Both the townhouse development and multifamily buildings will be designed with a variety of recreational facilities for the residents.

COMPLIANCE WITH EVALUATION CRITERIA

7. **Prince George's County Zoning Ordinance:** The subject CSP has been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the M-X-T Zone and the site design guidelines of the prior Zoning Ordinance.

   a. The subject application is in conformance with the requirements of Section 27-547, Uses permitted, of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which governs uses in all mixed-use zones, as follows:

      (1) The proposed townhouse and multifamily residential, commercial/retail, and industrial uses are permitted in the M-X-T Zone. Per Footnote 7 of the Table of Uses, the maximum number and type of dwelling units shall be determined at the time of the CSP approval. Therefore, development of this property would be limited to the numbers and types, as approved in this CSP, that cannot exceed 126 townhouse dwelling units and 550 multifamily dwelling units.

(2) Section 27-547(d) of the prior Zoning Ordinance provides standards for the required mix of uses for sites in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

(d) At least two (2) of the following three (3) categories shall be included on the Conceptual Site Plan and ultimately present in every development in the M-X-T Zone. In a Transit District Overlay Zone, a Conceptual Site Plan may include only one of the following categories, provided that, in conjunction with an existing use on abutting property in the M-X-T Zone, the requirement for two (2) out of three (3) categories is fulfilled. The Site Plan shall show the location of the existing use and the way that it will be integrated in terms of access and design with the proposed development. The amount of square footage devoted to each use shall be in sufficient quantity to serve the purposes of the zone:

(1) Retail businesses;
(2) Office, research, or industrial uses;
(3) Dwellings, hotel, or motel.

This CSP approves three types of uses, as required, including residential, commercial/ retail, and industrial uses. These uses, in the amount shown, satisfy the mixed-use requirement of Section 27-547(d).

b. Section 27-548 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, M-X-T Zone regulations, establishes additional standards for development in this zone. The CSP'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
(2) With the use of the optional method of development—8.0 FAR

A floor area ratio (FAR) range of 0.31 is proposed in this CSP. However, this project can be developed up to the maximum allowed (1.40 FAR), in accordance with Section 27-545(b)(4), which allows an additional FAR of 1.0 on top of the base 0.4 FAR to be permitted where 20 or more dwelling units are proposed. In this CSP, a total of 676 dwelling units are proposed and the proposed FAR is in conformance.

(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 applicant proposes a mix of uses to include residential, commercial/retail, and industrial on the M-X-T-zoned property in multiple buildings, on more than one parcel, as permitted.

(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 not applicable since this application is for a CSP. Subsequent DSP approvals will provide regulations for development on this property.

(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 use.

The development is subject to the requirements of the 2010 *Prince George's County Landscape Manual* (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 and interior incompatible land uses at the time of DSP.

(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 FAR for the approved CSP is 0.31. This will be refined further at the time of DSP, relative to the final proposed gross floor area of the buildings, in conformance with this requirement.

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

There are no private structures within the air space above, or in the ground below public rights-of-way, as part of this project.

(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.

While the overall development is accessed by public streets of MD 214 and proposed Karen Boulevard, the individual townhouse lots will be served by private streets and alleys. At the time of PPS, appropriate frontage and direct vehicular access for all lots and parcels must be properly addressed.

(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 two hundred (1,200) square feet in size, and shall have at least sixty percent (60%) of the full front facades constructed of brick, stone, or stucco. In addition, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except where the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. The minimum lot size, maximum number of units per building group and percentages of such building groups, and building width requirements and restrictions shall not apply to townhouses on land any portion which lies within one-half (½) mile of an existing or planned mass transit rail station site operated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and initially opened after January 1, 2000. In no event shall there be more than ten (10) dwelling units in a building group and no more than two (2) building groups containing ten (10) dwelling units. For purposes of this section, a building group shall be considered a separate building group (even though attached) when the angle formed by the front walls of two (2) adjoining rows of units is greater than forty-five degrees (45°). Except that, in the case of a Mixed-Use Planned Community, there shall be no more than eight (8) townhouses per building group, except when the applicant demonstrates to the satisfaction of the Planning Board or District Council, as applicable, that more than eight (8) dwelling units (but not more than ten (10) dwelling units) would create a more attractive living environment or would be more environmentally sensitive. In no event shall the number of building groups containing more than eight (8) dwelling units exceed twenty percent (20%) of the total number of building groups in the total development. The minimum building width in any continuous, attached group shall be eighteen (18) feet, and the minimum gross living space shall be one thousand two hundred and fifty (1,250) square feet. For the purposes of this Subsection, gross living space

shall be defined as all interior building space except the garage and unfinished basement or attic area. Garages may not dominate the streetscape. Garages that are attached or incorporated into the dwelling shall be set back a minimum of four (4) feet from the front façade and there shall not be more than a single garage, not to exceed ten (10) feet wide, along the front façade of any individual unit. Garages may be incorporated into the rear of the building or freestanding in the rear yard and accessed by an alley. Sidewalks are required on both sides of all public and private streets and parking lots. At the time of Detailed Site Plan, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve a request to substitute townhouses, proposed for development as condominiums, in place of multifamily dwellings that were approved in a Conceptual Site Plan approved prior to April 1, 2004. Such substitution shall not require a revision to any previous plan approvals. Further, at the time of Detailed Site Plan for a Mixed-Use Planned Community, the Planning Board or the District Council may approve modifications to these regulations so long as the modifications conform to the applicable regulations for the particular development.

The previous CSP-88030-02 approval did not impose minimum lot size and lot width requirements on the townhouse portion of the development different from those listed in this section. The applicant proposes minimum development standards for townhouses, in conformance with this section. The minimum lot size required by this section at the time of approval of CSP-88030-02 in 2005 was 1,800 square feet. The minimum lot size required, in accordance with this section, is now 1,200 square feet.

(i) The maximum height of multifamily buildings shall be one hundred and ten (110) feet. This height restriction shall not apply within any Transit District Overlay Zone, designated General Plan Metropolitan or Regional Centers, or a Mixed-Use Planned Community.

The height limit will be further evaluated with the DSP for the proposed multifamily buildings.

(j) As noted in Section 27-544(b), which references property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation, regulations for Conceptual or Detailed Site Plans (such as, but not limited to density, setbacks, buffers, screening, landscaping, height, recreational requirements, ingress/egress, and internal circulation) should be based on the design guidelines or standards intended to implement the development concept recommended by the Master Plan, Sector Plan, or the Sectional Map Amendment Zoning Change and any referenced exhibit of record for the property. This regulation also applies to property readopted in the

M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006 and for which a comprehensive land use planning study was conducted by Technical Staff prior to initiation of a concurrent Master Plan or Sector Plan (see Section 27-226(f)(3) of the Zoning Ordinance).

The subject property was placed in the M-X-T Zone through the *Suitland/District Heights and Vicinity (Planning Areas 75A and 75B) Sectional Map Amendment*, dated March 1986 (Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-25-1986). However, no specific design guidelines were approved with the master plan for this property. Per Footnote 145 of the Use Table in Section 27-441(b)(7) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, M-X-T regulations are applicable to townhouse development in the R-55-zoned portion of the site.

c. The subject application has been reviewed for conformance with the requirements of Section 27-546(d) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which requires additional findings for the Planning Board to approve a CSP in the M-X-T Zone, as follows:

(1) The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes and other provisions of this Division:

The proposed development is in conformance with the purposes of the M-X-T Zone. The purpose of the M-X-T Zone is to promote orderly development of land in the vicinity of major intersections and to enhance the economic status of Prince George's County. The proposed development, consisting of residential, commercial/retail, and warehouse/distribution uses, will provide increased economic activity proximate to the MD 214 corridor. It also allows for the reduction of the number and distance of automobile trips by constructing residential and nonresidential uses near each other. This CSP, in general, promotes the purposes of the M-X-T Zone and contributes to the orderly implementation of the 2014 *Plan Prince George's 2035 Approved General Plan* (Plan 2035). The proposed development is in conformance with the purpose of the M-X-T Zone.

(2) For property placed in the M-X-T Zone through a Sectional Map Amendment approved after October 1, 2006, the proposed development 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 subject site was rezoned to the M-X-T Zone through the 1986 *Suitland/ District Heights and Vicinity (Planning Areas 75A and 75B) Sectional Map Amendment*. Therefore, this requirement is inapplicable to the subject CSP.

(3) The proposed development has an outward orientation which either is physically and visually integrated with existing adjacent development or catalyzes adjacent community improvement and rejuvenation;

The proposed development will be oriented outward. The proposed development includes a significant identification and entry feature at its Karen Boulevard/ MD 214 intersection. The placement of the multifamily building with retail at that same location creates the outward orientation that draws interest from vehicular and pedestrian movements along MD 214 at that location and at the new street—proposed by the applicant—between its two multifamily/retail buildings. This will create visible retail and an open area of activities that will be a draw to the existing surrounding and new community. The applicant has provided a concept for its urban open space designated as the Community Lawn Plan (Exhibit A) and the Glenwood Hills Public Park (Exhibit B) area to provide potential concepts to be developed. How buildings relate to the street and other urban design considerations must be addressed at the time of DSP, to ensure continued conformance with this requirement.

This CSP approves a mixed-use development that will improve and rejuvenate a currently vacant site. The site will be accessible from MD 214 from at least two access points. There are existing adjacent residential and commercial developments and there are extensive pedestrian and bicycle facilities planned for the area in Plan 2035, which, when complete, will provide pedestrian connections to adjacent developments and amenities. Pedestrian connections will be installed at a future time should there be development of adjacent sites. All proposed mixed-use buildings are outwardly oriented and facing MD 214. The surrounding land uses consist of single-family residential or institutional uses. To reduce the impact of the proposed industrial warehouses in this setting, and increase the impact and continuity of green areas, it is desirable to create a 'park-like' setting by locating the large warehouse buildings away from Karen Boulevard and incorporating an enhanced buffer between the street and the buildings. This buffer should comprise a mix of berms and evergreen and shade trees. An enhanced buffer is even more desirable given that Karen Boulevard will connect existing residential neighborhoods to MD 214. The standard requirement for landscape strips along streets in accordance with Section 4.2 of the Landscape Manual is a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip to be planted with a minimum of one shade tree and ten shrubs per 35 linear feet of frontage. A minimum 20-foot-wide landscape strip shall be planted, with a minimum of two shade trees and 20 shrubs per 35 linear feet of frontage.

(4) The proposed development is compatible with existing and proposed development in the vicinity;

The proposed development will implement the vision of the 2010 *Approved Subregion 4 Master Plan and Sectional Map Amendment* (Subregion 4 Master

Plan and SMA) and will revitalize the vacant site that fronts approximately 1,500 feet of MD 214, which is located half a mile from a metro station and a mile from Walker Mill Regional Park, and is adjacent to two public schools. The proposed development is compatible with existing development in the area and appropriate landscape buffering will be provided in accordance with the Landscape Manual.

(5) The mix of uses, arrangement and design of buildings and other improvements, and provision of public amenities reflect a cohesive development capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability;

This development proposes a sustainable and quality site with mixed-use buildings, pedestrian access, and spacing to avoid high density development. A mix of uses is envisioned along MD 214 to create a gateway to the development, attracting both local residents and visitors. This mixed-use development will provide convenient shopping and residences within a walkable area, capable of sustaining an independent environment of continuing quality and stability. The specifics of the arrangement and design of the buildings will be further examined at the time of DSP.

(6) If the development is staged, each building phase is designed as a self-sufficient entity, while allowing for effective integration of subsequent phases;

The initial development is proposed to include approximately 50 percent or more of the industrial development, one of the multifamily buildings, the townhouse development and the majority of the retail, all contingent on the "ripeness" of the market. This amount of development—with its accompanying employee base of the industrial and retail employment—creates the 24-hour environment envisioned by the M-X-T Zone. Additional employment and multifamily development are envisioned in a subsequent phase.

(7) The pedestrian system is convenient and is comprehensively designed to encourage pedestrian activity within the development;

This requirement will be evaluated in detail at the time of PPS and DSP. The illustrative plan submitted with the CSP shows sidewalks adjacent to roadways, connecting to each part of the development. Shared use paths and sidewalks are associated with all the parking areas and connect to both the public rights-of-way and to internal walkways in and around the site. The north-south pedestrian walkway is enhanced to be 8 feet wide on the western side of Karen Boulevard and has pedestrian connectivity to the existing established residential communities to the west and the public school to the south. These connections facilitate access to the major retail area proposed along MD 214.

(8) On the Detailed Site Plan, in areas of the development which are to be used for pedestrian activities or as gathering places for people, adequate attention has been paid to human scale, high quality urban design, and other amenities, such as the types and textures of materials, landscaping and screening, street furniture, and lighting (natural and artificial); and

The above finding is not applicable because the subject application is a CSP. The design of pedestrian and public spaces will be reviewed at the time of DSP.

(9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club), or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of Conceptual Site Plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.

A traffic impact study (TIS) was submitted as part of this CSP. The proposed development provides adequate transportation facilities.

(10) On the Detailed Site Plan, if more than six (6) years have elapsed since a finding of adequacy was made at the time of rezoning through a Zoning Map Amendment, Conceptual Site Plan approval, or preliminary plat approval, whichever occurred last, the development will be adequately served within a reasonable period of time with existing or programmed public facilities shown in the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, within the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, or to be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club).

The above finding is not applicable because the subject application is a CSP. This requirement will be evaluated at the time of DSP for this project.

(11) On a property or parcel zoned E-I-A or M-X-T and containing a minimum of two hundred fifty (250) acres, a Mixed-Use Planned Community including a combination of residential, employment, commercial and institutional uses

may be approved in accordance with the provisions set forth in this Section and Section 27-548.

The above finding is not applicable because the subject development only contains 133.45 acres.

d. The CSP is in conformance with the applicable site design guidelines contained in Section 27-274 of the prior Zoning Ordinance. The approved development concept provides a mix of uses that front on roadways. The CSP notes that architecture for the development will provide a variety of architectural elements to convey the individuality of units, while providing for a cohesive design. Detailed designs of all buildings, site infrastructure, features, and amenities will be further reviewed at the time of DSP.

Specifically, the CSP anticipates and aims to achieve the following design options:

- The parking lot has been designed to provide safe and efficient vehicular and pedestrian circulation within the site;
- Parking spaces have been designed to be located near the use that it serves;
- Parking aisles have been oriented and designed to minimize the number of parking lanes crossed by pedestrians;
- Plant materials will be added to the parking lot for the commercial use to avoid large expanses of pavement;
- The loading space(s) will be located to avoid conflicts with vehicles or pedestrians;
- The loading area will be clearly marked and separated from parking areas;
- Light fixtures will be designed to enhance the site's design character by using full cut-off light fixtures throughout the development;
- Luminosity and location of exterior fixtures will enhance user safety and minimize vehicular/pedestrian conflicts;
- Lighting will be designed to enhance building entrances and pedestrian pathways;
- The pattern of light pooling will be directed to the site to ensure that no excessive lighting spills over to the adjacent properties;
- The site landscaping will comply with all requirements of the Landscape Manual, and native species will be used throughout the development.

- Public amenities including outdoor seating, bike racks, benches, etc. will be proposed; and

- Building architecture and materials will be high-quality and visually interesting.

In addition, all buildings will be designed to provide a modern, clean, and strong presence along road frontages. The proposed site and streetscape amenities in this project will contribute to an attractive, coordinated development. The CSP envisions attractive site fixtures that will be made from durable, high-quality materials and will enhance the site for future residents and patrons. Conformance with site design guidelines will be further reviewed at the time of DSP, when all required information is provided.

e. In accordance with Section 27-574 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, the number of parking spaces required in the M-X-T Zone is to be calculated by the applicant and submitted for Planning Board approval at the time of DSP. Detailed information regarding the methodology and procedures to be used in determining the parking ratio is outlined in Section 27-574(b) of the prior Zoning Ordinance. At the time of DSP review, demonstration of adequacy of proposed parking, including visitor parking and loading configurations, will be required for development.

8. **Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020 and its amendments**: CSP-88020 was approved by the Planning Board on September 8, 1988 (PGCPB Resolution No. 88-303) and included 2,146,700 square feet of office space, 1,794 residential dwelling units, a 300-room hotel, and 85,100 square feet of retail space. On March 31, 1994, the original CSP was amended to revise the mix of uses for the site, including different types and number of dwelling units and reducing the amount of commercial/retail and office square footage. The conditions of CSP-88020 were thoroughly reviewed and carried forward with the -01 amendment approval, as necessary. Therefore, they do not need to be included here for review.

CSP-88020-02: On January 10, 2005, the District Council approved CSP-88020-02, to further reduce the number of proposed dwelling units from 785 to 597 dwelling units but with no revision to 203,000 square feet of office/retail space, subject to 29 conditions. With the current -03 amendment, the applicant proposed several deletions and amendments to the conditions approved by the District Council's original approval of CSP-88020-02. The 29 conditions of approval are below, followed by the applicant's request regarding each, and the Planning Board's analysis. The conditions of the subject approval entirely supersede those contained in CSP-88020-02.

1. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for MD 214 at Addison Road 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-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. Option 1: The construction of a northbound free right-turn lane along Addison Road

b. Option 2: The construction of an eastbound right-turn lane along MD 214.

The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 would be implemented shall be made at the time of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review.

2. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for MD 214 at Garrett A Morgan Boulevard/Ritchie Road 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-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. Option 1: The modification of westbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and a shared through/right-turn lane.

b. Option 2: The modification of eastbound MD 214 to a five-lane approach which includes one left-turn lane, three through lanes, and one right-turn lane; and the modification of northbound Ritchie Road to a five-lane approach which includes two left-turn lanes, two through lanes, and one right-turn lane.

The above two improvements are options for which feasibility shall be reviewed further by the applicant. Determination of whether Option 1 or 2 would be implemented shall be made at the time of Preliminary Plan of Subdivision review.

3. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for Walker Mill Road at Addison Road 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-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. The modification of westbound Walker Mill Road to provide an exclusive left-turn lane and a left-turn/right-turn lane.

4. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit an acceptable traffic signal warrant study to SHA and, if necessary, DPW&T for a possible signal at the intersection of MD 214 and Pepper Mill Road/Karen 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 responsible agency. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the

release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by the responsible permitting agency. Also, prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road 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-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. The provision of an eastbound shared through/right-turn lane along MD 214.

b. The addition of a westbound left-turn lane along MD 214.

c. The construction of the northbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.

d. The modification of the southbound approach to include an exclusive left-turn lane and a shared through/right-turn lane.

e. The signalization at the intersection of MD 214, Pepper Mill Road, and Karen Boulevard shall include a left turn/right turn (no through movement) north approach. Copies of the proposed plan shall be provided to representatives of the Pepper Mill Village Association before it is implemented.

The scope of access improvements may be modified at the time of preliminary plan review at the direction of SHA if the alternative improvement(s) provide an acceptable service level that meets the requirements of Subtitles 27 and 24.

5. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the subject property, the applicant shall submit acceptable traffic signal warrant studies to DPW&T for the intersection of Walker Mill Road and Karen Boulevard. The performance of a new study may be waived by DPW&T in writing if DPW&T determines that an acceptable recent study has been conducted. 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 DPW&T. If a signal is deemed warranted by the responsible agency at that time, the applicant shall bond the signal prior to the release of any building permits within the subject property and install it at a time when directed by DPW&T.

6. Prior to approval of the Preliminary Plan, the following issues shall be further analyzed and addressed:

a. Inclusion of vehicular and pedestrian access between the subject property and Quarry Avenue.

b. Inclusion of vehicular and pedestrian internal access between the residential and the commercial components of the site.

7. The traffic circle shown on the subject plan shall be reviewed and conceptually approved by DPW&T prior to approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision.

8. Total development within the subject property under this Conceptual Site Plan shall be limited to uses which generate no more than 780 AM and 933 PM new peak-hour vehicle trips, in consideration of the rates of trip generation, internal satisfaction, and pass-by travel that are consistent with assumptions in the traffic study.

9. Prior to the issuance of any building permits within the subject property, the following road improvements for Karen Boulevard 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-upon timetable for construction with the appropriate operating agency:

a. Construct Karen Boulevard as a modified four-lane collector roadway between MD 214 and the southern end of the site.

10. Prior to the approval of the first Detailed Site Plan for the property, the applicant shall demonstrate the following have been or will be fulfilled to the satisfaction of the State Highway Administration:

a. Provide a diagram that demonstrates stopping and intersection site distance.

b. Provide an adequate left-turn lane along westbound MD 214 approach to Karen Boulevard.

c. Provide adequate turning lanes along eastbound MD 214 approach and departure at Karen Boulevard.

d. Provide a full movement traffic signal.

The applicant requested that Conditions 1–9 be eliminated, since those conditions were premised on a prior TIS. A new TIS was provided which is premised on a significantly different development proposal with decreased quantity of residential dwellings, commercial/retail space, and the addition of industrial development. The applicant further stated that the new TIS, along with the proposed access and circulation design elements, more appropriately provide for the necessary transportation improvements and timing thereof that were previously outlined in these conditions. The applicant has not requested any action on Condition 10 which is also related to traffic improvements at MD 214.

The TIS submitted as part of the CSP application was reviewed, and it was concluded that existing transportation facilities, when improved with proposed improvements

outlined in the TIS, are sufficient to support the proposed development. All intersections within the study area will operate at acceptable levels, except the Karen Boulevard/ MD 214 intersection, which will require construction of a traffic signal to meet the requirements of the applicable transportation service area. As such, a condition of approval is included in this resolution, which requires that, as part of the approval of the PPS application, the applicant shall submit a full traffic signal warrant analysis for the Karen Boulevard/MD 214 intersection to determine if a signal is deemed warranted. The adequacy of transportation facilities will be further analyzed with the PPS, which is currently under review. Therefore, Conditions 1–10 are deleted.

11. Prior to signature approval of the Conceptual Site Plan, the following revisions shall be made:

a. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk along the subject property's entire east side of Karen Boulevard.

b. Provide a minimum eight-foot-wide sidewalk that is separated from the curb with a landscape strip along the subject site's entire road frontage of MD 214, unless modified by SHA.

c. Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all internal roads, unless modified by DPW&T.

d. Revise the Conceptual Site Plan to provide a trail connection from the end of Road "G" to Quarry Place and, if possible, Fawncrest Drive. The exact location of this trail connection should be determined at the time of DSP.

The applicant requested one revision to Condition 11. Specifically, it is requested that in Condition 11.a., the minimum 8-foot-wide sidewalk be required on the west side of Karen Boulevard instead of the east side. The applicant argued that the east side of the property is proposed to include the majority of the industrial uses, and the west side of the property is proposed to include portions of the new single-family residential and park areas along Karen Boulevard. Given the proximity of the existing and new single-family residential, the new school further south, and to negate unnecessary pedestrian traffic at the industrial use access point, the applicant proposed an 8-foot sidewalk for the west side of Karen Boulevard.

The Planning Board agrees with providing a wider pedestrian facility along the west side of Karen Boulevard, however, recommends a minimum 10-foot-wide shared use path and/or shared roadway be provided along this street. The pedestrian and bicycle facilities were evaluated in accordance with the Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA and the 2009 *Approved Countywide Master Plan of Transportation* (MPOT). A condition of approval is included in this resolution requiring the applicant to construct adequate pedestrian and bikeway facilities for the development. Therefore, Condition 11 is deleted.

12. **A Detailed Site Plan shall be submitted for approval by the Planning Board which complies with the standards outlined in the Parks and Recreation Facilities Guidelines.**

13. **The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.**

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

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

16. **The land to be conveyed to a homeowners association shall be subject to the applicable conditions in attached Exhibit "A."**

17. **The following private recreational facilities shall be provided within the development and shall be deemed adequate:**

    - **Townhouse pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)**

    - **Multifamily pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.**

    - **Central recreational area consisting of the following:**

        - **Clubhouse with meeting room large enough to accommodate seating for 100 persons, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), 1,000-square-foot fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons**

        - **25-meter swimming pool**

        - **One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)**

        - **Possible trail connection from the townhouse development along the stream to the central recreational area.**

        - **One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)**

- **One tennis court**

- **Appropriately sized parking facility for the residents only**

At the time of the Preliminary Plan, the design of the Central Recreational Area shall be conceptually approved and shall include the facilities noted above.

18. The following schedule shall govern bonding and construction of recreational facilities and shall be included in the recreational facilities agreement(s):

a. Prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.

b. Prior to the issuance of the 300th building permit in the development, the applicant shall complete the central recreational facilities.

c. The bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development pods shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each pod respectively, and the completion of the same facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each pod of development.

Conditions 12–18 relate to the provision of private recreational facilities for the proposed residential development, their design, adequacy, triggers for construction, location, and ownership and maintenance.

The applicant requested that Condition 13 be revised to reflect the recreational facilities may be of an "owners" association or M-NCPPC. The project proposes two areas along the west side of Karen Boulevard, an area west of the Karen Boulevard/MD 214 intersection and within the multifamily/retail area east of that intersection—which may have recreational facilities or amenities. Since these areas are proposed to be accessible and used by existing area residents, new residents, area patrons, ownership of areas not conveyed to M-NCPPC may more appropriately need to be on land of an owners association that is not limited to homeowners.

The applicant also requested that Conditions 17 and 18 be eliminated, since the number of residential dwellings has been substantially reduced, and the new PPS and DSP propose on-site private recreational facilities for the multifamily building and a new set of recreational facilities for the 132 single-family attached dwellings. The amount of prior approved recreational facilities no longer aligns with the proposed development.

The CSP shows conceptual locations of proposed active and passive recreational areas, for both multifamily and townhouse residential development pods. The applicant has also provided exhibits depicting the conceptual design of these facilities, to accommodate various activities during different times of the day and for different users and age groups.

Conditions 12–18 are therefore deleted, since the adequacy of proposed recreational facilities will be reviewed further with the PPS and DSP.

19. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan:

a. The TCPI-44-96-01 shall be revised to show the following:

(1) Proposed building footprint locations, parking lots, and easements in the new design for the office/retail component.

(2) Revisions signed and dated by a qualified professional.

(3) The 65 dBA Ldn noise contour from I-95/495.

20. Prior to submission of a Detailed Site Plan for the office/retail component, the Applicant shall provide a copy of the approved/proposed stormwater management concept plan for that area.

The applicant requested that Conditions 19 and 20 be eliminated, since the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) and SWM concept plan for the property have been submitted anew, and the conditions associated with those reviews should be reflected on the CSP. The TCP1 shows the proposed building footprints, parking lots, and easements for the mixed-use development pod, which includes the retail component, and is signed and dated by a qualified professional. Office use is no longer proposed in this development. A Phase I noise study will be required with the PPS to demonstrate that any planned outdoor recreation areas and the multifamily dwelling units are not impacted by noise. Also, at the time of DSP, when the positions of dwellings and details of the recreation facilities are known, Phase II noise studies will be required with the plans. Therefore, deletion of Conditions 19 and 20 is approved.

21. Prior to the issuance of a building permit for the 500th dwelling unit, the Applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of some of the office/retail component or (b) provided to M-NCPPC Urban Design Division evidence of its good faith efforts marketing of the commercial component along with third-party data on the existing market for office and/or retail development at the Property and adjoining area.

The applicant requested that Condition 21 be revised to reflect the trigger as 133rd, instead of 500th dwelling unit and to remove "office." The applicant proposes to commence concurrent construction of the multifamily/retail mixed-use area, and this will occur prior to issuance of the final building permits for the proposed 126 townhouse dwelling units.

This condition was included in the prior CSP-88020-02 approval, to assure completion of a portion of the office/retail component before completion of the entire residential

component, which would not result in a mixed-use development, as required for M-X-T-zoned properties. Since office use is no longer proposed in this development, and a change in the trigger from the 500th to the 127th building permit will still ensure that the mix of uses required in the M-X-T Zone is achieved, the Planning Board agrees with the requested revision. The revised condition has been included in this resolution.

22. Prior to approval of any Detailed Site Plan, a new Preliminary Plan of Subdivision application shall be approved.

The applicant did not request the deletion of Condition 22. However, it is noted that, in accordance with Section 27-270 of the prior Zoning Ordinance, which establishes the order of approvals, a PPS is required to be approved prior to approval of any DSP for a development. Therefore, Condition 22 is deleted.

23. Prior to certification of the Conceptual Site Plan, the following revisions to the plans shall be made:

a. The FSD shall be revised as follows: revise the FSD plan notes under site analysis to reflect the correct acreage of existing forest on-site, if necessary, after the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined and have the plan signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plan.

b. The Type I Tree Conservation Plan (TCPI-66-94-01) shall be revised as follows.

(1) Add to the plan all of the standard notes as required exclusively for a TCPI.

(2) Have the total existing woodlands adjusted, if necessary, once the correct amount of existing woodland has been determined.

(3) Add a note as the first TCPI note that states: "This TCPI does not define the final limits of disturbance and does not approve the limits shown. Impacts to regulated environmental features are also not approved by this plan."

(4) Have the plans signed and dated by the qualified professional who prepared the plans.

c. The CSP shall be revised to show the projected 65 dBA Ldn at 247 feet from the centerline of Central Avenue or provide a Phase I Noise Study to verify a revised location of the 65 dBA Ldn contour.

The applicant requested the deletion of Condition 23, since a new or updated natural resources inventory (NRI) plan, that replaces the forest stand delineation plan, and a tree conservation plan were provided, consistent with the new design of the project, and the conditions associated with those reviews should be substituted in place of those currently expressed in Condition 23. It is noted that NRI-165-2021 was received with the CSP application, along with TCP1-066-94-03. Appropriate conditions of approval are included with this CSP, based upon a review of the NRI and TCP1. Therefore, the Planning Board agrees with the deletion of Condition 23.

24. At the time of Detailed Site Plan review, if residential uses are proposed within the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour, noise mitigation measures shall be provided for outdoor activity areas and interior living areas to meet the state noise standards.

The applicant requested the deletion of Condition 24. In justification of their request, the applicant stated that outdoor activities are proposed and designed integral to the mixed-use development close to MD 214, and that any required noise mitigation measures such as berms, walls, fencing, or extensive landscaping will conflict with the purposes of current planning documents. The Subdivision Regulations require that residential lots adjacent to existing or planned roadways of arterial classification be platted with a minimum depth of 150 feet, and that adequate protection and screening from traffic nuisances shall be provided by earthen berms, plant materials, fencing, and/or the establishment of a building restriction line, when appropriate. Maximum allowable noise levels for various land uses shall be as listed in Section 19-122 of the Prince George's County Code, and the evaluation of noise and its mitigation will be evaluated with the PPS and DSP.

It is noted that this condition was included with the approval of CSP-88020-02, since that CSP showed commercial uses located adjacent to MD 214 and residential units were proposed close to the approximate location of the 65 dBA Ldn noise contour. The current CSP proposes multifamily dwelling units near MD 214, and the subsequent noise studies required at the time of PPS and DSP will determine the location of the 45 and 65 dBA Ldn noise contours and any required mitigation. Therefore, deletion of this condition is approved.

25. The following development standards apply and shall be demonstrated throughout the review of future plans:

SINGLE-FAMILY DETACHED:

Traditional SFD

Minimum Net Lot area—6,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—2,200 square feet

Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—40%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—50 to 60 feet (Footnote 1)

Front yard setback—20 feet (Footnote 2)

Side yard setback—5/10 combined feet

Rear yard setback—20 (excluding decks)

Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at DSP

Small Lot SFD Front Load

Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet

One or Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—50%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—45-50 feet

Front yard setback—15 feet (Footnote 2)

Side yard setback—4 feet

Rear yard setback—20 (excluding decks)

Accessory building rear yard setback—2 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Small Lot SFD Rear Load

Minimum Net Lot area—4,000 square feet

Minimum finished living area—1,800 square feet

Two car garage—yes

Maximum lot coverage—60%

Minimum lot frontage at the street line—40 to45 feet (Footnote 1)

Front yard setback—15 feet, 20 feet along Karen Boulevard (Porches may extend up to 9 feet into the setback area)

Side yard setback—4 feet

Rear yard setback—3 feet

Accessory building rear yard setback—3 feet

Maximum height of building—40 feet

Deck standards—to be determined at Detailed Site Plan

Footnote 1 **Excludes cul-de-sacs, flag lots and lots which front on pocket parks.**

Footnote 2 **A minimum of 20 feet shall be provided to the garage door**

TOWNHOUSES:

All townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the Zoning Ordinance.

MULTIFAMILY:

12-plex multifamily units:

Minimum distance between two buildings—20 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a property line—20 feet

Minimum distance from a building to a parking lot—5 feet

Minimum green space (minimum percent of net lot area)—45%

Minimum of 60% of all facades shall be brick

TWO OVER TWO UNITS:

Not more than six ground level units in a row

Minimum width of the dwelling shall be no less than 16 feet wide

Minimum finished living area shall be no less than 1,100 square feet

Minimum of 60% of the front façade shall be brick

The Planning Board may make minor modifications to the Development Standards noted above, as a part of any subsequent approval, without the need to amend the Conceptual Site Plan if the Planning Board finds such modification is appropriate and consistent with the character and quality of the development envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan.

26. Prior to the approval of the preliminary plan of subdivision, the following shall be fulfilled:

a. Based on the proposed layout as shown on the Conceptual Site Plan for the multifamily 12-plex pod of development, the applicant shall demonstrate a minimum of 45 percent green area and a maximum of 55 percent lot coverage.

27. Prior to signature approval of the Conceptual Site Plan the following revisions shall be made:

a. The view corridors created by the streets running parallel to Karen Boulevard and adjacent to the central pocket park shown within the townhouse section shall be extended by creating smaller townhouse sticks adjacent to the tree save area. Larger sticks of townhouses, consistent with the provisions of the Zoning Ordinance, may be utilized in this area in order to avoid the loss of lots.

28. Prior to the approval of a Detailed Site Plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

a. Brick fronts shall be a standard feature for 60 percent of all single-family detached units fronting on Karen Boulevard, and picket fences shall be provided for single-family detached units along Karen Boulevard in a manner that provides for a separation element to the pedestrian area.

b. Sixty percent of all facades of the clubhouse shall be brick, and the building shall be placed in a visually prominent location.

c. Rooflines for all dwelling types shall be varied and provide for reverse gables where appropriate to add interest to the streetscape.

d. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.

e. Pole-mounted freestanding signs shall be prohibited for the office/retail component of the development. Freestanding and building-mounted signage shall not be internally lit.

f. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design.

g. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate areas such as the entrance to the subdivision off of Central Avenue, central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily 12-plex development, and the office/retail development.

h. If allowed by DPW&T, shade tree plantings shall be provided within the median of Karen Boulevard and be of a size and type to create the residential, pedestrian friendly boulevard envisioned by the Conceptual Site Plan. A single row of 2½- to 3-inch caliper trees shall be provided along both sides of Karen Boulevard on one side of the sidewalks.

i. The multifamily (two over two units) pod of the development shall increase the number of units fronting onto Karen Boulevard and ensure adequate but not excessive parking areas in close proximity to all units.

j. The location of future bus stops, pedestrian connections, and crosswalks shall be shown on the plans.

29. Prior to the approval of a Preliminary Plan of Subdivision and Detailed Site Plans, the plans shall reflect the following:

a. The minimum number of traditional single-family detached lots shall be not less than 20 percent of the single-family detached lots.

The applicant requested the deletion of Conditions 25–29, as the residential component has changed significantly and the applicant will be proposing the elements and development standards on a future DSP.

Condition 25 established the development standards for various dwelling types proposed with CSP-88020-02. Except for townhouses, none of the prior dwelling types are being approved with the current CSP amendment. It is also noted that the development standards listed for townhouses in the M-X-T Zone are subject to Section 27-548(h) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, and are unnecessary to be listed as a separate condition of

approval. Any townhouse development in the M-X-T Zone is required to conform to this section. Therefore, deletion of Condition 25 is approved.

Conditions 26, 27, and 29 are also specific to the development approved with CSP-88020-02 and, therefore, are approved for deletion.

Condition 28 requires certain issues related to architecture, signage, lighting, landscaping, parking, and pedestrian connections for the proposed mixed-use development. Each of these issues have been reviewed, and conditions related to entrance features, signage, lighting, and paving are being carried forward, since they are still relevant to the development approved in this CSP.

9. **Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance:** This property is subject to the provisions of the Prince George's County Woodland and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Ordinance (WCO) because the property is greater than 40,000 square feet in size and contains more than 10,000 square feet of existing woodland. Currently, this site has an approved TCP1 (TCPI-066-94-02) and Type 2 tree conservation plan (TCP2-049-07). This CSP application includes a revised TCPI (-03), which is subject to the current regulations because it is a part of a new PPS application submission.

   a. An approved natural resources inventory (NRI-165-2021) was submitted with the application. The site is fully wooded and contains regulated environmental features, steep slopes, streams, wetlands, and their associated buffers, which comprise the primary management area (PMA). The site also contains specimen trees. The site statistics table on the NRI shows 26.71 acres of PMA, with 7,200 linear feet of regulated streams.

   b. The site contains a total of 126.77 acres of woodlands, including 4.29 acres of wooded floodplain. With the passage of CB-51-2021, it was determined that the entire site would be subject to the M-X-T regulations, including the regulations for the woodland conservation thresholds. The site has a woodland conservation threshold of 15 percent or 18.72 acres. The TCP1 proposes to clear 91.69 acres woodland resulting in a total woodland conservation requirement of 42.43 acres. The woodland conservation requirement is proposed to be met with 28.04 acres of on-site preservation, 3.63 acres afforestation, and 10.76 acres of off-site credits. Technical revisions are required to the TCP1, prior to certification of the CSP, in conformance with the conditions of this approval.

   c. Section 25-122(b)(1)(G) of the County Code 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." The code, however, is not inflexible.

The authorizing legislation of the WCO is the Maryland Forest Conservation Act, which is codified under Title 5, Subtitle 16 of the Natural Resources Article of the Maryland Code. Section 5-1611 of the Natural Resources Article requires the local jurisdiction to provide procedures for granting variances to the local forest conservation program. The variance criteria in the WCO are set forth in Section 25-119(d). Section 25-119(d)(4) clarifies that variances granted under Subtitle 25 are not considered zoning variances.

A Subtitle 25 Variance, dated November 3, 2022, was submitted for review with this CSP. The approved NRI identifies a total of 218 specimen trees on-site. The following analysis is a review of the request to remove 107 specimen trees.

The letter of justification requested the removal of 107 specimen trees identified as 2, 3, 8–10, 18–20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 43, 46–48, 50–52, 56, 64, 65, 69–83, 90–97, 102–105, 109-114, 125–129, 132–140, 150–158, 160–163, 165–184, 204–206, 217, and 218. The condition of trees proposed for removal ranges from poor to excellent. The TCP1 shows the location of the trees proposed for removal. These specimen trees are proposed for removal for the development of the site and associated infrastructure.

In a discussion with the applicant on November 9, 2022, it was confirmed that specimen tree 28 is dead and specimen tree 29 is split and does not meet the 30 inches diameter at breast height requirement to be counted as a specimen tree. These two trees (28 and 29) are no longer considered specimen trees proposed for removal. This brings the variance request from 109 to 107specimen trees.

SPECIMEN TREE SCHEDULE SUMMARY FOR 107 TREES PROPOSED FOR REMOVAL ON TCP1-066-94-03

Glenwood Hills Variance Tree List				
Residential Area Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH*	Common Name	Condition	Reason for removal
129	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for SWM Facility
135	31"	Red Maple	Good	Constr. for Lot 26
136	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for Lot 26 & 27
137	43"	Northern Catalpa	Excellent	Constr. for Lot 26
138	30.5"	Am. Beech	Good	Constr. for Lot 27 & 28
139	46"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for Lot 27 & 28
140	36"	Silver Maple	Good	Constr. for Lot 28
176	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for Storm Drain

Mixed Use/ Retail Area Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH	Common Name	Condition	Reason for removal
102	44”	Sycamore	Excellent	Proposed connection to ex. sewer
103	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use/ retail buildings
104	32.5"	Silver Maple	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
105	42.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
165	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Proposed connection to ex. sewer
166	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Proposed connection to ex. sewer
167	34"	Sycamore	Good	Proposed connection to ex. sewer
168	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
169	31.5"	Silver Maple	Good	Constr. for SWM Facilities
170	30"/30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
171	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
172	38.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
173	32.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
174	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
175	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use/ retail buildings
205	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings
217	32.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for mixed-use / retail buildings

Industrial Area Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH	Common Name	Condition	Reason for Removal
2	33"	Silver Maple	Good	Grading for loading area/ parking lot
3	34"	Sycamore	Good	Grading for loading area/ parking lot
9	42"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM Facility
10	33"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #4
19	40.5"	Tulip Poplar	Poor	Hollow Trunk, Leaning & Grading for SWM/ Parking
20	38"	Red Oak	Good	Grading for SWM facility
22	48"	Silver Maple	Poor	Constr. of Warehouse #3 parking lot
23	38"	Black Walnut	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
25	35"	White Oak	Excellent	Constr. of Warehouse #2 parking lot
27	34.5"	Black Walnut	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #2 loading area
46	38.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
47	34"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
48	40"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for Warehouse #1 parking lot
50	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
51	33.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
52	43"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility

Industrial Area Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH	Common Name	Condition	Reason for Removal
69	33.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for Storm drain
70	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM & Warehouse #4
71	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM & Warehouse #4
72	31"	Silver Maple	Good	Grading for SWM & Warehouse #4
73	32.5"	Red Oak	Good	Grading for Warehouse #4
74	33.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM & Warehouse #4
75	36"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for Storm drain
76	38"	Sycamore	Good	Constr. for loading area/ parking lot
77	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility
79	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM fac. & parking lot
80	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM fac. & parking lot
81	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
82	35"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
96	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for parking lot
97	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for parking lot
109	33.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading assoc. w/ Warehouse #2
110	34.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading assoc. w/ Warehouse #2
111	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility
112	33.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility
113	34"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. & grading for Warehouse #5
114	34.5"	Pin Oak	Good	Constr. & grading for Warehouse #5
132	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading assoc. w/ Building #1
133	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading assoc. w/ Building #1
150	39"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
151	36"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for SWM facility
152	42.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for SWM facility
153	38"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of access rd. for Warehouse#1
155	51"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
156	43.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
157	37"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1 parking lot
158	43"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for Warehouse #1 parking lot
160	33"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for Warehouse #1 parking lot
161	38"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
162	41.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
163	39"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1
178	32"/27.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. for SWM facility

Industrial Area Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH	Common Name	Condition	Reason for Removal
181	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
182	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
183	38"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
184	38"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3
204	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #1 parking lot
206	30.5"	Tulip Poplar	Fair	Hollow Trunk/ Grading for SWM fac.
218	32"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Constr. of Warehouse #3 parking lot

Karen Boulevard Construction Impacts:				
Tree #	DBH	Common Name	Condition	Reason for Removal
8	43"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
18	35"	Black Oak	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
43	38.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & ret wall
56	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
64	32.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
65	36.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
78	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
83	32.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
90	33"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
91	33"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
92	34.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
93	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
94	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & culvert for storm drain outfall.
95	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
125	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway.
126	30.5"	Sycamore	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
127	35"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
128	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
134	31.5"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility assoc. w/ Master-Planned Roadway
154	39”	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway & constr. for Culvert & water line
177	30"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Grading for SWM facility assoc. w/ Master-Planned Roadway
179	31"	Tulip Poplar	Good	Master-Planned Roadway
180	31 "	Chestnut Oak	Good	Master-Planned Roadway

Note: *Diameter at breast height

Evaluation
The removal of 107 specimen trees requested by the applicant is approved, based on the findings below. Section 25-119(d) contains six required findings [text in **bold** below] to be made before a variance from the WCO 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.

In relation to other properties in the area, special conditions peculiar to the subject property would cause an unwarranted hardship if the applicant were required to retain the 107 specimen trees. Those "special conditions" relate to the specimen trees themselves, such as their size, condition, species, and on-site location.

The property is 133.45 acres, and the NRI shows approximately 26.71 acres of PMA comprised of streams, floodplain, wetlands, and associated buffers. This represents approximately 20 percent of the overall site area. The applicant is proposing 12 impacts to the site's PMA fully minimized to the extent practicable and is proposing woodland conservation and afforestation to further protect the PMA.

The specimen trees are located across the entire site, many within the PMA. The specimen trees proposed for removal are located in areas of the site most suited for development. This site contains steep slopes, wetlands, streams, and floodplains, which restrict development potential. Complete retention of these trees would severely limit the developable area of the site. A summary of each development section follows.

Residential Area Construction Impacts
Within the single-family residential townhome section, 8 trees are proposed for removal. These trees are identified as 129, 135–140, and 176. The trees are a mix of Poplars, Maples, Beech, and Catalpa. The condition ratings for the specimen trees in this section vary from good to excellent with the largest tree measuring 46 inches diameter at breast height. While these trees are listed in good condition, Beech, Maples, and Poplar have poor construction tolerances. Requiring the applicant to retain these trees and the critical root zone could result in these trees becoming hazardous due to stress as a result of the construction.

Retail Area Construction Impacts
Within the retail portion of the site, 17 trees are proposed for removal. These trees are identified as 102–105, 165–175, 205, and 217. A mixture of Poplars, Maples, and Sycamores are observed within this area. In total, 13 of the 17 specimen trees requested for removal in this section are Poplars which are known for poor construction tolerances. Sycamores have a medium tolerance with Maples varying based on the species.

Condition ratings for these specimen trees range from good to excellent with the largest tree being 44 inches in diameter at breast height. Requiring the applicant to retain these trees and the critical root zones could result in these trees becoming hazardous due to stress as a result of the construction.

Industrial Area Construction Impacts
Within the industrial area 58 trees are proposed for removal. These trees are identified as 2, 3, 9, 10, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 46, 47, 48, 50–52, 69–77, 79–82, 96, 97, 109–114, 132, 133, 150–153, 155–158, 160–163, 178, 181–184, 204, 206, and 218. A mixture of Poplars, Maples, Sycamores, and Oaks are present in this section. As with the sections noted above, this section is dominated by Poplar. Sycamores are noted for medium construction tolerances while Oak varies from good to medium based on species. Poplars have poor tolerances and are prone to failure when stressed. Conditions of the specimen trees range from poor to excellent, with the largest tree being 51 inches in diameter at breast height. Requiring the applicant to retain these trees and the critical root zones could result in these trees becoming hazardous due to stress as a result of the construction.

Karen Boulevard Construction Impacts
Karen Boulevard is a master-planned roadway (C-429) which connects the site to MD 214 to the north. This roadway crosses multiple regulated environmental features, such as streams, wetlands, steep slopes, and 100-year floodplain. The applicant has minimized the impacts to these areas by retaining the proposed master-planned alignment. Within this alignment are numerous specimen trees located in the right-of-way for the master-planned road. These trees are identified as 8, 18, 43, 56, 64, 65, 78, 83, 90-95, 125–128, 134, 154, 177, 179, and 180. This section is dominated by Poplars, with sparse Oak and Sycamore present. The conditions for specimen trees in this section are all listed as good with the largest tree at 43 inches in diameter at breast height. As mentioned above Poplar are prone to failure and have poor construction tolerances. The trees have the potential to become hazardous if they are required to be preserved. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066.

Summary of Areas
This CSP approves a mixed-use development consisting of residential, commercial, retail, and industrial development, as well as construction of the master-planned roadway (C-429). These are reasonable uses for an M-X-T-zoned site. Development is limited to areas outside of the PMA and most of these trees are within the most developable areas of the site. The remaining trees vary in tolerance from dead to excellent and are located in the central development portion of the site. Requiring the applicant to retain the 107 specimen trees on the site by designing the development to avoid impacts to the critical root zones would further limit the area of the site available for the orderly development that is consistent with the existing zoning, to the extent that it would cause the applicant an unwarranted hardship. The specimen tree variance request submitted with the CSP identified 109 trees proposed for removal.

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

Enforcement of the requirement that all specimen trees be preserved, along with an appropriate percentage of their critical root zone, would deprive the applicant of rights commonly enjoyed by others in similar areas. All variance applications for the removal of specimen trees are evaluated in accordance with the requirements of Subtitle 25 and the Environmental Technical Manual for site specific conditions. Specimen trees grow to such a large size because they have been left undisturbed on a site for sufficient time to grow; however, the species, size, construction tolerance, and location on a site are all somewhat unique for each site.

Based on the location and species of the specimen trees proposed for removal, retaining the trees and avoiding disturbance to the critical root zone would have a considerable impact on the development potential of the property. If similar trees were encountered on other sites, they would be evaluated under the same criteria. The proposed residential, commercial, retail, and industrial development is a use that aligns with the uses permitted in the M-X-T Zone. The specimen trees requested for removal are located within the developable parts of the site.

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

Not granting the variance would prevent the project from being developed in a functional and efficient manner. This is not a special privilege that would be denied to other applicants. If other similar developments featured regulated environmental features and specimen trees in similar conditions and locations, it would be given the same considerations 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.

The existing site conditions or circumstances, including the location of the specimen trees, are not the result of actions by the applicant. The removal of the 107 specimen trees would be the result of the infrastructure and grading required for the development. As Poplars have poor tolerances, construction activities while retaining these trees could lead to hazardous conditions. The request to remove the trees is solely based on the trees' locations on the site, their species, and their condition.

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

There are no existing conditions relating to land, or building uses on the site, or on neighboring properties, which have any impact on the location or size of the specimen trees. The trees have grown to specimen tree size based on natural conditions and have not been impacted by any neighboring land or building uses.

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

Granting this variance request does not violate state water quality standards, nor cause measurable degradation in water quality. Requirements regarding SWM will be reviewed and approved by the Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE). Erosion and sediment control requirements are reviewed and approved by the Prince George's Soil Conservation District. Both SWM and sediment and erosion control requirements are to be met in conformance with state and local laws to ensure that the quality of water leaving the site meets the states standards. State standards are set to ensure that no degradation occurs.

Conclusion

The required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of 107 specimen trees, identified as 2, 3, 8–10, 18–20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 43, 46 through 48, 50–52, 56, 64, 65, 69–83, 90–97, 102–105, 109–114, 125–129, 132–140, 150–158, 160–163, 165–184, 204–206, 217, and 218. The requested variance for the removal of 107 specimen trees, for construction of a mixed-use development is approved.

10. **Other site-related regulations:** Additional regulations are applicable to site plan review that usually require detailed information which can only be provided at the time of DSP. The discussion provided below is for information only.

a. **2010 Prince George's County Landscape Manual**—This development in the M-X-T Zone is subject to the requirements of the Landscape Manual, at the time of DSP. Specifically, the site is subject to Section 4.1, Residential Requirements; Section 4.2, Requirements for Landscape Strips along Streets; Section 4.3, Parking Lot Requirements; Section 4.4, Screening Requirements; Section 4.6, Buffering Development from Streets; Section 4.7, Buffering Incompatible Uses; and Section 4.9, Sustainable Landscaping Requirements, of the Landscape Manual.

b. **Prince George's County Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance**—Subtitle 25, Division 3, the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance, requires a minimum percentage of tree canopy coverage (TCC) on projects that require a grading permit. Properties zoned M-X-T are required to provide a minimum of 10 percent of the gross tract area to be covered by tree canopy. The subject site is 133.45 acres in size and the required TCC is 13.35 acres. Conformance with the requirements of the Tree Canopy Coverage Ordinance will be ensured at the time of DSP.

11. **Referral Comments:** This CSP application was referred to the concerned agencies and divisions. The referral comments are adopted herein by reference and main points are summarized, as follows:

a. **Historic Preservation**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 2, 2022 (Stabler to Gupta), which included the following comments:

(1) The Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA includes goals and policies related to historic preservation (pages 287–296). However, these are not specific to the subject site.

(2) The subject property does not contain, and is not adjacent to, any designated Prince George's County historic sites or resources. The subject CSP will not affect any Prince George's County historic sites or resources.

(3) A search of current and historic photographs, topographic and historic maps, and locations of currently known archeological sites indicates the probability of archeological sites within the subject property is moderate to high.

(4) A Phase I archeology survey was conducted on a portion of the subject property in 2007. A draft report, *Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Glenwood Hills Development, Prince George's County, Maryland, PPS 4-04081*, was received by the Prince George's County Planning Department and was reviewed by Historic Preservation staff. Two archeological sites were identified, 18PR838 and 18PR839. Both were identified as 20th century farmsteads with related outbuildings, and no further work on those sites was required. The subject CSP contains Parcels 124 and 125, which were not included in the prior Phase I archeology survey. A Phase I archeology survey should be conducted on Parcels 124 and 125.

b. **Community Planning**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 4, 2022 (Bishop to Gupta), which concluded that, pursuant to Part 3, Division 9, Subdivision 2, of the prior Zoning Ordinance, master plan conformance is not required for this application.

(1) This application is located within the Established Communities Policy Area of Plan 2035. Plan 2035 describes Established Communities as areas appropriate for context-sensitive infill and low- to -medium density development and recommends maintaining and enhancing existing public services, facilities, and infrastructure to ensure that the needs of residents are met (page 20).

(2) Master Plan: The Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA recommends a forested land use on the subject property, but this is no longer applicable due to CB-51-2021.

It is noted that CB-51-2021 includes specific requirements and recommends that the M-X-T regulations be applied to townhouses within the R-55 Zone, the Industrial uses not exceed 60 percent of the gross acreage of the land, and the industrial development must be separated from any existing or proposed residential development by a minimum of 75 feet. This will be reviewed with a future DSP. The applicant is encouraged to work with staff at that time to make sure screening, berming, and landscaping is provided to buffer incompatible uses and the existing residentially zoned property surrounding the site.

(3) This site is located within the Military Installation Overlay (M-I-O) Zone. Pursuant to Section 27-548.54(e)(2)(D), Maximum Height Requirement, of the prior Zoning Ordinance, all proposed structures in this application must comply with the requirements for height for properties located in Surface B App/Dep Clearance (50:1) - North End. This will be reviewed at the time of DSP.

(4) The Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA retained the M-X-T Zone and a portion of the site in the R-55 Zone, in June of 2010. On November 29, 2021, the District Council approved Prince George's County Council Resolution CR-136-2021, the Countywide Sectional Map Amendment, which reclassified the subject property from the M-X-T Zone and a portion of the site in the R-55 Zone, to the RMF-48 and RSF-65 Zones and is effective April 1, 2022.

c. **Transportation Planning**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 14, 2022 (Smith to Gupta), which concluded that multimodal transportation facilities exist to serve the proposed development, as required under Subtitle 27, and will conform to the MPOT and the Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA.

Prior Conditions of Approval
The site has prior approved CSP, PPS, and DSP applications. The subject CSP amends or removes conditions included in the prior CSP approval and, therefore, new PPS and DSP applications will be needed, which will supersede what was previously approved.

Master Plan Compliance
This CSP is subject to the MPOT. The subject property fronts MD 214, which is designated as master-planned arterial road (A-32) with a recommended variable width right-of-way of 120 to 150 feet, which includes a master plan recommended bicycle lane facility. The subject property also includes the master-planned collector roadway, Karen Boulevard (C-429), to which the MPOT recommends an 80-foot right-of-way to include bicycle lane and side path facilities along the frontage. It is important to note that the hard surface Chesapeake Rail Trail impacts the northern portion of the site with an east-west orientation.

The CSP shows the extent and limitations of the ultimate right-of-way for Karen Boulevard, but shows MD 214 as a 100-foot right-of-way, which is not consistent with

the master plan recommendations. It is acknowledged that, at the time of PPS, the appropriate right-of-way dedication will be addressed. The applicant shall update the CSP to show the extent and limits of the master plan ultimate right-of-way along the subject property's frontage of MD 214.

The MPOT provides policy guidance regarding multimodal transportation and the Complete Streets element of the MPOT recommends how to accommodate infrastructure for people walking and bicycling.

> **Policy 1: Provide standard sidewalks along both sides of all new road construction within the Developed and Developing Tiers.**
>
> **Policy 2: All road frontage improvements and road capital improvement projects within the Developed and Developing Tiers shall be designed to accommodate all modes of transportation. Continuous sidewalks and on-road bicycle facilities should be included to the extent feasible and practical.**
>
> **Policy 4: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.**

This development is also subject to Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA, which also recommends a 120 to 150-foot right-of-way along MD 214 and an 80-foot right-of-way along Karen Boulevard. The area master plan recommends the following policies regarding multi-modal transportation (page 234):

> ***Roadway Policies***
>
> **Policy 2: The transportation system must have efficient access to residential, commercial, and employment areas with improvements to existing roadways and new roadways and minimizing dislocation and disruption resulting from the implementation of these recommendations.**
>
> **Policy 5: Ensure the transportation facilities are adequate prior to the approval of any new development within established neighborhoods and in the designated centers in accordance with the procedures provided in the County Code.**
>
> ***Pedestrian, Bicycles and Trails***
>
> **Policy 1: Incorporate appropriate pedestrian-oriented and TOD features in the centers.**

Policy 2: Provide sidewalks and neighborhood trail connections within existing communities to improve pedestrian safety, allow for safe routes to Metro stations and schools, and provide for increased non-motorized connectivity between neighborhoods.

Policy 3: Develop bicycle-friendly roadways in conformance with the latest standards and guidelines, including the 1999 AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities.

In addition, the subject site is impacted by the planned Central Avenue Connector Trail, which includes a portion of the planned Chesapeake Rail Trail that was relocated along the frontage of MD 214. The route of the Central Avenue Connector Trail impacts the frontage of the property along MD 214, the northern portion of Karen Boulevard, and the PEPCO right-of-way that is oriented east-west through the property.

The property frontage of MD 214 shall be designed, consistent with the Central Avenue Connector Trail, to maintain continuity along the entire frontage. A bicycle lane and a minimum 10-foot-wide side path are also required to be provided along the entire limits of Karen Boulevard, to provide a multi-modal connection through the site and to adjacent properties. Minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalks are required along all internal roadways that are not designated as master-planned facilities. All pedestrian pathways are to include Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps and crosswalks. Designated bicycle parking is to be included throughout the site to accommodate the multi-modal environment.

Zoning Ordinance Compliance

Mixed Use-Transportation Oriented (M-X-T) Zone
Most of the subject site is located within the M-X-T Zone. Section 27-546 of the prior Zoning Ordinance provides additional requirements for a CSP. The section emphasizes the need for appropriate transportation facilities to support sites developed in this zone and comprehensive pedestrian connections within a mixed-use community.

Analysis of Traffic Impacts
The applicant submitted a full TIS. This study was used as the basis for a determination of transportation adequacy for developments located in the M-X-T zoning district, in conformance to Section 27-546(d)(9) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, as stated below:

Section 27-546(d)(9) discusses anticipated transportation adequacy for a CSP for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment and is copied below:

(d) In addition to the findings required for the Planning Board to approve either the Conceptual or Detailed Site Plan (Part 3, Division 9), the Planning Board shall also find that:

(9) On a Conceptual Site Plan for property placed in the M-X-T Zone by a Sectional Map Amendment, transportation facilities that are existing; that are under construction; or for which one hundred percent (100%) of construction funds are allocated within the adopted County Capital Improvement Program, or the current State Consolidated Transportation Program, will be provided by the applicant (either wholly or, where authorized pursuant to Section 24-124(a)(8) of the County Subdivision Regulations, through participation in a road club), or are incorporated in an approved public facilities financing and implementation program, will be adequate to carry anticipated traffic for the proposed development. The finding by the Council of adequate transportation facilities at the time of conceptual site plan approval shall not prevent the Planning Board from later amending this finding during its review of subdivision plats.

The TIS that was submitted as part of the CSP application was reviewed. The TIS shows that all intersections within the study area will operate at acceptable levels, except the Karen Boulevard/MD 214 intersection, which will require construction of a traffic signal to meet the requirements of the area transportation service area. As such, a condition of approval is included in this resolution which requires that, as part of the approval of the PPS application, the applicant shall submit a full traffic signal warrant analysis for the Karen Boulevard and MD 214 intersection to determine if a signal is deemed warranted.

Based on the findings and conclusions of the TIS, existing transportation facilities, when improved with improvements outlined in the TIS, are sufficient to support the approved development and meet the requirements of Section 27-546(d)(9).

Site Circulation
The CSP proposes sidewalks throughout the site and along the property frontage to detail an interconnected system that provides general circulation for pedestrians. Internal connections are required to be provided throughout the site to all uses, creating continuous, convenient, and comprehensive connections to encourage alternative modes of transportation.

The site must also comply with Section 27-274, which provides requirements regarding parking, loading and circulation. These requirements include ensuring parking lots are designed to provide safe and efficient circulation for both pedestrians and vehicles to minimize conflicts. Designated areas for vanpool, carpool, and visitor parking should be provided at convenient locations. Safe transitions for vehicular access should be provided throughout the site. In addition, the design of streetscape amenities should be clearly visible, accessible, and functional.

A condition of approval is included in this resolution which requires that the site is developed with clearly marked and visible pathways for pedestrians throughout all parking areas to separate vehicular and pedestrian routes. The site shall also be served by designated parking spaces for rideshare, carpool activities and visitor parking are to be provided at all multifamily buildings.

Transportation Planning Review
The CSP includes the main access to the site, at the intersection of MD 214 and Karen Boulevard, and two secondary accesses along MD 214, east of the Karen Boulevard intersection, being proposed as right-in and right-outs. Within the site, Karen Boulevard provides the main circulation and proposes an 80-foot-wide right-of-way to include an 8-foot-wide side path along Karen Boulevard. The proposed right-of-way is sufficient to provide all internal sidewalks and streetscape amenities.

In addition, the applicant provided a circulation plan that includes both vehicular and pedestrian networks. The plan shows a sidewalk along the frontage of MD 214, both sides of Karen Boulevard, and connections to adjacent properties. It is required that all pedestrian and bicycle facilities be provided and included on subsequent site plans. The overall circulation and proposed roadway configurations are acceptable.

d. **Subdivision**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 8, 2022 (Vatandoost to Gupta), which stated that a new PPS and final plat will be required, for the proposed development, because this CSP amendment proposes changes to the lotting pattern approved with PPS 4-04081.

(1) The property is located adjacent to MD 214, a master-planned arterial roadway. A Phase I noise study will be required with the PPS to demonstrate that any planned outdoor recreation areas and the multifamily dwelling units are not impacted by noise. Also, at the time of DSP when the positions of dwellings and details of the recreation facilities are known, Phase II noise studies will be required with the plans. Mitigation will be required for all exterior noise-sensitive areas exposed to traffic noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn, to ensure traffic noise is reduced to not higher than that level. All dwellings exposed to noise levels above 65 dBA Ldn must achieve an interior noise level no higher than 45 dBA Ldn.

(2) The CSP identifies locations for proposed on-site recreational facilities throughout the development. The adequacy of any on-site recreational facilities to satisfy the mandatory parkland dedication requirement will be evaluated at the time of PPS and DSP review.

(3) The lotting and circulation pattern, and any required right-of-way dedication, will be reviewed further with the PPS application. Right-of-way widths for any public and private streets internal to the development will also be determined at the time of the PPS. Moreover, the location of public utility easements required along all public and private streets will be determined with the PPS.

e. **Environmental Planning**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 14, 2022 (Kirchhof to Gupta), which provided comments summarized, as follows.

The EPS previously reviewed the following applications and associated plans for the subject site:

Development Review Case #	Associated Tree Conservation Plan #	Authority	Status	Action Date	Resolution Number
CSP-88020	N/A	Planning Board	Approved	9/8/1988	88-303
CSP-88020-01	N/A	Planning Board	Approved	3/3/1994	93-269
4-94066	TCPI-066-94	Planning Board	Approved	7/18/2002	94-351
CSP-88020-02	TCPI-066-94-01	Planning Board	Approved	7/15/2004	04-170
4-04081	TCPI-066-94-02	Planning Board	Approved	10/28/2004	04-252
DSP-07003	TCP2-049-07	Planning Board	Approved	10/11/2007	07-165
DSP-07003-01	N/A	Planning Director	Approved	5/25/2010	COA
NRI-165-2021	N/A	Staff	Approved	11/18/2021	N/A
CSP-88020-03	TCPI-066-94-03	Planning Board	Approved	12/08/2022	2022-129
4-21051	TCP1-066-94-03	Planning Board	Pending	Pending	Pending

Grandfathering
The project is subject to the environmental regulations contained in Subtitle 25, and prior Subtitles 24 and 27 because the application is for a new CSP.

Site Description
This 133.45-acre site is fully wooded and located just south of the MD 214 and Karen Boulevard intersection. The site is bounded to the north by MD 214 and is bisected by the proposed Karen Boulevard master-planned roadway. Under the current zoning ordinance this site is zoned RMF-48. The applicant filed this application under the prior M-X-T Zone. A review of the available information indicates that streams, wetlands, and steep slopes occur on the property. There is potential forest interior dwelling species habitat mapped on-site. According to information obtained from the Maryland Department of Natural Resources Natural Heritage Program, there are no rare, threatened, or endangered species on or in the vicinity of this property. The site has one stream system that drain towards Cabin Branch. The property fronts on MD 214 which is a designated arterial roadway and considered a traffic noise generator. The site lies within the M-I-O Zone for height. The property is not adjacent to any roadways designated as scenic or historic. CSP-88020-03 is located within the Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA. The site is located within the Environmental Strategy Area 1 (formerly the Developed Tier) of the Regulated Environmental Protection Areas Map, and in the Established Communities of the General Plan Growth Policy (2035) map as designated by Plan 2035. The property is shown on the General Plan Generalized Future Land Use (2035) as Mixed-Use. According to the 2017 *Green Infrastructure Plan of the Approved*

Prince George's County Resource Conservation Plan: A Countywide Functional Master Plan, the site contains regulated and evaluation areas.

Prior Approvals
The site was subject to several prior approvals which proposed mixed-use development. The conditions of approval are not applicable to this CSP because the proposed uses and site design have changed. The approval of CSP-88020-03 and subsequent PPS 4-21051 and DSP supersedes all previous approvals.

Preservation of Regulated Environmental Features/Primary Management Area
The site contains regulated environmental features including streams, stream buffers, wetlands, wetland buffers, and steep slopes which comprise the PMA.

Section 27-273(e)(15) of the prior Zoning Ordinance requires that CSP applications include, "A statement of justification describing how the proposed design preserves and restores the regulated environmental features to the fullest extent possible."
Section 27-276(b)(4) of the prior Zoning Ordinance states that for all CSP applications, "The plan shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of the regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible in accordance with the requirement of Subtitle 24-130 (b)(5)."

Section 24-130(b)(5) of the prior Prince George's County Subdivision Regulations states: "Where a property is located outside the Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas Overlay Zones the preliminary plan and all plans associated with the subject application shall demonstrate the preservation and/or restoration of regulated environmental features in a natural state to the fullest extent possible consistent with the guidance provided by the Environmental Technical Manual established by Subtitle 25. Any lot with an impact shall demonstrate sufficient net lot area where a net lot area is required pursuant to Subtitle 27, for the reasonable development of the lot outside the regulated feature. All regulated environmental features shall be placed in a conservation easement and depicted on the final plat."

Impacts to the regulated environmental features should be limited to those that are necessary for the development of the property. Necessary impacts are those that are directly attributable to infrastructure required for the reasonable use and orderly and efficient development of the subject property or are those that are required by the County Code for reasons of health, safety, or welfare. Necessary impacts include, but are not limited to, adequate sanitary sewerage lines and water lines, road crossings for required street connections, and outfalls for SWM facilities. Road crossings of streams and/or wetlands may be appropriate if placed at the location of an existing crossing or at the point of least impact to the regulated environmental features. SWM outfalls may also be considered necessary impacts if the site has been designed to place the outfall at a point of least impact. The types of impacts that can be avoided include those for site grading, building placement, parking, SWM facilities (not including outfalls), and road crossings where reasonable alternatives exist. The cumulative impacts for the development of a

property should be the fewest necessary and sufficient to reasonably develop the site in conformance with the County Code. Impacts to regulated environmental features must first be avoided and then minimized.

A letter of justification and exhibit for PMA impacts were submitted with this application. The letter of justification proposed a total of 12 impacts to the PMA, and a brief description of each impact. The Planning Board approves Impacts 1–3 and 5–12, and determined that the evaluation of Impact 4 shall be deferred to the next phase of review.

Impact 1—Sewer Main and Stormdrain Outfall
Impact 1 proposes 12,097 square feet (0.28 acre) of PMA impacts for the relocation of a sewer main. A stormdrain outfall is also proposed as part of this impact to serve the mixed-use retail portion of the site. The utility connection will be co-located with the stormwater outfall to minimize PMA impacts. This impact is approved.

Impact 2—Stormdrain Outfall
Impact 2 proposes 1,564 square feet (0.04 acre) of PMA impacts for a stormdrain outfall in association with the stormwater facilities for an industrial building site. This impact cannot be avoided because it is required by other provisions of the County and state codes. This impact is approved.

Impact 3—Karen Boulevard Construction
Impact 3 proposes 2,815 square feet (0.06 acre) of PMA impacts for the development of Karen Boulevard, a master-planned roadway. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. This impact is approved.

Impact 4—Karen Boulevard Construction
Impact 4 proposes 60,282 square feet (1.38 acres) of PMA impacts for the development of Karen Boulevard including a culvert, headwalls, roadway, and environmental site design. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. This impact is partially approved. The provided exhibit shows a portion of this impact is for Karen Boulevard and a portion is for an adjacent industrial development pod. A stormwater outfall is placed in close proximity to the proposed culvert for Karen Boulevard. This impact must be separated to show the disturbance needed for Karen Boulevard and from the disturbance needed for the proposed building and parking. This impact shall be evaluated with a subsequent application (DSP). This impact is partially approved for development of Karen Boulevard.

Impact 5—Sewer Main Installation
Impact 5 proposes 4,651 square feet (0.11 acre) of PMA impacts for a sewer line connection and stormdrain outfall. The location of this impact was chosen due to surrounding stream banks. The stream segment proposed to be impacted is more stable and not as steep or eroded as banks further downstream. This impact cannot be avoided because it is required by other provisions of the County and state codes. This impact is approved.

Impact 6—Stormdrain Outfall
Impact 6 proposes 1,772 square feet (0.04 acre) of PMA impacts for a SWM facility and associated outfall. This impact is given a different acreage of 0.32 in the letter of justification. The LOJ shall be revised to indicate the correct disturbance acreage. This impact cannot be avoided because it is required by other provisions of the County and state codes. This impact is approved.

Impact 7—Karen Boulevard Construction, Stream Crossing, Culvert, and Stormdrain
Impact 7 proposes 57,489 square feet (1.32 acres) of PMA impacts for the construction of Karen Boulevard including culvert, stormdrain, roadway, sidewalk, and environmental site design. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. This impact is approved.

Impact 8—Stormdrain Outfall
Impact 8 proposes 3,079 square feet (0.07 acre) of PMA impacts for a stormdrain outfall with relation to the 100-year floodplain and to serve the residential development. This impact was reduced in size, and the proposed square footage shall be reflected on the TCP1. This impact is approved.

Impact 9—Karen Boulevard Construction, Stream Crossing, Culvert, and Stormdrain
Impact 9 proposes 50,739 square feet (1.16 acres) for the development of Karen Boulevard, including a steam crossing, culvert, and outfall. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. This impact is approved.

Impact 10—Karen Boulevard Bridge and Road Construction and Water Line.
Impact 10 proposes 23,765 square feet (0.55 acre) for PMA impacts associated with the bridge needed to develop Karen Boulevard. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. The proposed water line was adjusted to follow closely with Impact 10. This impact is approved.

Impact 11—Karen Boulevard Bridge and Road Construction
Impact 11 proposes 2,558 square feet (0.06 acre) of PMA impacts associated with the bridge crossing for Karen Boulevard. The current master-planned alignment of Karen Boulevard (C-429) was previously reviewed and approved with prior approvals for CSP-88020 and PPS 4-94066. This impact is the other side of the stream from Impact 10. This impact is approved.

Impact 12—Site Access (Temporary)
Impact 12 proposes 9,467 square feet (0.22 acre) of temporary PMA disturbance that will serve as an access road during the development of the site and will be reforested after construction. This impact proposes to utilize an existing farm road for site access, which will receive minor improvements as required by DPIE, to permit as a haul road for the construction phase. No additional culverts or stream crossings are proposed as the existing farm road is to be utilized, and this impact is necessary for temporary site access during the construction phases. The northern crossing for Karen Boulevard proposes a bridge, and the existing access road will be used to bring materials to construct the southern side of the bridge. This impact is approved.

PMA Impact Summary
This site features multiple areas of PMA (26.71 acres total) consisting of, steep slopes, wetlands, 100-year floodplain, streams, and wetlands. Twelve impacts are approved to the PMA area with this CSP. Impacts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 are approved. Impact 4 is partially approved for development of Karen Boulevard. The portion of Impact 4 associated with the development pad shall be identified as "4a" and shall be evaluated for minimization, with a subsequent application.

Soils
The predominant soils found to occur according to the United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey include the Adelphia-Holmdel complexes, Adelphia-Holmdel-Urban land complexes, Annapolis fine sandy loam, Collington-Wist complexes, Collington-Wist-Urban land complexes, Croom gravelly sandy loam, Croom-Marr complexes, Marr-Dodon complexes, Marr-Dodon-Urban land complexes, Sassafras-Urban land complexes, Udorthents highway, and Widewater and issue soils. According to available mapping information, unsafe soils containing Marlboro clay or Christiana clay do not occur on this property. This information is provided for the applicant's benefit.

Stormwater Management
An unapproved site development concept plan and an approved SWM Concept Letter (48714-2021-00) were submitted with the current CSP. This letter is reflective of the prior layout and will be further reviewed by DPIE. Submittal of an approved SWM concept letter and plan will be required for subsequent development review applications. No further information pertaining to SWM is required at this time.

f. **Prince George's County Department of Permitting, Inspections and Enforcement (DPIE)**—DPIE did not offer comments on the subject application.

g. **Prince George's County Health Department**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated October 4, 2022 (Adepoju to Gupta), which provided several comments on this CSP. Those comments have been transmitted to the applicant, who is aware of the health-related requirements. Comments on designating space for a store that provides healthy food options, and connection to public transit along MD 214 corridor, have been reflected in the conditions of this approval, requiring the applicant to address these conditions at the time of DSP. Other comments such as light pollution, provision of pet-friendly amenities and community gardens, fine particulate air pollution, and noise related to traffic will be further evaluated at the time of PPS and DSP, when detailed information on the site will be available.

h. **Prince George's County Department of Parks and Recreation (DPR)**—The Planning Board has reviewed and adopts the memorandum dated November 7, 2022 (Thompson to Gupta), which provided an analysis of the applicant's request to delete prior conditions of approval related to private recreational amenities. This proposal is subject to the Subregion 4 Master Plan and SMA, the 2017 *Land Preservation, Parks and Recreation Plan for Prince George's County*, and the 2013 *Formula 2040: Functional Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space*. This property is currently unimproved.

The applicant sought to amend or eliminate several conditions of CSP-88020-02 approved by the District Council. The request reflects the new development proposals reflected in the PPS and the DSP. Conditions 13, 17, and 18 are relevant to the review of this application.

13. The recreational facilities shall be located on the homeowners association land and shall be available to all residents of Glenwood Hills.

The applicant requested to amend Condition 13 to reflect the provision of recreational facilities conveyed to a homeowners association or M-NCPPC. The site plan illustrates two areas along Karen Boulevard – the residential pod west of the Karen Boulevard/MD 214 intersection and within the mixed-use pod east of that intersection – as proposed locations for recreational amenities and facilities. The provision of recreation amenities shall be reviewed and developed with the PPS and DSP. There is also a proposed east-west segment of the Central Avenue Connector Trail that traverses the property along the PEPCO right-of-way extending west from MD 214 through the proposed Karen Boulevard east to Shady Glen Road. This segment shall be reviewed and developed with the PPS and DSP.

17. The following private recreational facilities shall be provided within the development and shall be deemed adequate:

Townhouse pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)

Multifamily pod—one tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination) and one picnic area.

Central recreational area consisting of the following:

- **Clubhouse with meeting room large enough to accommodate seating for 100 persons, lounge, kitchen (with a minimum of a double sink, standard size refrigerator, dishwasher, and large microwave), 1,000-square-foot fitness facility, bath facilities for pool patrons**
- **25-meter swimming pool**
- **One tot lot and one preteen lot (or one multiage playground combination)**
- **Possible trail connection from the townhouse development along the stream to the central recreational area.**
- **One full-size multipurpose court (indoor or outdoor)**
- **One tennis court**
- **Appropriately sized parking facility for the residents only**

At the time of the Preliminary Plan, the design of the Central Recreational Area shall be conceptually approved and shall include the facilities noted above.

18. The following schedule shall govern bonding and construction of recreational facilities and shall be included in the recreational facilities agreement(s):

a. Prior to the issuance of the 100th building permit in the development, the applicant shall bond the central recreational facilities.

b. Prior to the issuance of the 300th building permit in the development, the applicant shall complete the central recreational facilities.

c. The bonding of the recreational facilities for the townhouses and the multifamily development pods shall precede the issuance of the building permits for each pod respectively, and the completion of the same facilities shall occur prior to completion of 75 percent of each pod of development.

The applicant requested the elimination of Conditions 17 and 18. The applicant will provide on-site recreation to meet the parkland dedication requirement with the new PPS and DSP. Condition 17 identified specific locations and private recreational amenities and facilities within the development. The new PPS and DSP offer an opportunity to evaluate proposed recreational amenities and facilities reflective of the proposed residential development. Condition 18 provided a schedule for the bonding and construction of the proposed recreational facilities. The new PPS and DSP will provide recommendations for the scheduling and bonding of future proposed recreation amenities and facilities.

At the time of PPS review, the applicant shall evaluate on-site recreation facilities, including outdoor active and passive amenities, and development of the Central Avenue Connector Trail alignment, along the PEPCO easement, between MD 214 and Shady Glen Road, to fulfill the dedication of parkland requirement.

i. **Maryland State Highway Administration (SHA)**—SHA did not offer comments on the subject application.

j. **Adjoining Municipalities**—The subject property is located within one mile of the geographical boundaries of the City of Seat Pleasant, the Town of Capitol Heights, and the City of District Heights. The CSP application was referred to these municipalities for review and comments on September 29, 2022 and September 30, 2022. No correspondence has been received from any of the adjacent municipalities.

12. As required by Section 27-276(b)(1) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, with the conditions of approval, this CSP represents a reasonable alternative for satisfying the site design guidelines without requiring unreasonable costs and without detracting substantially from the utility of the proposed development for its intended use.

13. Section 27-276(b)(4) of the prior Zoning Ordinance, for approval of a CSP, requires that the regulated environmental features on-site have been preserved and/or restored in a natural state, to the fullest extent possible, in accordance with the requirements of Section 24-130(b)(5) of the prior Subdivision Regulations. Based on the level of design information submitted with this application, 12 impacts proposed to the regulated environmental features on the subject property are approved with this CSP. Impacts 1–3 and 5–12 are approved. Impact 4 is partially approved for development of Karen Boulevard. The remainder of Impact 4 shall be evaluated with a subsequent application.

14. The required findings of Section 25-119(d) have been adequately addressed for the removal of 107 specimen trees identified as 2, 3, 8–10, 18–20, 22, 23, 25, 27, 43, 46–48, 50–52, 56, 64, 65, 69 through 83, 90–97, 102–105, 109–114, 125–129, 132–140, 150–158, 160–163, 165–184, 204 through 206, 217, and 218.

15. **Planning Board Hearing:** The Planning Board held a public hearing on this application on December 8, 2022. At the hearing, and in rendering its decision, the Board considered all written and oral testimony, along with all exhibits submitted according to the Board's procedures. During the hearing, in response to Commissioner Doerner's question, the applicant provided additional information to justify their request to remove 107 specimen trees. The applicant's representative explained that placement of the development was made, while still providing the buffers required by CB-51-2021, which allowed additional employment uses on this site. In addition, the site was historically used for farming, and trees that have grown there are the result of ceasing of the farming activity. The site has also been used for illegal dumping in the past, and many trees have grown around these dump sites. Several of the specimen trees proposed for removal are located in these dump sites, which will be required to be remediated to make these areas appropriate for development. The applicant's representative also explained the engineering factors which needed to be considered to minimize limits of disturbance. The most critical factor was the location and alignment of Karen Boulevard, which needed to accommodate existing physical and environmental constraints, while providing necessary connections, minimize environmental impacts, and reduce the number of specimen trees to be removed. The applicant further explained the unique conditions on the site, including topography and associated grading which informed the alignment of Karen Boulevard. The applicant stated that the industrial uses have been located in areas which were already cleared and graded for farming. The other areas of mature forest stands were selected to be preserved as woodlands. The applicant concluded that they have taken all design steps to minimize the removal of specimen trees, to the maximum extent that they could, given the site constraints.

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 Type 1 Tree Conservation Plan TCP1-066-94-03, and APPROVED a Variance to Section 25-122(b)(1)(G), and further APPROVED Conceptual Site Plan CSP-88020-03 for the above-described land, subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to certificate approval of the conceptual site plan (CSP), the following revisions shall be made, or information shall be provided:

    a. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall show the extent and limits of the ultimate right of-way along the subject property's frontage of MD 214 (Central Avenue).

    b. The natural resources inventory shall be revised to include a complete site statistics table which includes all required elements and associated quantities, in conformance with the Environmental Technical Manual.

c. The CSP and the Type 1 tree conservation plan shall show a limit of disturbance that preserves all regulated environmental features to the extent practicable.

d. The primary management area (PMA) Impact 4 and the PMA letter of justification and exhibit shall be revised to separate the proposed impacts associated with the development pad from those proposed with Karen Boulevard. This shall be referred to as "Impact 4a."

e. Label the distance between the proposed industrial use located to the west of Karen Boulevard and the existing residential development abutting the property to be a minimum of 75 feet.

2. Prior to certification of the conceptual site plan, the Type 1 tree conservation plan (TCP1) shall be revised as follows:

a. Add the prior approval information to the Environmental Planning Section approval block.

b. Revise the TCP1 to show the same proposed primary management area impacts as shown in the revised exhibit.

c. Provide the signed and dated property owners' awareness certification.

d. Ensure all specimen trees are present and visible on the TCP1 with the critical root zone and specimen tree number label.

e. Provide the site statistics on the TCP1 to show conformance with the revised natural resources inventory.

3. Prior to issuance of any grading permit, including for rough grading, a Type 2 tree conservation plan shall be approved.

4. Prior to issuance of any permits which impact wetlands, wetland buffers, streams, or waters of the United States, the applicant shall submit copies of all federal and state wetland permits, evidence that approval conditions have been complied with, and associated mitigation plans.

5. At the time of detailed site plan, the applicant shall investigate the possibility to designate space for a store that provides healthy food options.

6. At the time of detailed site plan, the applicant shall demonstrate how the on-site pedestrian system will connect to public transit along the Central Avenue Corridor.

7. At the time of detailed site plan, the applicant shall incorporate an enhanced buffer between Karen Boulevard and the proposed industrial buildings. This buffer shall be a minimum 10-foot-wide landscape strip to be planted with a minimum of 1 shade tree and 10 shrubs per 35 linear feet of street frontage, excluding driveway openings.

8. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide adequate private recreational facilities in accordance with the standards outlined in the Park and Recreation Facilities Guidelines. The private recreational facilities shall be reviewed by the Urban Design Section of the Development Review Division, for adequacy and proper siting, prior to approval of the detailed site plan by the Prince George's County Planning Board.

9. At the time of preliminary plan of subdivision, the applicant shall evaluate on-site recreation facilities including outdoor active and passive amenities, and the development of the Central Avenue Connector Trail along the Potomac Electric Power Company right-of-way between MD 214 (Central Avenue) and Shady Glen Road, to fulfill the mandatory dedication of parkland requirement.

10. Prior to approval of a grading permit, Phase I (Identification) archeological investigations, according to the Prince George's County Planning Board's 2005 *Guidelines for Archeological Review*, shall be conducted on Parcels 124 and 125 within the subject property to determine if any cultural resources are present. Evidence of Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission concurrence with the final Phase I report and recommendations is required prior to approval.

11. Upon receipt of the final Phase I archeological report by the Prince George's County Planning Department, if it is determined that potentially significant archeological resources exist in the project area, prior to Planning Board approval of the grading permit which includes Parcels 124 and 125, the applicant shall provide a plan for:

    a. Evaluating the resource at the Phase II level, or
    b. Avoiding and preserving the resource in place.

12. If a Phase II and/or Phase III archeological evaluation or mitigation is necessary, the applicant shall provide a final report detailing the Phase II and/or Phase III investigations and ensure that all artifacts are curated in a proper manner, prior to any ground disturbance or approval of any grading permits which includes Parcels 124 and 125.

13. Prior to approval of the first detailed site plan, if significant archeological resources exist, the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall provide a plan for any interpretive signage to be erected and public outreach measures (based on the findings of the Phase I, II, and/or Phase III archeological investigations). The location and wording of the signage and the public outreach measures shall be subject to approval by the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission staff archeologist. The plan shall include the timing for the installation of the signage and the implementation of public outreach measures.

14. Prior to approval of a preliminary plan of subdivision (PPS), the applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall submit a signal warrant analysis for the Karen Boulevard and MD 214 (Central Avenue) intersection, if the traffic impact study submitted with the PPS application shows that a traffic signal is needed offset traffic impacts at this intersection.

15. The applicant and the applicant's heirs, successors, and/or assignees shall construct the following facilities and show these facilities on a pedestrian and bikeway facilities plan as part of the site plan prior to its acceptance:

    a. A minimum 10-foot-wide shared-use path and/or shared roadway pavement markings and signage along Karen Boulevard, unless modified by the operating agency with written correspondence.

    b. Standard bicycle lane along Karen Boulevard, in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines, unless modified by the operating agency with written correspondence or in the applicant's approved final plans.

    c. The minimum 5-foot-wide sidewalk along both sides of all internal roadways throughout the site and associated Americans with Disabilities Act curb ramps and crosswalks.

    d. Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant curb ramps and crosswalks crossing all vehicular access points.

    e. Designated pathways for pedestrians through surface parking lots.

    f. Streetscape amenities are to be accessible and functional throughout the site to accommodate the mixed-use community.

    g. Long-term bicycle parking within the multifamily building and short-term bicycle near the building entrance, in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines.

    h. Short-term bicycle for the commercial and industrial areas at a location convenient to the buildings, in accordance with the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials guidelines.

    i. Dedicated parking spaces for rideshare activities.

16. Prior to issuance of a building permit for the 127th dwelling unit, the applicant shall either (a) have commenced construction of the retail component, or (b) provided to the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission Urban Design Section evidence of its good faith efforts of marketing the commercial component, along with third-party data on the existing market for retail development at the property and adjoining area.

17. Prior to approval of a detailed site plan, the following issues shall be addressed:

    a. Entrance features shall be submitted for review and shall be appropriately coordinated in design and location.

b. Pole-mounted freestanding signs shall be prohibited for the commercial/retail and multifamily component of the development. Freestanding and building-mounted signage shall not be internally lit.

c. Lighting fixtures throughout the development shall be coordinated in design.

d. Special paving materials shall be provided in appropriate areas such as the entrance to the subdivision off of Central Avenue, the central recreation area, the entrance to the multifamily development, and the commercial/retail development.

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 Doerner, seconded by Commissioner Geraldo, with Commissioners Doerner, Geraldo, and Shapiro voting in favor of the motion, and with Commissioners Bailey and Washington absent at its regular meeting held on Thursday, December 8, 2022, in Upper Marlboro, Maryland.

Adopted by the Prince George's County Planning Board this 5th day of January 2023.

Peter A. Shapiro
Chairman

By Jessica Jones
Planning Board Administrator

PAS:JJ:MG:rpg

Approved for Legal Sufficiency
M-NCPPC Office of General Counsel

Dated 12/29/22